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1. Project Title

Old Town Sidewalk Improvement (OTSW) Project  
(CIP # 9031)

2. Lead Agency Name and Address

City of Goleta  
Public Works Department  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, California 93117

3. Contact Person and Phone Number

James Winslow, Senior Project Manager  
(805) 961-7577

4. Project Location

The project is located in Old Town Goleta, bounded by Fairview Avenue to the west, U.S. Highway 101 (US 101)/Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) to the north, Mallard Avenue to the east, and Old San Jose Creek to the south. The project in its regional location is shown in Figure 1. The majority of the project is located in the residential area of Old Town Goleta, north of Hollister Avenue. The remainder of the project, a stretch of sidewalk proposed on Pine Avenue, is located south of Hollister Avenue. The proposed elements of the project are located on different streets throughout the area, and are shown in Figure 2.

5. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address

City of Goleta  
Public Works Department  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, California 93117
Figure 1 Regional Location
Figure 2  Project Location and Components
6. General Plan Designation

Project activities are located in and along residential and commercial streets. The parcels abutting the project area have several General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Land Use designations namely: 1) Single Family Residential; 2) High Density Residential; 3) General Commercial; and 4) Old Town Commercial (City of Goleta GP Land Use Figure 2.1 Updated June 2016).

7. Zoning

The zoning classifications adjacent and surrounding the OTSW project include Commercial Districts of Old Town (OT), General Commercial (CG), High Density Residential (RH), and Single Family Residential (RS-7) (City Goleta Inland Zone - Online GIS Mapper).

8. Description of Project

The project includes removing pedestrian access barriers and improving walkability for connections to businesses and alternative modes of transportation. The OTSW project would provide a continuous sidewalk, and curb and gutter, on at least one side of each street within the Project area. The project also includes installing American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) access ramps at the intersections where there are new or existing sidewalks. Figure 2 shows the location of individual project components (including, but not limited to, construction of sidewalks, curb ramps, access ramps, parking, etc.). Figure 3, Figure 4, and Figure 5 shows photos of the project area. Improvements and the different components of the project includes the following components listed below.

Design Improvements

Sidewalks

New or reconstructed sidewalks would be built along the east side of the following streets:

- South Fairview Avenue from Mandarin Drive to northerly terminus,
- Orange Avenue from north of Hollister Avenue to northerly terminus,
- Magnolia Avenue from Mandarin Drive to northerly terminus,
- Nectarine Avenue from north of Hollister Avenue to northerly terminus, and
- Pine Avenue from Thornwood Drive to Dawson Avenue.

New or reconstructed sidewalks would be built along the west side of the following street:

- Tecolote Avenue from Gato Avenue to Armitos Avenue.

New or reconstructed sidewalks would be built along the north side of the following streets:

- Mandarin Drive from north of Old San Jose Creek to Nectarine Avenue,
- Aguila Avenue from Tecolote Avenue to easterly terminus, and
- Gato Avenue from Tecolote Avenue to Mallard Avenue.

New or reconstructed sidewalks would be built along the south side of the following street:
- Armitos Avenue from Tecolote Avenue to Mallard Avenue.

The sidewalks would be four feet wide. Some areas would be widened to avoid overhead utility poles and trees where feasible.

*Curb Ramps*

Curb ramps would be constructed at the intersections on the sides where there are sidewalks. These locations are shown in Figure 2.

*Pedestrian Crosswalks*

Striping would be added to crosswalks at intersections with stop signs.

*Angled Parking*

The sidewalk would be relocated to the City right-of-way (ROW) line to order to provide angled parking on the east side of Magnolia Avenue from Mandarin Drive to the northerly terminus.

*Drainage Facilities and Stormwater Treatment*

Drainage and stormwater treatment options have not been fully designed. The general parameters could entail extending the existing drainage facilities on Hollister Avenue – such as drop inlets and piping – to Orange Avenue and Nectarine Avenue to help address the drainage issues at the Hollister Avenue approaches. Stormwater treatment facilities such as rain gardens, porous concrete sidewalks, permeable paving, dry wells, or tree filters, could be constructed, where feasible.

*Pedestrian Lighting*

The lighting options have not been fully designed. The general parameters include installing low-level, low-wattage light-emitting diode (LED) safety and pedestrian lighting at intersections, sidewalks and crosswalks, where feasible. The residential lighting would be less than 10,000 lumens and would likely be 5,800 lumens or 43 watts for each light. Back-shields would be used where a light is located directly adjacent to residences. The number of pedestrian and safety lighting ranges from 10 to 35 lights for the Project area with the pole height less than 35 feet.

*Miscellaneous Features*

A retaining curb would be constructed on Tecolote Avenue from Gato Avenue to Aguila Avenue. The project also includes constructing an approximately 350 foot long, three foot tall (or shorter) masonry retaining wall on Pine Avenue. This is required due to the elevation difference between the street and the adjoining private property.
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Figure 3 Site Photos

Photo 1: Residence without sidewalk along Armitos Avenue, facing east.
Photo 2: Residence without sidewalk along Gato Avenue, facing west.
Photo 3: Residence without sidewalk at Aguila Avenue, facing east.
Photo 4: Residence without sidewalk along Tecolote Avenue, facing south.
Figure 4  Site Photos

Photo 5: Mandarin Drive without sidewalk, curb, or gutters. Facing west, east of Orange Avenue.

Photo 6: Existing sidewalk and utility pole on Magnolia Avenue. Looking north.
Photo 7: Orange Avenue with vegetation adjacent to the right of way. No sidewalk or curb present, facing south.

Photo 8: Utility pole on private property at South Fairview Avenue, facing north.
Landscaping

There are approximately 60 trees in the project area. The project proposes to remove and replace approximately 31 trees. Of the 31 proposed for removal, 27 tree removals are located on Magnolia Avenue and Pine Avenue where the parkway is wider. The project proposes to install replacement trees in tree wells in the parkway throughout the project area. Removed trees will be replaced at a ratio of 1:1, where applicable. The replacement trees (and locations) will be selected from the approved Street Tree List (or other approved options such as dwarf varietal magnolias) in conformance with the City’s Urban Forestry Management Plan guidelines.

Construction

Method

Half of each roadway would be closed during working hours to construct the improvements on that side of the roadway. Project controls would include not allowing construction to occur concurrently on two consecutive blocks (linear or around a corner). The proposed order of the work is described below:

1. Install detour, construction area signs, and project duration traffic control devices,
2. Implement short-term (daily) traffic control devices and systems,
3. Relocate existing private improvements to private property, where appropriate,
4. Demolish existing public improvements,
5. Clear and grub other areas in City ROW,
6. Relocate utilities,
7. Construct roadway improvements (curb, gutter, driveway, sidewalk, road surfacing, etc.),
8. Construct miscellaneous improvements (striping, signage, etc.), and
9. Remove detour, construction area signs, and project duration traffic control devices.

Timing

Construction would occur from summer 2019 to winter 2019. Construction would occur over approximately a six-month period.

Demolition would occur at different points during construction. It is anticipated that construction would be limited to the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. It is possible, however, that unknown obstacles might make it necessary to work beyond those hours to complete each segment/block of work before the rainy season. If the contractor proposes to work during the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., then the contractor would be required to obtain special approval from the City.
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_Easements_
Temporary construction easement would be acquired for all properties fronting the proposed work. The easements would allow workers access to construct the public improvements, the relocation of private improvements to private property, and to provide adequate tie-ins/conforms between the new public improvements and existing private improvements.

_Permanent Property acquisitions_
A maximum of four permanent minor property acquisitions may be required to facilitate constructing the access ramps at intersections.

_Equipment and Staging_
Construction equipment includes manual and power hand tools, formwork, backhoes, skip loaders, compactors, concrete pump, dump trucks, demolition equipment (e.g. sawcut machine, jackhammers, air compressors), paving machine, compaction rollers, finish rollers, and other such equipment.

Material and equipment staging would occur in the parking lane area adjacent to active work areas.

_Traffic_

_CONTROL_
The contractor would provide a detailed traffic control plan to the City for review and approval prior to construction. The plan would provide for signage, flaggers, and provisions for allowing the ongoing circulation of automobile, bus, truck, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic around and through the construction site.

Routes for construction-related traffic and parking areas would be specified in the construction contract. The proposed construction truck route would be a loop from SR 217 to Hollister Avenue, to the project area, and back to US 101 via Fairview Avenue.

Parking would temporarily be prohibited, including overnight parking, adjacent to active work areas. Prior to closure, proper notification regarding these subject areas would be given.

_WORKERS_
The estimated construction work force would vary from five to 25, with a maximum of 25 workers. Construction related employee parking would require approximately 20 parking spaces and generate an estimated 20 to 27 average worker related trips per day, with a peak of 45 worker trips per day.

_TRUCK TRIPS_
Additionally, the project would require an estimated five average daily truck trips to carry materials, waste, and equipment with a peak of 15 trips per day.
Earthwork and Material Disposal

The project would require excavation to construct the sidewalks, curb, and gutter as well as the stormwater treatment facilities. The project would generate an estimated 2,600 cubic yards of cut material.

Materials from the demolition process, including but not limited to Portland cement and asphalt concrete, would be recycled locally. An estimated 400 cubic yards of Portland cement and asphalt concrete would be generated and trucked to a recycling facility.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

Hollister Avenue is the main arterial street running east-west through Old Town Goleta. Primarily commercial retail stores occupy both the north and south of the street. The residential neighborhoods north of Hollister Avenue and along Pine Avenue, south of Hollister Avenue, lack contiguous accessible sidewalks throughout. Areas where project construction would occur are categorized by older neighborhoods with narrow streets, limited sidewalks, and private encroachments into the ROW.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required

The City of Goleta, also the lead agency for the project, provides approval for the environmental document. Other agencies include the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), which may require a Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The project would be subject to the Santa Barbara County Stormwater Technical Guide for Low Impact Development.
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

This project would potentially affect the environmental factors checked below, involving at least one impact that is “Potentially Significant” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

Determination

Based on this initial evaluation:

- 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 to 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 (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) 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 potential significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to
applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Title
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 would 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 offsite as well as onsite, 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 California Environmental Quality Act (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.
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Environmental Checklist

1 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</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 its surroundings?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

Per the Scenic and Visual Resources map from the City of Goleta General Plan, there are no public lands with view opportunities in Old Town Goleta. Old Town is bounded by US 101 to the north, which is a local scenic corridor, as well as SR 217 to the east, which is also a local scenic corridor. A scenic view to be protected exists on Hollister Avenue near Kinman Avenue with a view looking north (City of Goleta 2009).

The portion of US 101 that extends north of Old Town Goleta is identified as an “Eligible Scenic Highway-Not Officially Designated” by the State Scenic Highway System (DOT 2011).

Existing light in the project area is generated by residential lighting in the Old Town neighborhood. In addition, vehicle lights and glare from car and housing windows are secondary light sources.
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Thresholds of Significance

According to the City's adopted CEQA Thresholds of Significance, a significant aesthetic/visual resources impact would occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist (a–d). In addition, pursuant to the City's adopted Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (Thresholds Manual) (adopted by Resolution 08-40), affirmative answers to the following questions also indicate potentially significant impacts on aesthetic/visual resources:

T AES-1 Does the project site have significant visual resources by virtue of surface waters, vegetation, elevation, slope or other natural or man-made features that are publicly visible? If so, does the project have the potential to degrade or significantly interfere with the public’s enjoyment of the site’s existing visual resources?

T AES-2 Does the project have the potential to impact visual resources of the Coastal Zone or other visually important area (i.e., mountainous area, public park, urban fringe or scenic travel corridor)? If so, does the project have the potential to conflict with the policies set forth in the Local Coastal Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or any applicable community plan to protect the identified views?

T AES-3 Does the project have the potential to create a significantly adverse aesthetic impact through obstruction of public views, incompatibility with surrounding uses, structures, or intensity of development, removal of significant amounts of vegetation, loss of important open space, substantial alteration of natural character, lack of adequate landscaping, or extensive grading visible from public areas?

