The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (Draft MND) was circulated for a 30 day public review period. The public review period began on July 22, 2016 and concluded on August 22, 2016. Three comment letters/emails were received on the Draft MND and are provided as Appendix C to this document. Two of the written comments provided clarifications/minor corrections to the information within the document and one letter raised a design issue that will be considered by the Planning Commission as part of the review process. None of comments introduced significant new information or changed the conclusions of the IS-MND. Where changes have been made to the document in response to the comments provided and/or corrections by staff, these are indicated in strikeout/underline format.

1. **PROJECT TITLE:**
   Fuel Depot Gas Station and Convenience Store New Development Plan
   Case No. 15-063-DP-DRB

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

3. **CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:**
   Darryl Mimick, Associate Planner/ Kathy Allen, Supervising Senior Planner
   (805) 961-7543

4. **APPLICANT:**
   John Price
   Fairview Auto Lube, LP
   1550 La Vista Road
   Santa Barbara, CA 93110

   **AGENT:**
   Harwood A. White
   1553 Knoll Circle Drive
   Santa Barbara, CA 93103

5. **PROJECT LOCATION:**
   The project site is located at 180 North Fairview Avenue, on the southeast corner of Fairview Avenue and Encina Road in the City of Goleta (City). The property encompasses a total 12,197-square feet. The Assessor Parcel Number (APN) is 069-110-054.
6. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project includes the following applications:

1. A Development Plan (DP) for the demolition of an existing on-site building (1,619 square feet) and the construction of a new one-story, 2,396-square foot convenience store (net increase of 777 square feet) and associated gas station. The existing fuel pumps and canopy would remain in their current and previously approved configurations within the front yard setback area. As part of the DP, it is proposed that two off-site parking spaces located at 52 N. Fairview Avenue (located within 500 feet of the site) would be counted towards the parking requirements.

2. The request for Modifications (MOD) to allow:
   a) the placement of two parking spaces adjacent to fuel pumps within the front setback along Fairview Avenue,
   b) the placement of one new ADA parking space within the secondary front yard setback adjacent to Encina Road,
   c) the placement of a new trash/recycling enclosure encroaching into the secondary front yard setback along Encina Road;
d) an increase in building/structure lot coverage from 30-percent to 35-percent, and
e) use of the eight (8) existing fueling stations to be used as eight (8) of the twelve
(12) parking spaces required pursuant to the Inland Zoning Ordinance (Goleta
Municipal Code (GMC) § 35-317.8).

The existing fuel islands, canopy, and freestanding signage would remain as presently
constituted. The new Development Plan would regulate the project site located at 180 N.
Fairview Avenue (APN 069-110-054). The subject site shares an existing Development
Plan (66-M-75) with the development located at 160 N. Fairview (APN 069-110-055)
which is separately owned. The new stand-alone Development Plan would supersede
that portion of the existing Development Plan (66-M-75) applicable to the subject site
that the project site shares with the adjacent parcel 160 North Fairview Avenue (APN
069-110-055). The proposed one-story convenience store and associated gas station
would have a maximum height of 23-feet.

Uses
The project would only be retail commercial related uses. The building floor area would
consist of 2,396-square feet and an overhead canopy area of 1,700-square feet. The
convenience store is proposed to be open 24 hours per day. The business will be
operated with 4 four full time equivalent (FTE) staff. There would be three shifts (6 am-
2 pm, 2 pm-10 pm, and 10 pm - 6 am), staffed primarily with 1 full time equivalent
person per shift.

Site Plan
The 12,197 square foot property is currently developed with an existing gas station
consisting of 8 fueling stations with an overhead canopy and a 1,619-square foot
building. Within the 1,619-square feet building, 432-square feet are currently used as a
convenience store, and 1,187-square feet as 3 auto-service bays. The gas station is part
of the Fairview Village Shopping Center/Encina Professional Building development
consisting of 3 other buildings and 45 parking spaces on two parcels.