Responses to questions T AES-1 through T AES-3 are included in the Project-Specific Impacts discussion below and are noted by a reference to the threshold identifier.

Project-Specific Impacts

a. The project would not be visible from either US 101 or SR 217, as vegetation and buildings block views. The scenic view to be protected from Hollister Avenue has no direct view of the project that occurs on Gato Avenue, which is the closest part of the project to the scenic view (T AES-2). In addition, the new sidewalks, curbs, and gutters are all located at street level, and cannot be seen over the existing residences and buildings (T AES-3). While there would be trees removed as part of the project, they would be replaced in the project area. There would be no impact.

b. The portion of US 101 located along the northern edge of Old Town Goleta is identified as an "Eligible Scenic Highway-Not Officially Designated" by the State Scenic Highway System (DOT 2011). Additionally, vegetation, railroad tracks, and residential and commercial buildings lie in between the US 101 and the project area, and substantially block views of the project area. There would be no impact.

c. The project would construct gutter and sidewalk to create a network of pedestrian access throughout the streets of Old Town Goleta, as well as adjusting
utility pole and vaults, and installing street lighting. The current streets are paved up to the private residences with no existing curbs, ramps, or sidewalks (Figure 4 – Photos 5 and 6) where construction would occur. In many places, private properties including masonry walls, shrines, and fences encroach on the ROW (Figure 5 – Photo 8). While the project would remove the existing objects in the ROW to build the sidewalks, curbs, etc., this change in visual character would not be degraded. There are no visual resources present in Old Town that would be degraded or interfered with by the project (T AES-1).

The trees designated for removal would be replaced. No buildings are proposed and all project activities would occur at street level. Upon completion, the project would create a pedestrian sidewalk system that is visually compatible with the existing sidewalks in the project area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d. The project is located in the existing street network adjacent to developed residential and commercial properties. Existing street lights as well as headlights from vehicles are the dominant light sources in the project vicinity. Existing glare occurs off the residential and commercial windows, as well as the vehicles parked, or passing through the area. The addition of the angled parking on Magnolia Avenue would slightly change the glare and light from cars pulling into and out of the spaces. The change from parallel parking to angled parking has the potential to subject adjacent residences on Magnolia Street to additional vehicle headlights shining into residences. This impact would be temporary, and only occur during the brief time when the vehicle is parking during nighttime hours. No new residences or buildings are proposed that would increase the light and glare from new vehicles in the area. Additionally, safety lighting would be added for the sidewalks and crosswalks. The lighting would be low-wattage light-emitting diode (LED) type lights. Back-shields would be used where a light is located directly adjacent to residences. The addition of any street lighting would be consistent and similar to the existing lighting in the neighborhood. Although the lighting has not been fully designed, the general parameters include a range of 10 to 35 lights in the Project area with a pole height less than 35 feet. Impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts
Goleta maintains a list of pending projects (City of Goleta 2017). This list was reviewed and no projects were identified in the project vicinity that were relevant in the context of potential cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources. There are no landscaping changes, aside from the tree removals discussed in the project specific analysis. Although trees may be removed, the project plans to plant at a ratio of 1:1. All lighting introduced by the project would be similar to the existing environment, and would be introduced for safety. The project’s contribution to overall aesthetic impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
No mitigation measures are recommended or required.
Residual Impact

Residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) to aesthetics would remain less than significant as a result of project implementation.
## Agriculture and Forestry Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Setting

There are no agricultural or forest lands on or adjacent to the project site. In addition, the site is not located on or adjacent to land designated for agricultural uses in the General Plan. The most current version of the Santa Barbara County Important Farmland Map, prepared by the California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection, identifies the project site and adjacent parcels as “urban and built up land” (DOC 2015). The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract.
Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact to agriculture and forest resources would occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, the City of Goleta’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* states that a project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

**T AG-1** Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located

**T AG-2** Convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use or impair the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land

Responses to thresholds T AG-1 and T AG-2 are included in the *Project-Specific Impacts* discussion below and are noted by a reference to the threshold identifier.

Project-Specific Impacts

a-e. Per the Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the project site is located on Urban and Built Up Land (DOC 2015). There are no farms or forestlands in the project area, and project activities would take place in the street and adjacent ROW. The project would not conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals (T AG-1), or result in changes to the environment that could either directly or indirectly result in loss of agricultural lands (T AG-2). Therefore, no impacts to agricultural resources would result from the project.

Cumulative Impacts

Since the project would not conflict with any existing zoning for agricultural use, Williamson Act contracts, or other changes to the environment resulting in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forestland or timberland to non-forest use, no cumulative impacts would result.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

Residual Impact

No residual impacts on agricultural and forestry resources would result.
### Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? □ □ ■ □

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? □ □ ■ □

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? □ □ ■ □

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? □ □ ■ □

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? □ □ ■ □

### Existing Setting

The project site is located in the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB). The climate in and around the Goleta, as well as most of Southern California, is controlled largely by the strength and position of the subtropical high-pressure cell over the Pacific Ocean. This high-pressure cell typically produces a Mediterranean climate with warm summers, mild winters, and moderate rainfall. This pattern is periodically interrupted by periods of extremely hot weather brought in by Santa Ana winds. Almost all precipitation occurs between November and April, although during these months the weather is sunny or partly sunny a majority of the time. Cyclic land and sea breezes are the primary factors affecting the region’s mild climate. The daytime winds are normally sea breezes, predominantly from the west, that flow at relatively low velocities. Additionally, cool, humid, marine air causes frequent fog and low clouds along the coast, generally during the night and morning hours in the late spring and early summer.

Surface temperature inversions (0 to 500 feet) are most frequent during the winter, and subsidence inversions (1,000 to 2,000 feet) are most frequent during the
summer. Inversions are an increase in temperature with height and directly relate to the stability of the atmosphere. Inversions act as a cap to the pollutants that are emitted below or inside them. The subsidence inversion is very common during the summer along the California coast, and is one of the principal causes of air stagnation. Poor air quality is usually associated with air stagnation (high stability/restricted air movement).

During the months of May to October, it is common for an inversion layer to form in the city and surrounding areas. Year-round, light onshore winds hamper the dispersion of primary pollutants and the orientation of the inland mountain ranges interrupt air circulation patterns. Pollutants become trapped, creating ideal conditions for the production of secondary pollutants.

The federal government and the State of California have established air quality standards and emergency episode criteria for various pollutants. Generally, State regulations are more stringent than those at the federal level. Air quality standards 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 (USEPA) 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 Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is required to monitor air pollutant levels to assure that federal and State air quality standards are being met.

A summary of the current NAAQS and CAAQS and the attainment status for Santa Barbara County is provided in Table 1. Currently, Santa Barbara County is classified as being in non-attainment of the state eight-hour and one-hour ozone standard and the state PM$_{10}$ standard.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant air quality impact could occur if the 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 the following:

**T AQ-1** Interferes with progress toward the attainment of the ozone standard by releasing emissions that equal or exceed the established long-term quantitative thresholds for nitrogen oxides (NO$_X$) and reactive organic gases (ROG)

**T AQ-2** Equals or exceeds the State or federal ambient air quality standards for any criteria pollutant (as determined by modeling)
Environmental Checklist

Air Quality

**TAQ-3** Emissions that may affect sensitive receptors (e.g. children, elderly, acutely ill)

**TAQ-4** Results in toxic or hazardous pollutants in amounts that may increase cancer risks for the affected population

**TAQ-5** 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).

### Table 1 Santa Barbara County Attainment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>8 hour</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon monoxide</td>
<td>8 hour</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen dioxide</td>
<td>Annual average</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur dioxide</td>
<td>Annual average</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hour</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>USEPA has yet to make final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 day average</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-month average</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>Annual arithmetic mean</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hour</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>Annual arithmetic mean</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hour</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The following significance thresholds have been established by the SBCAPCD (Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents) (SBCAPCD 2015). While the City of Goleta has not yet adopted any new threshold criteria, these SBCAPCD thresholds are used as a guideline for the impact analysis.
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**SBCAPCD Operational Impacts Thresholds**

Based on SBCAPCD thresholds, the project would result in a significant impact, either individually or cumulatively, if it would:

- **TAQ-5** Emit 240 pounds per day or more of ROG and NOX from all sources
- **TAQ-6** Emit 25 pounds per day or more of unmitigated ROG from any motor vehicle trips only
- **TAQ-7** Emit 25 pounds per day or more of unmitigated NOX from any motor vehicle trips only
- **TAQ-8** Emit 80 pounds per day or more of PM10
- **TAQ-9** Cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality standard (except ozone)
- **TAQ-10** Exceed the SBCAPCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the SBCAPCD Board (10 excess cancer cases in a million for cancer risk and a Hazard Index of more than 1.0 for non-cancer risk)
- **TAQ-11** 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).

- **TAQ-12** 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 (NOX or ROG), exceed the operational thresholds, then the project’s cumulative impacts are considered significant

For projects that do not have significant ozone precursor emissions or localized pollutant impacts, if emissions have been taken into account in the 2013 CAP and 2016 Ozone Plan growth projections, regional cumulative impacts may be considered to be less than significant.

**SBCAPCD 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 SBCAPCD recommends that construction-related NOX, ROG, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions from diesel and gasoline-powered equipment, paving, and other activities be quantified.

- **TAQ-13** SBCAPCD uses 25 tons per year for NOX and ROG as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts
Under SBCAPCD Rule 202(D)(16) (SBCAPCD 2012), if the combined emissions from all construction equipment used to construct a stationary source that requires an Authority to Construct permit, have the potential to exceed 25 tons of any pollutant, except carbon monoxide (CO) in a 12-month period, then the permittee must provide offsets under the provisions of Rule 804 (SBCAPCD, Rule 804, 2012) and demonstrate that no ambient air quality standards would be violated.

Responses to thresholds T AQ-1 through T AQ-13 are included in the *Project-Specific Impacts* discussion below and are noted by reference to the threshold identifier.

**Project-Specific Impacts**

a. The applicable air quality plans in the region are the 2013 SBCAPCD CAP and the 2016 Ozone Plan, which describes Santa Barbara County’s plan to achieve attainment of air quality standards. In addition, the City of Goleta has a Climate Action Plan, approved in July 2014. The City of Goleta Climate Action Plan primarily addresses the City’s goals and implementation strategies towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions (discussed further in Section 7, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*). The project would not involve a change in land use or an increase in population, and the project would not exceed established population or land use forecasts included in the 2013 CAP or 2016 Ozone Plan (T AQ-11). Impacts would be less than significant.

b., c. The analysis below is broken down into construction and operational impacts.

**Construction Impacts**

The project would generate temporary construction emissions. Emissions generated during construction are typically associated with the operation of heavy diesel equipment and grading. Both construction and operational emissions are discussed below.

Construction of the project would take approximately 6 months, from summer 2019 to winter 2019. Construction emissions were estimated using California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod, Version 2016.3.1).

SBCAPCD Rule 345 regulates fugitive dust for any activity associated with construction or demolition of structures. The project would be required to comply with Rule 345, as described below:

- No person shall engage in any construction or demolition activity or earth moving activities subject to this rule in a manner that causes discharge into the atmosphere beyond the property line visible dust emissions of 20-percent opacity or greater for a period or periods aggregating more than three minutes in any 60-minute period.

- No person, including facility or site owner or operator of source, shall load or allow the loading of bulk materials or soil onto outbound trucks unless at least one of the following dust prevention techniques is utilized:
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- Use properly secured tarps or cargo covering that covers the entire surface area of the load or use a container-type enclosure.
- Maintain a minimum of six inches of freeboard below the rim of the truck bed where the load touches the sides of the cargo area and ensure that the peak of the load does not extend above any part of the upper edge of the cargo area.
- Water or otherwise treat the bulk material to minimize loss of material to wind or spillage.
- Other effective dust prevention control measures approved in writing by the control officer.

- Visible roadway dust as a result of active operations, spillage from transport trucks, erosion, or track-out/carry-out shall be controlled as outlined below:
  - Visible roadway dust shall be minimized by the use of any of the following track-out/carry-out and erosion control measures that apply to the project or operations: track-out grates of gravel beds at each egress point, wheel-washing at each egress point during muddy conditions, soil binders, chemical soil stabilizers, geotextiles, mulching, or seeding
  - Visible roadway dust shall be removed at the conclusion of each work day when bulk material removal ceases, or every 24 hours for continuous operations. If a street sweeper is used to remove any track-out/carry-out, only a PM10-Efficient Street Sweeper shall be used. The use of blowers for removal of track-out/carry-out is prohibited.

Table 2 summarizes the estimated maximum daily emissions by pollutant. Annual construction emissions of all criteria pollutants would be below the SBCAPCD recommended 25 tons per year guideline (T AQ-5 through T AQ-9, T AQ-13). Nonetheless, the SBCAPCD requires implementation of dust and diesel particulate emission control requirements for all projects involving earthmoving activities. With implementation of standard dust and diesel particulate emission control measures, temporary construction emissions would be further reduced.
Table 2  Estimated Construction Maximum Daily Air Pollutant Emissions (tons/year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase*</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM_{10}</th>
<th>PM_{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019 Maximum</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCAPCD Guideline tons/year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All calculations were made using applicant provided information when available, and CalEEMod default values when not available. See Appendix A for calculations. Grading, Paving, Building Construction and Architectural Coating totals include worker trips, soil export hauling trips, construction vehicle emissions and fugitive dust. Numbers may not add up due to rounding. N/A = not available

California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod, Version 2016.3.1).

Operational Impacts

The project would not have any operational air quality emissions, as no operational air pollutant generators are proposed. No new vehicle trips, habitable residences, or structures are proposed that could contribute to operational emissions. Since there are no operational emissions, the project would not exceed SBCAPCD’s thresholds of significance (T AQ-1, T AQ-2, T AQ-5 through T AQ-9, T AQ-12). The project would have no impact on regional air quality from operational emissions.

d. Certain population groups, such as children, the elderly, and people with health problems are particularly sensitive to air pollution. Sensitive receptors are defined as land uses that are more likely to be used by these population groups and include health care facilities, retirement homes, school and playground facilities, and residential areas. The sensitive receptors nearest to the project include single-family residences, ranging as close as 15 feet from project construction activities.

As discussed in item c, there would be no long-term emissions from the project. Therefore, operation of the project does not pose any risk to the nearest sensitive receptors. The project would not result in long-term operational emissions levels that would exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. Furthermore, operation of the project would not result in the generation of other hazardous air contaminants.

Traffic-congested roadways and intersections have the potential for the generation of localized CO levels (i.e., CO hotspots). In general, CO hotspots occur in areas with poor circulation or areas with heavy traffic. As further discussed in Section 16, Transportation, the project would not increase trips to the area and may actually decrease trips as residents would be provided with a safe mode of circulation in the area by walking. Therefore, the project would not create or exacerbate CO hotspots on adjacent roadways.
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As discussed under items (b) and (c) above, compliance with Rule 345 would ensure that construction emissions would not be generated in such quantities as to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (T AQ-3). There are no residences proposed as part of the project, and therefore, no new residents would have the potential to be exposed to the possibility of excess cancer or other air pollution related hazard risks (T AQ-4, T AQ-10). Impacts would be less than significant.

e. Land uses typically producing objectionable odors include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, refineries, landfills, animal farms, and fiberglass molding. Odor emissions from the project would be limited to odors associated with typical construction such as vehicle and engine exhaust and idling or the application of architectural coatings during the construction phases. The project does not include any sources of objectionable odors for the long-term operations phase.

During construction activities, only short-term, temporary odors from vehicle exhaust, asphalt concrete, concrete curing compounds, and construction equipment engines would occur. As the project site is in an area without tall buildings to block air movement and hold odors, construction-related odors would disperse and dissipate fairly quickly and would not cause substantial odors at the closest sensitive receptors. In addition, any construction-related odors would be relatively short-term in any event and would cease upon completion of construction. Therefore, impacts related to objectionable odors during construction or operation would be less than significant. (T AQ-5)

Cumulative Impacts

Per the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, a project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considered significant if the project’s total emissions of either NOX or ROG exceed the long term threshold of 25 lbs/day. The project’s construction-related contributions to cumulative NOX and ROG emissions were below this threshold. There are no operational emissions from the project, therefore the project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts are not cumulatively considerable. Emissions have been incorporated into the 2013 Clean Air Plan in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

Residual Impact

Residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Air Quality would remain less than significant as a result of project implementation.
4 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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Setting

Rincon Consultants completed a field reconnaissance survey on May 18, 2017, to characterize and map habitats, natural communities and land cover types, and to perform an inventory of all plant and animal species in the study area, which is defined as the limits of the project, existing easements, ROW, and trees anticipated for removal.

The study area is completely urbanized and consists of residential uses, retail and service businesses, a community park, landscaping, ruderal vegetation, roads.

The study area and surrounding areas provide habitat for wildlife species that commonly occur in suburban areas of the city. Avian species observed/detected on or adjacent to the site include American crow (Corvus brachyrhynchos), bushtit (Psaltriparus minimus), song sparrow (Melospiza melodia), common yellowthroat (Geothlypis trichas), acorn woodpecker (Melanerpes formicivorus), California scrub-jay (Aphelocoma californica), California towhee (Meloezone crissalis), house finch (Haemorhous mexicanus), mourning dove (Zenaida macroura), Anna’s hummingbird (Calypte anna), northern mockingbird (Mimus polyglottos), western gull (Larus occidentalis), and house sparrow (Passer domesticus). No mammal, reptile, or amphibian species were observed or detected (i.e., presence of scat) on the project site during the survey.

Vegetation Communities

As described above, the study area is primarily disturbed and developed with residential uses, commercial uses, and roads. Vegetation in the study area is dominated by various ornamental non-native trees including an assortment of palm trees, and ornamental shrubs and ruderal vegetation. Riparian habitat is present along Old San Jose Creek in the southern portion of the study area. The riparian habitat generally runs northeast to southwest. Dominant species in the riparian area consist of willows (Salix spp.) with eucalyptus (Eucalyptus spp.) also present. The riparian area is illustrated on Figure 6.

Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California were searched for special-status species occurrences in the Goleta, California USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (quad) and the surrounding six quads (quads 7-9 consist of the Pacific Ocean). A United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) query of the Information, Planning, and Conservation System (IPAC) was conducted for federally listed species that may be affected by the project. The CNDDB records of special-status species within a five-mile radius of the study area and the USFWS IPAC-generated species list were further evaluated to determine the potential for special-status species to occur in the study area based on the type and quality of habitats observed. The list of special-status species can be found in Appendix B.
None of the 31 special-status species identified in the region were found to be present in the study area or have a moderate or high potential to occur based on habitat type and quality present. Additionally, nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) Section 3500 have a high potential to nest in the study area.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant impact on Biological Resources would be expected to occur if the 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 thresholds of significance as described below.

*Types of Impacts to Biological Resources*

Disturbances to habitats or species may be significant, based on substantial evidence in the record, if they impact significant resources in the following ways:

- **T BIO-1** Substantially reduce or eliminate species diversity or abundance
- **T BIO-2** Substantially reduce or eliminate quantity or quality of nesting areas
- **T BIO-3** Substantially limit reproductive capacity through loss of individuals or habitat
- **T BIO-4** Substantially fragment, eliminate, or otherwise disrupt foraging areas and/or access to food resources
- **T BIO-5** Substantially limit or fragment range and movement (geographic distribution of animals and/or seed dispersal routes)
- **T BIO-6** Substantially interfere with natural processes, such as fire or flooding, upon which the habitat depends

*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:

- Small acreages of non-native grassland if wildlife values are low
- Individuals or stands of non-native trees, if not used by important animal species such as raptors or monarch butterflies
- Areas of historical disturbance such as intensive agriculture
- Small pockets of habitats already significantly fragmented or isolated, and disturbed or degraded
- Areas of primarily ruderal species resulting from pre-existing man-made disturbance
Responses to thresholds T BIO-1 through T BIO-6 are included in the Project-Specific Impacts discussion below and are noted by reference to the threshold identifier.

Project-Specific Impacts

a. No special-status species with known occurrences within five miles of the project site have a potential to occur in the study area or were found to be present. No work is proposed in Old San Jose Creek. Therefore, there would be no impacts to western pond turtle or California red-legged frog would occur.

No other special status species with known occurrences within five miles of the project site have a potential to occur within the study area or were found to be present.

While no active nests were observed at the time of the reconnaissance survey, nesting habitat is present in the trees proposed for removal and in other trees and structures located throughout the study area. There is a potential for direct and indirect impacts to nesting birds if construction was to occur during the nesting season through disturbance, nest removal, nest abandonment and subsequent mortality of eggs or nestlings. Impacts of this nature would constitute a violation of the MBTA and CFGC. Therefore, the project’s impacts on nesting birds would be considered potentially significant. Mitigation measure BIO-1, listed below, is intended to reduce these potential impacts (T BIO-1, T BIO-2).

b. The study area is heavily disturbed and developed with residential uses, commercial uses, and roads. Ruderal vegetation and ornamental landscaping is present throughout the study area. As described above in Existing Setting, riparian habitat is present in the southern portion of the study area adjacent to Old San Jose Creek. The riparian area is identified as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) on Figure 4-1 of the City of Goleta’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP). No work is proposed in the riparian area. Therefore, there would be no impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. (T BIO-3)

c. Old San Jose Creek, located in the southern portion of the study area, is mapped as “riparian/marsh/vernal pool” on Figure 4-1 of the City’s GP/CLUP. Old San Jose Creek has a defined bed, bank, and channel that conveys water to the Pacific Ocean and, therefore, would likely meet the established criteria for jurisdictional areas subject to, but not limited to, federally protected waters or wetlands as defined by Section 401/404 of the Clean Water Act. No work is proposed within the creek. Therefore, no direct impacts to Old San Jose Creek would occur.

As described in Section 9, Hydrology and Water Quality, the project design will incorporate a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which will include erosion and sediment control BMPs. The southernmost portion of the sidewalk improvements along Pine Avenue are approximately 65 feet from riparian habitat along Old San Jose Creek. Potentially significant indirect impacts from construction activities, such as the spill of materials, could occur in the absence of avoidance and
minimization measures. Mitigation measure BIO-2 would reduce potential indirect impacts. (T BIO-6)

d. The study area is heavily disturbed and developed with residential uses, commercial uses, and roads. The project site does not occur within a mapped wildlife corridor. Old San Jose Creek located on the southern portion of the study could facilitate wildlife movement through the area. No work would be completed within Old San Jose Creek. Noise and vibrations from construction in the vicinity of Old San Jose Creek could disrupt wildlife movement. This activity would be a temporary disturbance and would have a less than significant impact on wildlife movement. (T BIO-5)

e. The City of Goleta’s GP/CLUP Conservation Element Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas, provides for the protection of creeks and riparian areas. Old San Jose Creek located in the southern portion of the study area is mapped as “riparian/marsh/vernal pool” on Figure 4-1 of the GP/CLUP. Potential impacts to Old San Jose Creek are discussed in subsection “c” above.

There are approximately 31 trees proposed for removal throughout the study area. Agri-Turf Supplies, Inc., on July 28th, 2017, completed an assessment of the trees within the study area that are proposed for removal or need to be checked. None of the trees identified to be removed are subject to the City’s GP/CLUP Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands or CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest. Policy CE 9 protects native trees in the city including: oaks (Quercus spp.), walnut (Juglans californica), sycamore (Platanus racemosa), cottonwood (Populus spp.), willows (Salix spp.) given the species type to be removed. Additionally, the project includes the replacement of all removed trees, native and non-native, at a ratio of 1:1, where applicable. Impact from the removal of trees would be temporary as all the removed trees would be replaced as part of the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Policy CE 14 calls for preservation and projection of the city’s urban forest including public and private trees. This policy allows for removal of trees on public property with authorization from the City. The trees would be removed and new species and locations would be selected in conformance with the City’s Urban Forest Management Plan. Staff would take any proposed tree recommendations not on the approved Street Tree List to the Public Tree Advisory Commission (PTAC) for review and recommendation.