The proposal is to demolish the existing on-site building (service bays and small
convenience store) and replace it with a new 2,396 square foot convenience store. The
new building will be in a Spanish-style to complement the existing buildings at the
Fairview Village Shopping Center. Existing concrete drive aisles related to the auto-
service use of the business will be converted into new landscaping along the Encina
Road frontage and eastern property line. The landscaping will be increased from 862
square feet to 1,942 square feet, with a blend of new trees, drought-tolerant shrubs and
groundcovers. A new 128-square foot trash enclosure is also proposed.

The project would require a total of 12 parking spaces for the proposed convenience
store. The applicant is proposing to satisfy parking in the following manner:
• constructing one on-site ADA compliant parking space located adjacent to the
  north property line along Encina Road,
• constructing one on-site parking space located at the south east corner of the
  parcel;
• utilizing the eight fuel pump locations as parking spaces as most trips to the
  convenience store will be in conjunction with pumping gas;
- utilizing two off-site parking spaces at 52 North Fairview Avenue (located within 500’ of the site).

No changes are proposed to the design or location of the fuel islands, signage, or canopy.

The applicant requests five proposed modifications to the Inland Zoning Ordinance as part of the new Development Plan application, including the following:

1. Locating two parking spaces adjacent to fuel pumps within the front setback along Fairview Avenue (encroaching 3’-10 ½” into the 20-foot front setback area).
2. Locating one new ADA parking space within the secondary front yard setback adjacent to Encina Road (encroaching 17’-9 ½” into the 20-foot front setback area).
3. Placing a new trash/recycling enclosure 16’-4½” into the 20-foot secondary front setback area along Encina Road.
4. Increasing building/structure lot coverage from 30-percent to 35-percent.
5. Placing 8 of the 12 required parking spaces at the 8 existing fueling stations.

Project Site Plan
A preliminary landscape plan identifies 1,942-square feet of area to be landscaped on the project site. The plan includes various drought tolerant shrubs, queen palms, evergreen trees, and various other ground covers.

Preliminary earthwork quantities are estimated at 175 cubic yards of cut and 25 cubic yards of fill (net export of 150 cubic yards). Stormwater drainage would flow towards the northeast and south east portions of the site into a drainage swale then filter into existing storm drains on Encina Road and North Fairview Avenue.

The Goleta Water District and the Goleta Sanitary District would provide water and sanitary sewer service to the proposed project.

7. BACKGROUND INFORMATION
On August 3, 1966, the Santa Barbara County Planning Commission approved the Fairview Village Shopping Center site plan (66-M-075), which encompassed the parcels addressed as 160 and 180 N. Fairview.1 The shopping center included a service station (with four fueling pumps and an approximately 1,600 square foot building), a 2,400 square foot "mart," approximately 6,800 square feet of retail, and 45 parking spaces to serve the development. The shopping center contained two parcels with the service station on one parcel and all of the other improvements including parking on the other parcel with both parcels owned by a single entity. There is a recorded access easement along the southern 12.5 feet of the project site. A reciprocal access agreement was recorded.

On July 13, 1999, the County Planning Director approved an amendment (66-M-075-AM01) to allow the 1,700 sq. ft., 18' tall overhead canopy over the existing fuel pump islands. Given the site configuration and the location of the existing fuel pumps, the canopy was allowed to encroach into setbacks. It was noted in the July 13, 1999 staff report, that the "Parking would be provided by the existing parking lot, located on the adjacent parcel within the Fairview Village Shopping Center. No new parking is proposed as the facility has adequate on-site parking."

At some point, the two parcels were individually sold and are now separately owned. The land use entitlement (66-M-75 and 66-M-75-AM01) that created the Fairview Village Shopping Center, however, continues to link the two parcels together. Upon incorporation, the City inherited all of the previous land use entitlements granted by the County, including the Development Plan associated with the Fairview Village Shopping Center.

In 2013, the applicant submitted for a Development Plan Amendment (DP Amendment) to expand the existing building by approximately 900 square feet and to change the use of the building from 4 service bays and a mini-mart to solely a convenience store. No changes were proposed to the existing fuel islands, the canopy, or signage. Since there is a single Development Plan covering multiple properties, both property owners' signatures would be required to initiate a DP Amendment. The property owner of 180 N.

1 "M" files were the precursor to Development Plans in the Santa Barbara County Planning Department and are now treated/ considered as Development Plans.
Fairview was unsuccessfully securing the other property owner’s signature to allow the DP Amendment.