The remainder of the study area is heavily disturbed, and there are no other biological resources in the study area protected under the GP/CLUP.

The project would not conflict with local policies protecting biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant. (T BIO-4, T BIO-5).

f. The project site is not in the coverage area of any approved federal, state, or local Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. Thus, implementation of the project would result in no impacts related to consistency with these types of plans.
Cumulative Impacts
The project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources. Therefore, the project’s contributions to cumulative impacts to biological resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
The following measures are proposed to avoid or reduce potential impacts to nesting birds:

BIO-1
To avoid direct and indirect impacts to nesting birds, all construction activities, including grading and vegetation clearing, should be conducted outside of the bird breeding season (generally defined as February 1 - August 31) to the extent feasible. If the nesting season for birds is avoided, no other mitigation is required.

If the nesting season cannot be avoided, an initial breeding and nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified avian biologist no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of land clearing activities. The project site including the construction footprint and a 100-foot buffer will be surveyed. If an active nest (i.e., occupied with eggs or nestlings) is found, all construction work will be conducted outside of the buffer zone which will be determined by a qualified biologist in the field. The buffer area(s) shall be off-limits to all construction personnel and equipment until the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site. A qualified biologist shall confirm that breeding/nesting is completed and young have fledged the nest prior to the removal of the buffer. Encroachment into the buffer shall be conducted at the discretion of the qualified biologist. Plan Requirements and Timing: The City must verify that construction and grading, including tree removal, is occurring outside the nesting season, or that nesting bird and raptor surveys have been conducted, and buffer requirements specified above are in place (if applicable). Monitoring: The City shall conduct periodic site inspections to ensure compliance throughout the construction period.

BIO-2
A 100-foot setback buffer shall be established around Old San Jose Creek. A City qualified biologist may adjust the buffer, as appropriate, if necessary to complete construction. Additionally, the following measures will be implemented:

- Any material/spoils from project activities shall be located away from potential jurisdictional areas or sensitive habitat and protected from storm water run-off using temporary perimeter sediment barriers such as berms, silt fences, fiber rolls, covers, sand/gravel bags, and straw bale barriers, as appropriate.
- Materials shall be stored on impervious surfaces or plastic ground covers to prevent any spills or leakage from contaminating the ground and generally at least 100 feet from potentially jurisdictional waters.
Any spillage of material shall be stopped if it can be done safely. The contaminated area will be cleaned and any contaminated materials properly disposed of. For all spills the project foreman or other designated liaison will notify the project's biologist.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** Prior to the start of construction, the City shall establish a 100-foot buffer, or buffer determined by a City qualified biologist, from Old San Jose Creek. **Monitoring:** The City shall conduct periodic site inspections to ensure compliance with the established buffer throughout the construction period.

**Residual Impact**

Implementation of the mitigation measures above would reduce potential direct and indirect impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level. No residual impacts are anticipated.
## 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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?</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 geological feature?</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>
</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 gathers 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 project site is located in a residential neighborhood that has been previously disturbed by the development of existing infrastructure and residential/commercial structures. A cultural resources records search of the California Historical Resources
City of Goleta
Old Town Sidewalk Improvement Project

Information System was conducted at the Central Coast Information Center located at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The search was performed to identify all previously recorded cultural resources and previously recorded cultural resources studies within the project site and a 0.5-mile radius around it. A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search was also conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to identify the potential for cultural resources within the project site and to provide contact information for Native Americans groups or individuals who may have knowledge of resources within the project site.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on cultural resources would be expected to occur if the 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 state:

T CR-1 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.

Responses to threshold CR-1 is included in the Project-Specific Impacts discussion below and is noted by reference to the threshold identifier.

Project-Specific Impacts

a, b, and d. Four historic-era resources have been identified along the project site that are identified in the City’s General Plan (2006) to have been previously listed or are eligible for listing as Local Historic Landmarks. However, project development would be limited to sidewalks and would not directly impact any buildings or structures, thus keeping with the goals of the City’s General Plan.

One archaeological resource (CA-SBA-60) has been identified in the westernmost portion of the project site and numerous resources have been recorded inside a half-mile radius of the project site. Site CA-SBA-60 consists of a large prehistoric village site with an extensive cemetery. The site extends outside of the current project site to the adjacent areas, but the portion of CA-SBA-60 in the project site falls under an area with commercial and residential developments. Due to the lack of ground visibility, it is unclear whether portions of the site are still present within the project site. Recent testing (DUDEK 2009, Munns et al. 2009) of CA-SBA-60 in proximity to the project site has found minimal presence of archaeological resources under the current facilities. Much of the recent findings have been sparse shell fragments in a clearly disturbed context.

Although much of CA-SBA-60 has been heavily disturbed by previous construction, human remains have recently been found near the project site (TRC 2001), indicating that human remains may still be present even in a disturbed context. Ground disturbance for the project is expected to be limited, but the removal of existing sidewalks, the adjustment of utility conflicts, and the installation of new stormwater infrastructure could expose cultural resources and/or human remains. Mitigation measures CR-1 and CR-2 are therefore required.
c. CEQA requires that public agencies and private interests identify the potential environmental consequences of their projects on any object or site of significance to the scientific annals of California (Division I, California Public Resources Code Section 5020.1 [b]). Appendix G in Section 15023 provides an Environmental Checklist of questions (Section 15023, Appendix G, Section V, Part c) that includes the following: “Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site…?”

CEQA does not define “a unique paleontological resource or site.” However, the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) has provided guidance specifically designed to support state and federal environmental review. The SVP broadly defines significant paleontological resources as follows (SVP 2010: 11):

Fossils and fossiliferous deposits consisting of identifiable vertebrate fossils, large or small, uncommon invertebrate, plant, and trace fossils, and other data that provide taphonomic, taxonomic, phylogenetic, paleoecologic, stratigraphic, and/or biochronologic information. Paleontological resources are considered to be older than recorded human history and/or older than middle Holocene (i.e., older than about 5,000 radiocarbon years).

Paleontological Sensitivity

The SVP (2010) describes sedimentary rock units as having high, low, undetermined, or no potential for containing significant nonrenewable paleontological resources. This criterion is based on rock units in which vertebrate or significant invertebrate fossils have been determined by previous studies to be present or likely to be present. The paleontological sensitivity of the geologic units underlying the project site is characterized according to the SVP (2010) categories.

Geology and Paleontology of the Project Site

The project site contains one geologic unit mapped at the surface: Quaternary alluvium and colluvium, and artificial fill (Minor et al. 2007). Artificial fill has no potential to yield significant fossil resources. Quaternary alluvium and colluvium deposits consists of Holocene and upper Pleistocene-aged, poorly consolidated silt, sand, and gravel deposits of modern drainages and piedmont alluvial fans and floodplains, that are generally less than 10 meters thick. These units are predominantly too young (less than 5000 years) to preserve fossils. Additionally, the older sections of this unit that have some potential to preserve fossils would occur at depths below those that would be affected by project activity. This unit is considered to have low paleontological sensitivity at the surface and depths up to five feet.

Ground disturbance at depths shallower that five feet associated with the construction of the project is unlikely to directly disturb geologic units with high paleontological sensitivity. The project area has been extensively disturbed by prior development. Ground-disturbing activity associated with sidewalk construction typically does not involve significant levels of ground disturbance, and is anticipated to occur in previously disturbed sediments to a maximum depth of less than five feet. No impacts to paleontological resources are expected.
Cumulative Impacts
The project could potentially contribute to cumulative permanent adverse impacts on cultural or paleontological resources without proper mitigation.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

CR-1 Cultural Resources Monitoring. In order to reduce impacts, cultural resources monitoring should be implemented for the project. Plan Requirements: The City shall retain a qualified archaeologist, defined as an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (NPS 1983), to carry out all mitigation measures related to archaeological and historical resources. This archaeologist shall work with the City and local Native American representatives to develop formal protocols for archaeological monitoring. Timing/Monitoring: An archaeologist and Native American monitor shall be present to monitor all initial ground disturbing activities associated with the project, including but not limited to, sidewalk removal, the relocation of utilities, and any excavation required for the installation of storm drains, etc. If, during initial ground disturbance, the monitors determine that the ground disturbing activities have little or no potential to impact cultural resources, the qualified archaeologist may recommend that monitoring may be reduced or eliminated. This decision will be made in consultation with the qualified archaeologist, Native American monitor, and the City. The final decision to reduce or eliminate monitoring will be at the discretion of the City.

CR-2 Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains. The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities. Plan Requirements/Timing/Monitoring: If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

Residual Impact
Residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Cultural Resources would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
### Geology and Soils

#### Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Expose people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Landslides?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is made unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing Setting

The Goleta is located in the western Transverse Range Geomorphic Province of California (CGS 2002). The project site is located near the western edge of the Goleta Groundwater Basin (DWR 2004). The geologic formations exposed on the site are recent artificial fill (Qaf) and Quaternary-age marine terrace deposits (Qmt) (USGS 2009). The topography of Old Town is relatively flat, with little fluctuations in slope. No mountains or hills are present.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on geology and soils would occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual stipulates that a project would result in a potentially significant impact on geological processes if:

T GEO-1 The project, and/or implementation of required mitigation measures, could result in increased erosion, landslides, soil creep, mudslides, and/or unstable slopes.

T GEO-2 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.

T GEO-3 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.

T GEO-4 The project proposes construction of a cut slope over 15 feet in height as measured from the lowest finished grade.

T GEO-5 The project is located on slopes exceeding 20 percent grade.

Responses to thresholds T GEO-1 through T GEO-5 are included in the Project-Specific Impacts discussion below and are noted by reference to the threshold identifier.

Project-Specific Impacts

a.1, a.2. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zones in the project area (CGS 2015). The nearest faults to the project site are the Los Carneros Fault and the More Ranch Fault (City of Goleta 2006). Based on absence of known faults in the site, potential project impacts associated with seismic rupture would be less than significant (T GEO-1, T GEO-2). The project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects from fault rupture, as no habitable residences or structures are proposed. Impacts regarding ground shaking and fault rupture are less than significant.
Environmental Checklist
Geology and Soils

a.3. There is no historical evidence of structures being damaged by liquefaction in the Goleta or in adjacent unincorporated areas (Jones and Stokes 2006). Based on low potential for liquefaction and lateral spreading at the site and incorporation of applicable standards, potential project impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure hazards would be less than significant (T GEO-1). In addition, no habitable residences or structures are proposed. Impacts would be less than significant.

a.4. Per the Geologic Hazards Map of the City of Goleta General Plan, Old Town is not in an area of Moderate or High Landslide Potential (City of Goleta, 2009). The street network and neighborhoods in Old Town are located on flat, previously developed land with no hill or mountain topography (T GEO-3 through T GEO-5). In addition, no habitable residences or structures are proposed. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. Increased erosion potential exists at locations with poorly drained soil and steep slopes. The areas where construction is to occur are flat, and have been previously developed, graded, and paved. The areas where new sidewalks and curbs are proposed are nearly level and have an unpaved gravel and soil surface that allows onsite infiltration. Vegetative ground cover is limited to sparse weedy annuals that do not provide substantial soil stabilization. The remainder of the property is paved for the roadways or covered in structures.

During construction, approximately 2,600 cubic yards of soil would be displaced. Temporary Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be used during construction, as appropriate. Detailed site engineering would consider the present and future drainage patterns. A SWPPP would be developed for the project, as the project would occur over a portion larger than one acre. General requirements in a SWPPP include BMPs and onsite erosion control. Based on existing site conditions and planned implementation of BMPs, potential erosion impacts would be less than significant.

c. No specific geologic hazards have been identified near the project as project activities are located on alluvial soils and artificial fill. The project would require shallow excavation and other construction activities on previously developed, graded, and paved land. These activities would not impact an unstable geologic unit as they would occur on areas that are essentially flat (T GEO-1, T GEO-2, T GEO-5). Therefore, the activities would not contribute to a known landslide becoming unstable, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. Expansive soils are soils that are generally clayey, which swell when moistened and shrink when dry. All construction activities would occur on previously developed, paved, and graded land. The project would be designed and constructed to incorporate geotechnical recommendations to be prepared for the project to ensure soil stability, thus reducing potential impacts related to geologic units or soils to a less than significant level (T GEO-1).
City of Goleta
Old Town Sidewalk Improvement Project

e. The project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. There would be no impact.

Cumulative Impacts
The project poses no potentially significant project specific geohazard or erosion impacts. Therefore, potential cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

Residual Impact
Residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Geology and Soils would remain less than significant as a result of project implementation.
### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Setting

Climate gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are often called greenhouse gases (GHGs), analogous to the way in which a greenhouse retains heat. Common GHG include water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxides (N₂O), fluorinated gases, and ozone. GHGs are emitted by both natural processes and human activities. Of these gases, CO₂ and CH₄ are emitted in the greatest quantities from human activities. Emissions of CO₂ are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion, whereas CH₄ results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Man-made GHGs, many of which have greater heat-absorption potential than CO₂, include fluorinated gases, such as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) (CalEPA 2006).

The accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere regulates the earth’s temperature. Without the natural heat trapping effect of GHGs, Earth’s surface would be about 34° C cooler (CalEPA 2006). However, it is believed that emissions from human activities, particularly the consumption of fossil fuels for electricity production and transportation, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations.

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 major agencies, conventions, and programs focused on global climate change are listed below.
Thresholds of Significance

Neither the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) nor the City of Goleta has adopted a quantitative significance threshold for GHG emissions or a specific methodology for analyzing air quality impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. To date, only the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOCAPCD) have adopted quantitative significance thresholds for GHGs. The County of Santa Barbara relies on the use of BAAQMD standards until the County thresholds are developed and adopted (County of Santa Barbara 2010).

A significant impact regarding greenhouse gas emissions would occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual stipulates that a project would result in a potentially significant impact if:

T GHG-1 BAAQMD GHG thresholds are summarized in Table 3.

It is important to note that no thresholds of significance for construction emissions have been developed by the BAAQMD.

Table 3 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 MT CO₂e/yr or 4.6 MT CO₂e/SP/yr¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Sources²</td>
<td>10,000 MT CO₂e/yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ SP = Service Population (residents + employees).
² Stationary Sources include stationary combustion sources (industrial-type uses) regulated by SBCAPCD

Project-Specific and Cumulative Impacts

a. The project’s “business as usual” GHG emissions have been calculated for the project. “Business as usual” refers to the emissions that would be expected to occur in the absence of GHG reduction measures. These emissions include only GHG from the project’s construction, as no changes to operational impacts would occur from the project. Estimated emissions were calculated using CalEEMod version 2016.3.1. Emissions are shown below in Table 4.

Construction. Project construction activities would generate approximately 155.2 MT CO$_2$e/year. Construction GHG emissions are typically summed and amortized over the lifetime of the project (assumed to be 30 years), and then added to operational emissions. Construction emissions have been amortized over the 30 year period and would result in 5.2 MT CO$_2$e/year.

Mobile Source. There would be no added vehicle trips from the project.

Energy Consumption. The project is a transportation improvement project, and there would be no project related change to emissions from energy consumption.

Water Demand. The project is a transportation improvement project, and there would be no project related change to emissions from water demand.

Solid Waste. The project is a transportation improvement project, and there would be no project related change to solid waste emissions.

Table 4 Business as Usual Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total Metric Tons of CO$_2$e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Source</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Demand</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Emissions</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GHG Significance Threshold 1,100 MT CO$_2$e/year

GHG Significance Threshold Exceeded? No

Emissions estimated using CalEEMod v.2016.3.1
As discussed in the analysis, no operational emissions are included.

The project would generate GHG emissions only during construction activities. These emissions would come primarily from the equipment used during construction, and the emissions from construction worker and equipment vehicle trips. As shown in Table 4, the total amount of project related “business as usual” GHG emissions would be a total of 5.2 MT CO$_2$e/year. The project would not have operational emissions, and the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT CO$_2$e/year of unmitigated operational emissions (T GHG-1). Impacts would be less than significant.
b. The City of Goleta adopted the Final Climate Action (CAP) Plan in July 2014. The CAP establishes a 2007 baseline inventory, establishes a planning horizon of 2007 through 2030, and identifies quantified and non-quantified measures to effectively meet GHG reduction targets. The CAP outlines a framework to reduce community GHG emissions by 2020 and 2030 and supports AB 32. The project would directly support the goals of the CAP, as the project would improve public transportation accessibility. By improving pedestrian accessibility in the area, this would provide an opportunity to and in turn, reduce vehicle trips. The sidewalk improvements made by the project would promote pedestrian movement in the neighborhoods, and connect the residences to the commercial properties along Hollister Avenue. In addition, the improved walkability would allow for residents in the neighborhood to better access the public transportation available along Hollister Avenue.

Regionally, the Santa Barbara Council of Associated Governments (SBCAG) has adopted the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan – Sustainable Communities Strategy (2040 RTP-SCS), which addresses GHG emissions from passenger vehicles in Santa Barbara County. As discussed in Section 16, Transportation/Traffic, the project would not generate vehicle daily trips as a part of long-term generation. On the contrary, the project intends to reduce vehicle trips by encouraging pedestrian travel. As mentioned under the Description of Project, construction activities would occur from summer 2019 to winter 2019. However, once complete, no new trips would be introduced. As the operation of the project would not result in increased vehicle trip emissions and there are no active statewide, local, or regional plans, including AB 32 or the 2040 RTP-SCS, applicable to temporary construction projects, the project would not conflict with any plan regarding mobile emissions. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. No impacts would occur.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

Residual Impact

Residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Greenhouse Gas Emissions would remain less than significant as a result of project implementation.
### 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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located in 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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

An Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) hazardous materials records search was prepared for the project area and surrounding area in June 2017 (attached as Appendix C). The EDR search was conducted for the project area and also included data for sites surrounding the property. Federal, State, and County lists were reviewed to identify sites that generate, store, treat, or dispose of hazardous materials or sites for which a release or incident has occurred. In addition, Rincon Consultants, Inc. reviewed copies of historic records, aerial photographs, and topographic maps. This review revealed evidence of Potential Recognized Environmental Conditions in connection with the project site as follows:

1. Adjacent automotive repair facilities: two automotive repair facilities are located adjacent to the project site and have the potential to have contaminated soil or groundwater plumes located within 100 feet of the subject property. Although no known documented releases associated with these adjacent automotive repair facilities were identified, if undocumented releases have occurred, there is the potential for contamination (if any) to be present beneath the subject property.

2. Adjacent gasoline stations and automotive repair facilities: 10 adjacent sites are listed on the Historical Auto Station database searched by EDR. Of these 10 listings, two are interpreted to be former gasoline stations and three are interpreted to be former automotive repair facilities. Although no known documented releases associated with these adjacent, former facilities were identified, if undocumented releases have occurred, there is the potential for contamination (if any) to be present beneath the subject property.

3. Adjacent Quick Clean Center Historical Cleaner listing: five adjacent sites are listed on the Historical Cleaners database searched by EDR. One of the listings, Quick Clean Center at 92 South Fairview Avenue, is interpreted to be a potential former dry cleaner. Although no known documented releases associated with this facility were identified, if undocumented releases have
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occurred, there is the potential for contamination (if any) to be present beneath the subject property.

Rincon’s review and conclusions from EDR and other historical records were used in the Project Specific Impacts analysis below.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact with regard 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 Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual addresses public safety impacts resulting from involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. These thresholds focus on the activities that include the installation of 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 would not be a hazardous materials facility, the City's risk-based thresholds are not applicable.

Project-Specific Impacts

a. Construction activities would involve the use of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, lead solder, and glues. While these materials would be contained in vessels inside excavation equipment, generators, and other construction equipment, the normal operation of such vehicles/equipment would not lead to risk of upset. However, it is possible that accidental spills may occur during onsite fueling of equipment. If that were to occur, it would be localized onsite and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

As discussed in the Existing Setting section above, known or suspected hazardous materials were identified on or near the project site. Construction and ground disturbing activities could result in a potential safety hazard as the contaminants discussed above could be spread via dust particulates. Ground disturbance and transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction would increase the potential for an accidental release of hazardous materials. This could result in the exposure of worker and the public to potential health hazards. As discussed in Section 3, Air Quality, compliance with SBCAPCD Rule 345 would be required. This rule reduces fugitive dust emissions and would limit exposure to any hazardous materials associated with dust. Impacts related to exposure to contaminants as a result of known or suspected hazardous materials on or near the project site would be potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated. Mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 ensure that no contamination would be present where construction occurs.

c. As previously described, the project site is located in the residential and commercial neighborhood of Old Town Goleta. There are no schools within 0.25 miles of the Project Area.

d. While some of the sites adjacent to the project area are located on the Cortese list, the project area itself (the streets) are not located on a site included on a list of
hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Department of Toxic Substances Control 2017, City of Goleta 2009). There would be no impact.

e, f. The project site is within one mile of a public use airport (Santa Barbara Municipal Airport) and the project site is in the airport's area of influence, as defined in the Airport Land Use Plan (City of Santa Barbara 2014). The project is located in the Traffic Pattern Zone of the Safety Compatibility Policy Map (SBCAG 2012). This zone is characterized by an area where planes typically fly overhead in order to reach the runway(s). The project timeline is temporary, and would last approximately six months. Neither the construction activities nor the operational use of the sidewalk improvements would be affected by airport hazards or pose a risk to planes overhead. There would be no impact.

f. The streets in Old Town are classified as Local Streets and Roads (City of Goleta 2009), and are not designated critical transportation facilities (i.e. State Route (SR) 217, US 101, and Hollister Avenue). The project consists of transportation and utility improvements in the residential and commercial neighborhoods of Old Town. The project’s purpose is to improve the network circulation for both pedestrians. During construction, sections of roads may be temporarily blocked. However, detours would be made accessible for emergency responders and residents who live in the area. A detailed traffic control plan would ensure that signage, flaggers, and routes are placed for residents and emergency responders. The project would not interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

h. The project is located in an urban, heavily developed portion of Old Town Goleta, where no wildlands or forests occur (City of Goleta 2016). Old Town Goleta is not located in a Fire Hazard Severity zone (CalFire 2008). The project proposes transportation and utility improvements and would not include residences or habitable buildings that would expose people or structures to risks from wildfires. There would be no impact.

Cumulative Impacts

There would be no cumulative impacts regarding hazards and hazardous materials.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

In the vicinity of the Potential Recognized Environmental Conditions discussed in the Existing Setting section, the following mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Disposal. For construction activities near the Potential Recognized Environmental Concerns, prior to the issuance of any construction related permits, a soil assessment shall be completed under the supervision of a professional geologist or professional engineer. If soil sampling indicates the presence of any contaminant in quantities not in compliance with applicable laws, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) shall
Environmental Checklist
Hazards and Hazardous Materials

be contacted to determine proper disposal. **Requirements:** Prior to the commencement of site construction, the following shall be performed: an assessment of air resource impacts and health impacts associated with excavation activities, transportation impacts from the removal activities, and risk of upset management practices shall be employed if an accident occurs on or off the site. **Monitoring:** The Director of Public Works shall ensure that the soil sampling is completed prior to the issuance of the related permits. No monitoring is required during construction with this mitigation measure.