Consequently, the property owner of 180 N. Fairview seeks approval for a standalone Development Plan governing the gas station property. The application for this Development Plan (15-063-DP, DRB) was filed on May 26, 2015 and deemed complete on March 11, 2016.

8. **APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:**
   a. Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region, if needed.
   b. Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District.

9. **SITE INFORMATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Information</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Land</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use Designation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Intersection (C-I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,197 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present Use and Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas station, convenience store, and auto-lube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrounding Uses/Zoning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North: Multi-family residential development / DR-12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: Shopping center and offices / SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: Office building / PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: Shopping center and offices / SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing: Fairview Avenue and Encina Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities and Public Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply: Goleta Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage: Goleta Sanitary District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power: Southern California Edison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas: Southern California Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable: Cox Cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: Verizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire: Santa Barbara County Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Districts: Goleta Union Unified School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

    The project site is a 12,197-square foot parcel located within an existing commercial shopping center in the urban core of the City of Goleta. This project site was first developed in 1966 with a gas station consisting of 8 fueling stations with an overhead canopy, a 1,619-square foot convenience store/auto-service building, landscaping, and zero parking spaces within the project site area. The gas station is part of the Fairview
Center/Encina Professional Building Development Plan consisting of 3 other commercial/office buildings and 45 parking spaces on two parcels.

Surrounding Land Uses
The surrounding area is primarily comprised of one and two-story commercial and office buildings and a condominium development for senior citizens. To the south and east of the project site are one-story Spanish-style commercial/office buildings comprising the Fairview Center/Encina Professional Building. To the north of the project site is a senior citizen residential community with two-story condominiums. To the west of the project site is the Fairview Shopping Center consisting of one-story commercial buildings.

Aesthetics
The project site and North Fairview Avenue are designated as Local Scenic or Viewshed Corridors, as identified in the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, 2006 as amended, (GP/CLUP). The Santa Ynez Mountains, which are identified as a scenic resource in Policy VH 1.1 of the GP/CLUP are partially visible from the project site and North Fairview Avenue.

Cultural Resources
There are no known cultural resources on the site.

Biological Resources and Surface Water Bodies
No biological resources and surface water bodies are found on the project site. Approximately 15% of the project site is landscaped with trees and shrubs. The Goleta General Plan (Conservation Element, Figure 4-1) does not identify any rare, endangered, or special status animal species on the project site.

Topography and Soils
The project site is generally flat with an approximately 2-foot northeasterly and southeasterly drop towards Encina Road and the southeastern portion of the site. The project site is currently developed and consists of paved areas and landscaping. As a result, soils at the project site consist of fill soils from the development of the existing shopping center/office complex.

Transportation/Traffic
The transportation system is comprised of regional highways, arterial roadways and residential streets. The principal components of this street network are North Fairview Avenue, Encina Road, Calle Real and US Highway 101. Area roadway segments and intersections currently operate in acceptable ranges of Level of Service C or better.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐ Aesthetics
☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources
12. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

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

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

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

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

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier environmental document, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project and that a subsequent document containing updated and/or site specific information should be prepared pursuant to CEQA Sections 15162/15163/15164.
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier environmental document, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Jennifer Carmen, AICP
Planning and Environmental Review Director
Date 9-1-16

13. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

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

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

1) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
2) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
3) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

(f) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). References to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

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

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

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

AESTHETICS

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

Existing Setting
The project site is located on the southeast corner of the Fairview Avenue/Encina Road intersection and contains an existing one-story convenience store/auto-service building, an overhead canopy, and 8 fueling stations. The existing convenience store building is set back approximately 67 feet from the right-of-way line of Fairview Avenue and approximately 20 feet from the right-of-way line of Encina Road. The existing on-site building is a rectilinear California Ranch-style building with a Dutch gable roof. The existing flat roofed overhead canopy is set back approximately 6 feet from the right-of-way line of Fairview Avenue and approximately 20 feet from the right-of-way line of Encina Road.