**HAZ-2 Contaminated Soil Contingency Plan.** Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, for construction activities near the Potential Recognized Environmental Concerns, the applicant shall either provide proof that the soil in the area is not contaminated, or shall develop and implement a Contaminated Soil Contingency Plan to handle treatment and/or disposal of contaminated soils. If contaminated soil is encountered during project construction, work shall halt and an assessment made to determine the extent of contamination. Treatment and/or disposal of contaminated soils shall be conducted in accordance with the Contingency Plan. **Plan Requirements:** The plan and completion remediation shall be certified by the County of Santa Barbara Public Health Department. **Timing:** Shall be completed prior to issuance of construction permits on the site. **Monitoring:** The City of Goleta shall monitor the site during construction to ensure contaminated soils (if present) are disposed of properly.

**Residual Impact**

Implementation of the project would have no residual impacts regarding the emissions, exposure, and handling of hazardous materials.
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### 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</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 or the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</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 the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water that 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing Setting

The project is located in the residential and commercial neighborhood of Old Town Goleta. Environmental setting information pertaining to the analysis has been included in the *Project Specific Impacts* section below.

### Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on hydrology and water quality would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* provides that a significant impact on hydrology and water resources would occur if:

**T HYD-1** A project would result in a substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns, alter the course of a stream or river, or increase the rate of surface runoff to the extent that flooding occurs or substantially degrades water quality.

Responses to thresholds T HYD-1 is included in the *Project-Specific Impacts* discussion below and is noted by reference to the threshold identifier.

### Project-Specific Impacts

a., f. Construction of the project would require grading that could cause runoff into surrounding waterways and the Pacific Ocean. Impacts would be minimized during all phases of construction through compliance with the Construction General Permit and compliance with the City’s grading regulations. Moreover, the permittee would be required to prepare a SWPPP for the construction of the project, which must

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g. Place housing in a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h. Place structures in a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including that occurring as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
include erosion and sediment control BMPs, as well as BMPs that control other potential construction-related emissions. Examples of BMPs that may be implemented during construction activities include, but are not limited to, temporary drains and swales, silt fences, sediment traps, removal of sediment from construction vehicles, and the restriction of cement washout areas. These BMPs would limit not only sediment discharge, but also pollutants associated with sediments, such as heavy metals, and certain pesticides and herbicides. The development and implementation of a SWPPP is a standard requirement that would apply to the project.

During long-term operations of the project, no wastewater discharges would occur. The potential for water quality impacts over the life of the project are less than significant.

b. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater recharge or supplies. No new municipal water connections are required or proposed as part of the project. There would be no impact.

c., d. The site is nearly level and project activities would occur in the public ROW. New curbs, gutters, and sidewalks would change, but improve the drainage pattern of the neighborhood (T HYD-1). Stormwater and runoff would flow down the streets and along the curbs, and eventually make its way to stormwater collection drains. Existing conditions without sidewalks and curbs create pools and flooding due to the lack of proper drainage. Although the project would alter the existing drainage at the site, the project would be improving the drainage, and allow for run off to be directed from curbs, sidewalks, and ramps. There would be an increase in impervious surfaces due to the new sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and other improvements. The increase of impervious surface is approximately 19,200 square feet, and the drainage tributary area is approximately 2,424,000 square feet. This would be an increase of 0.8 percent in impervious surface, which is not substantial, and would not have an effect on flooding, siltation, or erosion.

As noted in item (a, f), appropriate BMPs would be maintained onsite to ensure that sediment or other pollutants are contained onsite and do not enter the storm drain along the southern perimeter of the project site. During and after construction, any excess soil, construction waste, or other debris would be removed from the site. BMPs and soil management procedures would be listed on the project construction plans. As discussed further in item h, a portion of the project activities would be located inside of designated FEMA flood zone areas, however, project implementation would improve existing drainage, and stormwater treatment. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. As discussed in items c and d, the project would add not add a substantial amount of impervious surface to the area, and that the project would not substantially change the drainage pattern of the area that affects erosion, siltation, or flooding. However, according to the City of Goleta Public Works Department, the stormwater containment and treatment system in the area is already impacted. Since the existing systems are already impacted, the projects addition of 0.8 percent
impervious surfaces would create run off that the existing drainage systems are unable to accommodate. Therefore, to ensure that impacts would be less than significant, mitigation measure HYD-1 is required.

g. The project does not involve housing. Therefore, it would have no impact related to placing housing within a 100-year flood zone.

h. As shown in Figure 7, the project area spans a large area in Old Town, and a few portions are located inside the 100 year floodplain. Although project construction would occur in areas designated for a high risk of flooding, the project would improve existing conditions. The project proposes sidewalks, curbs, ramps, extending drainage facilities, and providing new infiltration or retention facilities under the sidewalks to minimize the impacts to stormwater flow. As a transportation and utility improvement project, the project would not generate or increase flooding impacts. There would be no impact.

i. The project is partially located in a 100-year floodplain and 500-year floodplain. However, the project does not involve the development of habitable structures, and no impacts related to exposing people or structures to a significant risk due to failure of a levee or dam would occur as a result of the project.

j. Goleta does not contain any large water bodies that would be subject to a seiche (Jones and Stokes 2006). The project is located inside the Potential Tsunami Run-up Area per the City of Goleta General Plan FEIR (Jones and Stokes 2006). Although the project is located in this area, no habitable structures or buildings are proposed as part of the project description, and would not expose people to potential tsunami risks. In addition, the City has a tsunami warning plan that would give warning signs to residents in all potential tsunami inundated areas. Mudflows are typically associated with hillside areas where landslides are also a concern. Old Town Goleta is relatively flat, with no hillsides with landslide potential (City of Goleta 2009). There would be no impact.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

In order to ensure runoff and stormwater treatment impacts are less than significant, the following mitigation measure is required.

**HYD-1 Stormwater and Runoff Detention and Treatment.** Prior to issuance of permits, the applicant shall submit a hydrology plan for the project that would ensure that runoff from the area would be the same or less than current conditions once the project is complete. **Requirements:** The plan shall include detention and/or infiltration basins, pervious paving, or other methods approved by the City. The plan shall also include calculations of flow that show that the runoff is not increased by the project and that it would not adversely impact the stormwater infrastructure in the area. All of these methods that are included in the hydrology plan that is approved by the City shall be included on all plans submitted for approval. **Monitoring:** The City of Goleta shall monitor the new methods constructed and ensure that the methods are properly installed and that the future amounts of stormwater and run off are similar or less than existing conditions.
Residual Impact
Residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Hydrology and Water Quality would remain less than significant as a result of project implementation.
Figure 7  Floodplain Map
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<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</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 the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

Project activities would be located in and along the streets of Old Town Goleta. The adjacent General Plan Land Use designations to the streets include Single Family and High Density Residential, as well as General Commercial and Old Town Commercial (City of Goleta, 2016). Project components would occur in the public ROW and include construction of curbs, ramps, lighting and drainage improvements, and pedestrian crosswalks. The project area currently lacks a complete pedestrian circulatory network that limits access and generates safety issues with residents walking directly in the street/ROW.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant land use and planning impact would occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* provides guidelines related to “Quality of Life.” Quality of Life is broadly defined as the aggregate effect of all impacts on individuals, families, communities, and other social groupings and on the way those groups function. Quality of life issues include loss of privacy, neighborhood incompatibility, nuisance noise, not exceeding noise thresholds, increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods, and loss of sunlight/solar access. This analysis is augmented by the information contained in Aesthetics, Air Quality, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic sections, which cover issues that relate directly to the project’s land use compatibility.
City of Goleta  
Old Town Sidewalk Improvement Project

**Project-Specific Impacts**

a. Project activities would occur in the established community of Old Town Goleta. Improvements would occur in the local ROW, and would not divide the established community. Access would continue to be provided to all residences, streets, and buildings. No new roads, walls, or structures are proposed. There would be no impact.

b. The project is directly compatible with Land Use Policy 1.3 from the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. Policy 1.3-Goleta Old Town, is intended to develop and implement programs to revitalize the Old Town area. The project is a transportation and utility improvement project that would effectively improve the network and safety in the Old Town neighborhood. New sidewalks and infrastructure would allow for increased accessibility, and revitalize the existing street network.

The project is included in the SBCAG 2040 RTP/SCS. This programmed project has been identified by the County as a bicycle/pedestrian project that would encourage walking, and improve safety and drainage (SBCAG 2013). In addition, the project is included in the SBCAG Regional Active Transportation Plan, which is a plan to enhance bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in SB County (SBCAG 2015).

As indicated in the Pedestrian System Plan of the City of Goleta General Plan, a number of streets in the Old Town neighborhood are currently designated as Streets without Sidewalks (City of Goleta 2009). The project proposes to add sidewalks to the neighborhood, and would directly address this issue. This transportation improvement project would not conflict with any applicable land use plans. There would be no impact.

c. As discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources*, there are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans in the project area. There would be no impact.

“Quality of Life” impacts are not anticipated. As discussed above and throughout this Initial Study, the proposed transportation improvement project has very low or no potential to create nuisance impacts such as loss of privacy, neighborhood incompatibility, nuisance noise, or increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods. The project is intended to improve the quality of life for the residents and visitors of Old Town. Please refer to additional analyses in the Aesthetics, Air Quality, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic sections of this initial study.

**Cumulative Impacts**

There are no cumulative impacts that would result from implementing the project.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

**Residual Impact**

Residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Land Use and Planning would remain less than significant as a result of project implementation.
11 Mineral 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

Per the Department of Conservation's Mineral Land Classification Map, the project site is located in Incorporated City Land (CGS 2011). In addition, the City of Goleta General Plan states that no significant mineral resources are located in the city planning area (Conservation Element 2009). No known mineral resources have been identified on the project site, nor does the site contain any known locally important mineral resources.

**Thresholds of Significance**

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

**Project-Specific Impacts**

a., b. Per the Department of Conservation’s Mineral Land Classification Map, the project site is located in Incorporated City Land (CGS 2011). The City of Goleta General Plan states that no significant mineral resources are located in the City planning area (Conservation Element 2009). Project activities would include sidewalk construction in the residential neighborhood and commercial areas of Old Town Goleta. There are no active mineral extraction sites or mines in the project area, nor would the project result in the loss of availability of any known resources. There would be no impact.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The project would not affect mineral resources and, therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative mineral resource impacts would not be considerable.
City of Goleta
Old Town Sidewalk Improvement Project

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**
No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

**Residual Impact**
Residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Mineral Resources would remain less than significant as a result of project implementation.
## 12 Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above those existing prior to implementation of the project?</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located in 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project near a private airstrip, would it expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Setting

**Overview of Sound Measurement**

Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound pressure levels to be consistent with that of human hearing response, which is most sensitive to frequencies around 4,000 Hertz (about the highest note on a
piano) and less sensitive to low frequencies (below 100 Hertz). In addition to the instantaneous measurement of sound levels, the duration of sound is important since sounds that occur over a long period of time are more likely to be an annoyance or cause direct physical damage or environmental stress. One of the most frequently used noise metrics that considers both duration and sound pressure level is the equivalent noise level (Leq). The Leq is defined as the single steady A-weighted level that is equivalent to the same amount of energy as that contained in the actual fluctuating levels over a period of time. Typically, Leq is summed over a one-hour period.

The time period in which noise occurs is also important since noise that occurs at night tends to be more disturbing than that which occurs during the day. Community noise is usually measured using Day-Night Average Level (DNL), which is the 24-hour average noise level with a 10-dBA penalty for noise occurring during nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) hours, or Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), which is the 24-hour average noise level with a 5 dBA penalty for noise occurring from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. and a 10 dBA penalty for noise occurring from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. Noise levels described by DNL and CNEL usually do not differ by more than 1 dBA. In practice, CNEL and DNL are used interchangeably.

The sound pressure level is measured on a logarithmic scale with the 0 dB level based on the lowest detectable sound pressure level that people can perceive. Decibels cannot be added arithmetically, but rather are added on a logarithmic basis. Based on the logarithmic scale, a doubling of sound energy is equivalent to an increase of 3 dB and a sound that is 10 dB less than the ambient sound level would result in a negligible increase (less than 0.5 dB) in total ambient sound levels. Because of the nature of the human ear, a sound must be about 10 dB greater than the reference sound to be judged as twice as loud. In general, a 3 dB change in community noise levels is noticeable, while 1-2 dB changes generally are not perceived. Quiet suburban areas typically have noise levels in the range of 40 to 50 dBA, while those along arterial streets are in the 50 to 60+ dBA range. Normal conversational levels are in the 60-65 dBA range and ambient noise levels greater than that can interrupt conversations.

Noise levels typically attenuate at a rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance from point sources such as industrial machinery. Noise from lightly traveled roads typically attenuates at a rate of about 4.5 dB per doubling of distance. Noise from heavily traveled roads typically attenuates at about 3 dB per doubling of distance.

Some land uses are more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. For example, residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, museums, cultural facilities, parks, and outdoor recreation areas are more sensitive to noise than commercial and industrial land uses.

**Vibration**

Vibration is a unique form of noise because its energy is carried through buildings, structures, and the ground, whereas sound is simply carried through the air. Thus,
Vibration is generally felt rather than heard. Some vibration effects can be caused by noise (e.g., the rattling of windows from passing trucks). This phenomenon is caused by the coupling of the acoustic energy at frequencies that are close to the resonant frequency of the material being vibrated. Typically, ground-borne vibration generated by manmade activities attenuates rapidly as distance from the source of the vibration increases. The ground motion caused by vibration is measured as particle velocity in inches per second and is measured in vibration decibels (VdB).

The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Most perceptible indoor vibration is caused by sources inside buildings such as the operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or the slamming of doors. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible ground-borne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads.

Vibration impacts would be significant if they exceed the following Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) thresholds:

- 65 VdB where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operations, such as hospitals and recording studios
- 72 VdB for residences and buildings where people normally sleep, including hotels
- 75 VdB for institutional land uses with primary daytime use, such as churches and schools
- 95 VdB for physical damage to extremely fragile historic buildings
- 100 VdB for physical damage to buildings

In addition to the groundborne vibration thresholds outlined above, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) outlined human response to different levels of groundborne vibration, and determined that vibration that is 85 VdB is acceptable only if there are an infrequent number of events per day. Construction-related vibration impacts would be less than significant for residential receptors if they occur during the City’s normally permitted hours of construction below the threshold of physical damage to buildings (100 VdB), and any vibration over 85 VdB would be infrequent with respect to the number of events per day.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant noise impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, based on the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, Section 12 Noise Thresholds, the following thresholds are used to determine whether significant noise impacts would occur:
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T N-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.

T N-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.

T N-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.

T N-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 EPA guidelines, the average construction noise is 95 dBA at a 50-foot distance from the source. A 6 dBA 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 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. 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 T N-3, the term “substantial increase” is not defined in the Thresholds Manual. The limit of perceptibility by humans in a laboratory environment is around 1.5 dBA. Under outdoor conditions, people generally do not perceive that the noise level has clearly changed until there is a 3 dBA difference. In this context, a threshold of 3 dBA is commonly used to define "substantial increase."

Responses to thresholds T N-1 through T N-4 are included in the Project-Specific Impacts discussion below and are noted by reference to the threshold identifier. Thresholds T N-1 through T N-3 pertain to a project long term operational impacts, and threshold T N-4 relates to a project’s construction impacts.

Project-Specific Impacts

a., d. Project construction would result in temporary noise increases due to use of limited heavy duty construction equipment. The project site is immediately adjacent to sensitive receptors (residences), as close as 15 feet. To assess construction noise levels from different phases of construction during the project, the Federal
Highway Administration’s Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA RCNM) Version 1.1 was utilized. As shown in Table 5, the project is broken down into five phases, demolition, grading, construction, paving, and architectural coating. The equipment used during each phase is included in the project description.

### Table 5  Construction Noise Levels by Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Estimated Noise at 15 feet (dBA Leq)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Jackhammer, Air Compressor, Pavers, Rollers</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Backhoe, Dozer, Excavator, Scraper</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>Dump Truck, Pump Truck, Compacter, Loader, Backhoe</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>Air Compressor</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>Paver, Roller</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Appendix D for equipment noise impact data sheets and assumptions.

As shown in Table 5, construction noise levels would range from 84 to 94 dBA Leq, depending on the construction phase, at adjacent residences. Per City thresholds (TN-4), the project would result in a significant impact if construction within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors would occur on weekdays outside of the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., or on weekends. Construction for the project would occur during the allowable construction hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., the transitory nature of the construction would disperse the noise levels over a wider geographic area than a more stationary construction site, and the extent of the construction noise levels is limited due to the type of work contemplated. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact. Impacts would be less than significant.

Transportation-related noise sources would include construction worker vehicles, deliveries and off-hauling of materials. The volume of construction traffic generated by these sources would be roughly 60 truck trips per day during peak construction periods (approximately 45 workers per day, and 15 truck trips for hauling materials, waste, and equipment). The project’s construction would last approximately six months from summer 2019 to winter 2019, with project components and construction phases occurring at different times. The project timeline would be temporary and all construction activity would be restricted to the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Noise impacts from construction traffic would be less than significant.

b. Certain types of construction equipment generate substantial levels of vibration. Table 6 provides vibration levels associated with typical vibratory construction
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equipment. Pile drivers or oversized earth moving equipment, which have particularly high levels of vibration impact, would not be used by the project.

Vibration at the nearest receptors approximately 15 feet from construction activities would range from 63 VdB to 99 VdB. Vibration levels would not exceed the threshold of physical damage to buildings (100 VdB) and would occasionally exceed 85 VdB. In addition, as discussed in the project description, the project’s construction would occur during the City’s normally permitted hours of construction. Therefore, construction would be restricted to daytime hours, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., and would not occur during recognized sleep hours for nearby residences. Vibration impacts from project construction would be less than significant.

Table 6  Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Approximate VdB¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded trucks</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ FTA provides equipment vibration levels in approximate vibration levels (Lv VdB) at a distance of 25 feet. These were converted to VdB at other distances using methods provided in Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment (2006).
Source: FTA 2006

c. During operation of the project, there are no components that would generate any new substantial noise generating sources. The sidewalks would encourage residents to walk through the area and children to play on the sidewalk, which would increase noise associated with these activities. However, children playing and people talking are typical sources of noise in residential neighborhoods and would not cause a substantial increase in noise levels in the area. The project would not permanently increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project would not introduce a substantial operational source of noise on the project site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e., f. The project site is within one mile of a public use airport (Santa Barbara Municipal Airport) and the project site is inside the airport’s area of influence, as defined in the Airport Land Use Plan (City of Santa Barbara 2014). The project is located outside of the 60, 65, 70 and 75 dBA noise contour levels produced by the airport (SBCAG 2012). The project would not subject new residents or workers to excessive noise levels, as there are no proposed habitable structures or buildings. There would be no impact.
Cumulative Impacts
As discussed in the analysis above, operation of the project would not permanently change existing ambient noise levels. In addition, construction noise impacts would not be cumulative because impacts are location specific. The project’s contribution to cumulative noise impacts would not be considerable.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

Residual Impact
No residual impacts related to potential noise impacts are identified.
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13 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial amounts of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting
The project site and area of construction is located in the public ROW in the existing street network. The Old Town neighborhood is primarily residential, with scattered commercial properties adjacent to Fairview Avenue, Hollister Avenue, and Pine Avenue.

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

Project-Specific Impacts
a. The project includes transportation and pedestrian access improvements in the existing transportation network of Old Town Goleta. The project does not propose any habitable structures or buildings that would induce population growth. No businesses, roads, or other infrastructure would indirectly induce population growth. There would be no impact.

b. The existing residences and commercial properties would not be displaced or removed, nor would the project require the displacement of people. The project would require removing portions of private encroachments (such as walls, fences, landscaping) in the public ROW where reconfiguration of parking spaces, sidewalks, curbs, gutters and utilities are proposed. None of these project activities would
displace the existing housing, or people in the neighborhood. No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The project would not displace any existing housing, nor would it develop new housing or result in an increased demand for existing housing. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on population and housing would not be considerable.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

**Residual Impact**

No impact on population growth and the area’s housing supply would occur under the project or cumulative development scenarios.
## 14 Public Services

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 nearest station to the project site is located at 5330 Calle Real, approximately one mile northeast. 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.
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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 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 firefighter on scene, in order to meet the “two-in-two-out.”

Station 12 has an engine company with a staff of three personnel. Fire Station 12 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 12 is 1: 5,541
2) Fire Station 12 currently serves a population of 16,623 (2000 Census)

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.
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.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on public services would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual includes thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools. Specifically, under these thresholds, any project that:

T PS-1 Potential impacts would occur for 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. As described in the Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, current State standards are as follows:

- Kindergarten through Grade 2: 20 students per classroom
- Grades 3 through 8: 29 students per classroom
- Grades 9 through 12: 28 students per classroom

Responses to thresholds T PS-1 is included in the Project-Specific Impacts discussion below and is noted by reference to the threshold identifier.

Project-Specific Impacts

a1., a2. The project to construct sidewalks and other associated improvements within Old Town would not increase demand for public services including emergency services, such as fire and police protection. The presence of construction workers in the project area would be temporary, and the need for public services, such as emergency medical services in case of an accident, would not exceed the current demand and capacity. Once the project is complete and operational, no new buildings or residences would be built that would require protection services. Therefore, no new or expanded fire or police emergency service infrastructure would need to be built in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of public services.
a3. The project does not propose new buildings or habitable residences, which would increase the current population. Therefore, no new students would enter the Goleta Union School District or Santa Barbara High School District as a result of the project (T PS-1). The project would have no impact on existing schools, and would not require or result in the need for future construction of schools.

a4. As discussed further in Section 15, Recreation, the project does not propose new buildings or habitable residences, which would increase the current population. Therefore, no new residents or people would be increasing the demand for recreational facilities. The project would have no impact on existing parks, and would not require or result in the need for future construction of parks and recreation.

a5. The project does not propose new buildings or habitable residences, which would increase the current population. Therefore, no new residents or people would be increasing the demand for libraries and other public and governmental facilities. The project would not generate any additional demand for public facilities, and would not require or result in the need for future construction of other public facilities. There would be no impact.

Cumulative Impacts
The project is a transportation and utility improvement project. The project does not include housing (with associated population growth) that could generate increased demand for public services. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts related to public services would not be considerable.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

Residual Impact
No residual project-specific impacts on public services would occur.
15 Recreation

<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>
</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

The project is located in an existing residential and commercial neighborhood in Old Town Goleta. Nearby recreational resources include Nectarine Park at 99 Nectarine Avenue, a small neighborhood park at the end of Armitos Avenue, and Twin Lakes Golf Course across Fairview Avenue to the west of the project limits. Goleta Beach is located approximately two miles south of the project, and provides public picnic and barbeque space, a jungle gym, and open space beach activity. Various other parks and recreational facilities are located throughout Goleta and unincorporated Santa Barbara County west of Goleta.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project-Specific Impacts

a, b. As discussed in Section 13, Population and Housing, the project would not increase or generate new residents, which would increase the demand for local recreational facilities. The project proposes transportation and utility improvements, and as such would not create additional demand or impact existing recreational facilities. The project is intended to enhance pedestrian walkability and connect Old Town residents to the Hollister Avenue commercial corridor and light industrial areas south of Hollister Avenue. There would be no impact.