To the south and east of the project site are one-story Spanish-style commercial/office buildings comprising the Fairview Center/Encina Professional Building (See Figures 1 and 2). To the north of the project site is a senior citizen residential community with two-story condominiums (See Figure 3). To the west of the project site is the Fairview Shopping Center consisting of one-story commercial buildings (See Figure 4).
Figure 1. View of existing commercial and office buildings the south of project site.

Figure 2. View of existing commercial and office buildings to the east of project site.
Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project Specific Impacts
a,b,c) The project site is located on Fairview Avenue which is a Designated Scenic Corridor under GP/CLUP policy VH2.1 and in the Scenic and Visual Resources Map in Figure 6-1 of the GP/CLUP. The Scenic View to be protected is looking
north towards the Santa Ynez Mountains. Because the proposed convenience store reconstruction would be set back approximately 70 feet away from Fairview Avenue with a one-story building 23-foot high building, the reconstruction would not have an adverse effect on scenic views/view corridors. Further, the convenience store reconstruction would be located behind an existing 19-foot tall canopy. The style of the existing building will be changed to an architectural style (Spanish) which is more compatible with the architectural style of the other buildings within the Fairview Center and the adjacent Encina Professional Building. Given the distance from Fairview Avenue right-of-way, the proposed one story nature of the new building, and the presence, location, and height of the existing overhead canopy, the new convenience store would not impact mountain and foothill views. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to scenic views and scenic corridors.

d) No new lighting is proposed as part of the reconstruction of the convenience store. All existing project lighting would remain night sky compliant. As such, the project would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare and therefore would remain a less than significant impact on glare.
Cumulative Impacts
The project’s contribution to cumulative aesthetic impacts is considered to be less than significant, as it would not contribute to overall changes in the visual character of the area.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
Based on the above analysis, no mitigation measures are necessary.

Residual Impact
The project’s contribution to aesthetic impacts is less than significant, as it is consistent with the size, bulk and scale of surrounding buildings and uses and would not contribute to the overall changes in the visual character of the City.
**AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES**

| In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project: |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document |
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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))? |  |  |  |  |  |
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |  |  |  |

**Existing Setting**
The project site is located within an urbanized area and has no agricultural use, forest lands, or timberlands that exist on the project site or in the immediate vicinity.
Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact to Agriculture and Forest Resources may occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, according to the City of Goleta’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual a project may pose a significant environmental effect on agricultural resources if it converts prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use or impairs the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land.

Project Specific Impacts
a,b,e) The site is designated as “Urban Built Up land” and is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as mapped by the California Department of Conservation. There are no agriculturally zoned properties or properties under a Williamson Act contract in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not result in any environmental changes that would involve the conversion of any farmland to non-agricultural uses. Additionally, the gas station was present on the project site for approximately 50 years. Further there are no lands zoned as forest lands or timberlands on the project site or in its immediate vicinity. Therefore the project would have no impact on agricultural resources in the area.

c,d) The proposed site is an existing gas station with associated improvements and does not contain forested areas. Additionally, the proposed project would not result in any other environmental changes that would involve the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses. Therefore, the project would have no impact on forest resources in the areas.

Cumulative Impacts
The proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative impact on agriculture or forest resources within the City

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
Based on the above analysis, no mitigation measures are necessary.

Residual Impact
No residual impacts (either project specific or cumulative on agriculture and forest resources would occur as a result of project implementation.
AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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

Existing Setting

Meteorological Setting

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

Temperatures in the Goleta area average 59 degrees annually. Daily and seasonal oscillations of mean temperature are small because of the moderating effects of the nearby oceanic thermal reservoir. In contrast to the steady temperature regime, rainfall is highly variable. Measurable precipitation occurs mainly from early November to mid-April, but total amounts are generally small. Historically, Goleta averages 18 inches of rain annually with January as the wettest month.

The wind pattern on air pollution is that locally generated emissions are carried offshore at night and toward inland Santa Barbara County by day. Dispersion of pollutants is restricted when the wind velocity for nighttime breezes is low. The lack of development in inland Santa Barbara County, however, causes few air quality problems during
nocturnal air stagnation. Daytime ventilation is usually much more vigorous. Both summer and winter air quality in the project area is generally very good.