Cumulative Impacts

The project would not impact existing recreational facilities, add recreational facilities or generate substantial increased demand for park and recreational facilities.
Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on park and recreational facilities would not be considerable.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Residual Impact**

Residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Recreation would remain less than significant as a result of project implementation.
### 16 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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing Setting

Roadway Network

- Fairview Avenue, in the study area, is a four-lane north-south roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour. On-street parking is prohibited. Fairview Avenue is classified as a Principal/Major Arterial in the City of Goleta General Plan Circulation Element.

- Hollister Avenue, in the study area, is a four-lane east-west roadway with a posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour west of Fairview Avenue and a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour east of Fairview Avenue. Hollister Avenue, east of Fairview Avenue has existing signalized and un-signalized intersections. On-street parking is prohibited. Hollister Avenue is classified as a Principal/Major Arterial in the City of Goleta General Plan Circulation Element.

- Mandarin Drive, in the study area, is a two-lane east-west roadway with a prima facie speed limit of 25 miles per hour. On-street parking is permitted. Mandarin Drive is classified as a Minor Collector in the City of Goleta General Plan Circulation Element.

- Nectarine Avenue/Pine Avenue, in the study area, is a two-lane north-south roadway with a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour. On-street parking is permitted. Nectarine Avenue and Pine Avenue are classified as Minor Collectors in the City of Goleta General Plan Circulation Element.

- Orange Avenue and Magnolia Avenue, in the study area, are two-lane north-south roadways with a prima facie speed limit of 25 miles per hour. On-street parking is permitted. Orange Avenue and Magnolia Avenue are local streets.

- US 101 is a four-lane, north-south interstate highway that connects the Goleta to Santa Barbara, Carpinteria, and Ventura to the south and Buellton, Lompoc, and Santa Maria to the north.

Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

There are Class II bicycle lanes on Fairview Avenue in the study area and on Hollister Avenue west of Fairview Avenue. Hollister Avenue east of Fairview Avenue is a Class III bike route with painted shared lane markings. Sidewalks along roadways and curb ramps at intersections are present on Hollister Avenue. Sidewalks are intermittent/incomplete or missing entirely throughout the rest of the study area.

Public Transit Services

Goleta is served by the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD). In the study area bus service is primarily along Hollister Avenue, with bus stops at Fairview Avenue, Nectarine Avenue, and Pine Avenue.

The study area is served by MTD Santa Barbara Routes 6, 7, 11, 12x, and 2720 and VCTC’s Coastal Express bus service.
Thresholds of Significance

Intersection Analysis

Level of Service (LOS) is commonly used to describe the quality of flow on roadways and at intersections using a range of LOS from LOS A (free flow with little congestion) to LOS F (severely congested conditions). The definitions for LOS for interruption of traffic flow differ depending on the type of traffic control (traffic signal, unsignalized intersection with side street stops, or unsignalized intersection with all-way stops). The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010 (Transportation Research Board, 2010) methodology expresses the LOS of an intersection in terms of delay time for the intersection approaches. The HCM methodology utilizes different procedures for different types of intersection control.

CEQA and City of Goleta

A significant project generated traffic impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above CEQA Appendix G checklist. Additional thresholds of significance are set forth in the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual and include the following:

T T-1 Traffic generated by the proposed project would increase the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio at local intersections by the values provided in Table 7 below.

T T-2 The project’s access to a major road or arterial road would require access that would create an unsafe situation, a new traffic signal, or major revisions to an existing traffic signal.

T T-3 The project would add traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g., narrow width, road-side ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) that would become potential safety problems with the addition of project traffic.

T T-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 level of service (LOS) D (V/C 0.80) or lower. Substantial is defined as a minimum change of 0.03 for intersections that would operate from 0.80 to 0.85, a change of 0.02 for an intersection that would operate from 0.86 to 0.90, and a change of 0.01 for an intersection that would operate greater than 0.90 (LOS E or worse).
Table 7 Volume to Capacity Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Level of Service (Including Project)</th>
<th>Increase in V/C or Trips Greater Than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>15 Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>10 Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS F</td>
<td>5 Trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Goleta’s roadway impact threshold defines a significant impact if a project would increase traffic volumes by more than one percent (either project-specific or project contribution to cumulative impacts) on a roadway that currently exceeds its Acceptable Capacity or its forecast to exceed its Acceptable Capacity under cumulative conditions.

Responses to thresholds T T-1 through T T-4 are included in the *Project-Specific Impacts* discussion below and are noted by reference to the threshold identifier.

**Project Specific Impacts**

a. As a sidewalk improvement project, the project would not add any new vehicle trips. Intersections and roadways in the project area would continue to operate at existing LOS and there would be no changes to existing traffic (T T-1 through T T-4). Implementation of the project would improve walkability and accessibility for both pedestrians and bicyclists. There would be no impact.

b. As discussed in item a, the project would not introduce any new vehicle trips, and thus would not add vehicles to local roads or highways. Existing conditions on local roads and highways would continue to operate at the existing service levels with project implementation. The project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program, and no impact would occur.

c. The project site is within one mile of a public use airport (Santa Barbara Municipal Airport) and the project site is inside the airport’s area of influence, as defined in the Airport Land Use Plan (City of Santa Barbara, 2014). The project however would have no impact on air traffic patterns, as no structures are proposed that would interfere with air traffic. As discussed in Section 8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the project would not result in safety risks associated with the implementation of the project. There would be no impact.

d. No new curves, intersections, roads, or incompatible uses are proposed as part of the project. All project activities that would occur in the existing ROW are intended to improve the design of the existing circulatory pedestrian network. In addition, the project would reduce hazards as currently pedestrians walk in the street/ROW, since sidewalks are discontinuous or not present. There would be no impact.

e. Access to all residential and commercial properties would be maintained throughout project construction and operation. Portions of streets may be blocked
and detoured to accommodate construction, however proper rerouting would reduce any potential issues. Emergency vehicles would be able to navigate freely throughout the Old Town neighborhood during and after project construction. There would be no impact.

f. As discussed in item a, the project would not have a significant impact to the roadway and intersection network. The project is a transportation improvement project, which is meant to improve the existing pedestrian circulatory system, and provide safe pedestrian access for the neighborhood. The project would not add any new residents who would access the existing public transit system. There would be no impact or conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs.

**Cumulative Impacts**

As discussed in the analysis above, impacts to the roadways and intersections in the project area would be improved, and no cumulative impacts would occur.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

**Residual Impacts**

The project would result in no residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Transportation.
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Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in a Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 2024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significant of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Existing Setting
The project site is located in a residential neighborhood that has been previously disturbed by the development of existing infrastructure.

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

Project-Specific Impacts
a., b. Tribal cultural resources are defined in Public Resources Code 21074 as sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either:
City of Goleta
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- Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources
- Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1

No tribal cultural resources (TCRs) have been identified at the project site. A review of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) search performed by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) indicated that Native American cultural sites are present at the project site or surrounding area. The NAHC provided the contact information for an individual who could provide more information about these sites. The contact information was incorrect, and attempts to contact the NAHC for the proper information were unanswered.

Informal outreach letters were mailed to six Native American individuals to request information regarding cultural resources in the area. Two responses were received expressing concerns for potential impacts to cultural resources during project execution, which included recommendations for Native American monitoring during project-related ground disturbance. However, these efforts did not identify the presence of known TCRs at the project site. Formal outreach letters and AB 52 consultation requests were sent out as of August 2017. To date, no responses have been received.

The mitigation measures proposed for Cultural Resources in Section 5 would be applicable to TCRs and would therefore reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The project would not contribute to any cumulative permanent adverse impacts on tribal cultural resources.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

The mitigation measures (CR-1 and CR-2) required in Section 5, *Cultural Resources*, are required in this section, and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**Residual Impacts**

The project would result in no residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Tribal Cultural Resources.
## 18 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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Existing Setting**

*Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment*

The project is located in the service district of the Goleta Water District (GWD) and wastewater is serviced by the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD). The GSD treatment plant located adjacent to the city and Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, has a capacity of 9.7 million gallons per day, and a daily limit of 7.64 million gallons per day. The disposal of treated effluent is by ocean outfall offshore from Goleta Beach. The plant currently operates under a NPDES permit issued by the USEPA with concurrence by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

*Landfill Capacity and Solid Waste*

The Santa Barbara County Public Works Department owns and 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. In the city, collection services are provided by Marborg Industries. Waste generated in the city is handled at the South Coast Recycling and Transfer Station where recyclable and organic materials are sorted out. The remaining solid waste is disposed of at the Tajiguas Landfill.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant impact on utilities and service systems would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

**Project Specific Impacts**

a., b., e. Construction and operation of the project would not produce wastewater. The project would not involve the construction of habitable structures and would not require the expansion of existing wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with wastewater treatment and capacity requirements of the CCRWQCB.

c. Construction and operation of the project would generate a 0.8 percent increase in impervious surfaces, which would increase the amount of stormwater runoff directed into the existing impacted stormwater drainage facilities. As discussed in Section 9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, mitigation measure HYD-1 requires that the project ensure that runoff remain the same in the area. This can be accomplished through the construction of new stormwater facilities. The project proposes new connections to the existing storm drain system, to accommodate the anticipated runoff. There would be no impact to the environment associated with new stormwater drainage facilities.

d. The project would not involve any habitable structures and would not create new long-term demand for water supplies. While water may be necessary during construction activities for dust suppression, demand would be temporary and would not result in exceedances of existing water supply capacity.
During operation, the project would not generate solid waste. Approximately 400 cubic yards of demolition materials, including but not limited to Portland cement and asphalt concrete, would be generated during construction, and would be trucked to a recycling facility. The likely location for the recycling materials is the Tajiguas Landfill in Gaviota. The County-operated Tajiguas Landfill would accept construction debris. The landfill has the capacity to accept up to 1,500 tons of waste per day and has a remaining capacity of over 4.8 million cubic yards (CalRecycle 2017). The project would recycle approximately 400 cubic yards or 108 tons of material, and the amount of waste generated per day would be variable depending on the amount of excavation performed. The Tajiguas Landfill would be properly equipped with storage capacity, and impacts would be less than significant.

All solid waste from construction would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. As discussed in Section 8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, no hazardous materials or waste would be generated by the project.

### Cumulative Impacts

The project would not result in an increase in demands on water supply, sewage treatment capacity or the storm drain system. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on the GWD’s water supply, GWSD’s sewage treatment capacity, or the city storm drain system.

Small quantities of solid waste generated during initial construction and routine maintenance and repairs would be well below the City’s established threshold of 40 tons/year and would therefore not result in an adverse contribution to cumulative impacts on the Tajiguas Landfill or other waste handling facilities. Construction and maintenance debris and waste materials would be recycled to the extent feasible.

### Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are recommended or required.

### Residual Impacts

Residual impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) on Utilities and Public Services would remain less than significant as a result of project implementation.
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19 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>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Does the project:

a. Have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, 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?

   □ □ □ □

b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” 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)?

   □ □ □ □

c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

   □ □ □ □

a. As discussed in Section 4, Biological Resources, 32 31 trees are designated for removal and adjacent to construction related activities that have the potential to disrupt nesting birds. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The project site does not currently provide substantial habitat for wildlife. As discussed in Section 5, Cultural Resources, the project has the potential to uncover and disturb intact cultural resources that contain examples of California history. Incorporation of mitigation measures CR-1 and CR-2 would ensure that the project would have a less than significant impact on unanticipated cultural resources and human remains. With mitigation incorporated, the project would have a less than significant effect on any major periods of California history.
b. All potential environmental impacts of the project have been determined in this Initial Study to have either no impact, a less than significant impact, or a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. In connection with the effects of any past projects, current projects, and provable future projects, the project would have less than significant cumulative impacts (i.e., impacts would not be cumulatively considerable).

c. As discussed in Section 3, Air Quality, construction emissions in close proximity to residences would be less than BAAQMD thresholds. As discussed in Section 8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the project area has the potential to contain known or previously unknown hazardous materials, and could expose people to potential hazards or risks. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3, impacts would be less than significant. As discussed in Section 12, Noise, construction would occur during required construction periods, and impacts would be less than significant. All impacts related to these topics would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.
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