Existing Air Quality

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS)

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

Federal standards are established by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and are termed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The State standards are established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and are called the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). The region generally has good air quality, as it attains or is considered in maintenance status for most ambient air quality standards. The Santa Barbara County (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.

Air Quality Planning

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

In 2001, the CARB developed an attainment plan that was designed to meet both Federal and State planning requirements. The Federal attainment plan was combined with those from other statewide non-attainment areas to become the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The 2001 Clean Air Plan (CAP) was adopted as the County portion of the SIP, designed to meet and maintain Federal clean air standards. The 2010 CAP, adopted by the APCD Board, incorporates updated data and is currently the most recent Clean Air Plan for meeting the state ozone standard.

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

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

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

a) interferes with progress toward the attainment of the ozone standard by releasing emissions which equal or exceed the established long-term quantitative thresholds for NO\textsubscript{X} and ROG;
b) equals or exceeds the State or Federal ambient air quality standards for any criteria pollutant (as determined by modeling);
c) results in toxic or hazardous pollutants in amounts which may increase cancer risks for the affected population;
d) Causes an odor nuisance problem impacting a considerable number of people.

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

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

**APCD Operational Impacts Thresholds**

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

e) Emit 240 pounds per day or more of ROG and NO\textsubscript{X} from all sources;
f) Emit 25 pounds per day or more of unmitigated ROG from any motor vehicle trips only;
g) Emit 25 pounds per day or more of unmitigated NO\textsubscript{X} from any motor vehicle trips only;
h) Emit 80 pounds per day or more of PM-10;
i) Cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality standard (except ozone);
j) Exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board (10 excess cancer cases in a million for cancer risk and a Hazard Index of more than 1.0 for non-cancer risk); or
k) Be inconsistent with Federal or State air quality plans for Santa Barbara County.

The cumulative contribution of project emissions to regional levels should be compared with existing programs and plans, including the most recent Clean Air Plan (SBCAPCD 2010).

l) 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 ROC), exceed the operational thresholds, then the project’s cumulative impacts are considered significant.

m) For projects that do not have significant ozone precursor emissions or localized pollutant impacts, if emissions have been taken into account in the 2010 Clean Air Plan growth projections, regional cumulative impacts may be considered to be less than significant.

**APCD Construction Impacts Thresholds**

Quantitative thresholds of significance are not currently in place for short-term emissions. However, CEQA requires that the short-term impacts such as exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generation during grading must be analyzed. The APCD recommends that construction-related NOx, ROC, PM-10, and PM-2.5 emissions, from diesel and gasoline powered equipment, paving, and other activities, be quantified.

n) APCD uses 25 tons per year for NOx and ROG as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts.

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

**Project Specific Impacts**

**Short-Term Construction Impacts:**

a, b) Construction of the proposed project would result in a temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed caused by soil disturbance, dust emissions, and combustion pollutants from on-site construction equipment. Pollutant emissions associated with construction activity were quantified using CalEEMod (Version 2013 2.2). Implementation of the project would generate construction-related air pollutant emissions from three general categories: entrained dust, equipment and vehicle exhaust emissions, and architectural coatings. Entrained dust results from the exposure of earth surfaces to wind from the direct disturbance and movement of soil, resulting in PM10 and PM2.5 emissions. To account for dust control measures in the calculations, it was assumed that the site would be
watered at least three times daily, resulting in an approximately 61% reduction of both PM10 and PM2.5 emissions, to represent compliance with SBCAPCD standard dust control measures. Exhaust from internal combustion engines used by construction equipment, hauling trucks, and vendor trucks would result in emissions of ROC, NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. Table AQ-1, below, show the estimated maximum unmitigated daily short-term construction emissions associated with the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Project Emissions</th>
<th>ROG (tons/year)</th>
<th>NOx (tons/year)</th>
<th>CO (tons/year)</th>
<th>SO2 (tons/year)</th>
<th>PM10 (tons/year)</th>
<th>PM2.5 (tons/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thresholds</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.22)</td>
<td>(1.85)</td>
<td>(1.68)</td>
<td>(.002)</td>
<td>(.014)</td>
<td>(.099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 tons/year</td>
<td>25 tons/year</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The emissions modeling included the following assumptions. The total timeframe for the construction period was assumed to be 15 weeks (as is typical for the type of project, size, and site conditions) including: one (1) week for demolition, one (1) week for grading, nine (9) weeks for building construction, one (1) week for application of architectural coatings, and two (2) weeks for paving and concrete, with some overlap between these phases. Emissions calculations were based on default CalEEMod V. 2013 2.2 assumptions for the types and quantities of construction equipment for a typical project less than one acre in size.

As previously mentioned, although the SBCAPCD’s does not currently have quantitative thresholds of significance in place for short-term or construction emissions, it uses 25 tons per year for ROC or NOx as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts. Table AQ-2 denotes the estimated annual construction emissions in 2015.
Table AQ-2

Total Estimated Annual Construction Unmitigated Emissions
(Fugitive and Exhaust Sources)
(Tons/Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM_{10}</th>
<th>PM_{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Project</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thresholds</td>
<td>25 tons/year</td>
<td>25 tons/year</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod v. 2013.2.2 model
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As shown in Table AQ-2, peak annual construction activity emissions would be below Santa Barbara County APCD threshold guidelines of 25 tons per year for ROG, and NOx. Neither the City nor the APCD has adopted any significance thresholds for construction-generated PM_{10}. The City and APCD do require fugitive dust control measures be incorporated into the permit conditions of approval for any project involving earth-moving activities. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable air quality plan and would have less than significant impacts related to fugitive and exhaust emissions.

e) Construction of new parking areas onsite would require application of aggregate concrete (AC aka asphalt) that could create objectionable odors. Such odors would be temporary and localized as the paving portion of the project will last approximately 2 to 3 days. APCD Rule 329 governs the application of cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials in the County, would apply to all project paving activities. Therefore, given the short duration and minimal amount of paving, construction impacts related to objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people are less than significant.

Long-term Operational Impacts:

a, b) Long-term operations of the project would produce ROC, NOx, CO, SOx, PM_{10}, and PM_{2.5} emissions primarily from vehicular trips to and from the proposed project. Specifically, the proposed project would impact air quality through additional vehicular traffic generated by customers coming to the expanded convenience market. Many trips are already coming to the site for the gas station and repair facility. Emissions associated with project-generated daily traffic were estimated based on the trip generation rates provided by ATE in the Traffic and Parking Analysis dated August 11, 2015. CalEEMod V. 2013 2.2 default data, including temperature, trip characteristics, variable start information, emission factors, and trip distances were conservatively used for the model inputs. Project-related traffic was assumed to consist of a mixture of vehicles in accordance with the model outputs for traffic. Emission factors representing the vehicle mix and emissions for the year 2016, when the project would be in its first year of
operation, were used to estimate emissions. In addition to estimating mobile source emissions, CalEEMod V. 2013 2.2 was also used to estimate emissions from project area and energy sources. Area sources include gasoline-powered landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products, and architectural coatings for building maintenance. Energy sources include space and water heating, which are included in the total estimated area source emissions for the air quality analysis.

Emissions associated with the expanded convenience store would be the net difference between the traffic trips generated from the existing uses on the site (8 pumps, 3 bay service areas, and 1,757 sq. ft. of convenience store) as compared to the proposed on-site uses (8 pumps and 2,396 sq. ft. of convenience store).

Table AQ-3, Estimated Maximum Daily Operational Emissions (2016), presents the maximum unmitigated daily summer or winter emissions associated with operation of the proposed project and continued operation of existing land uses.

<p>| Table AQ-3                                      |
| Estimated Maximum Daily Operational Emissions (2016) |
|                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROC (lbs/day)</th>
<th>NOx (lbs/day)</th>
<th>CO (lbs/day)</th>
<th>SOx (lbs/day)</th>
<th>PM10 (lbs/day)</th>
<th>PM2.5 (lbs/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Land Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular (Mobile) Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Total Emissions</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Land Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular (Mobile) Source Emissions</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Total Emissions</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Vehicle Source Emissions</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Area + Vehicle Source Emissions</strong></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fuel Depot Air Quality Assessment, 2015

As shown in Table AQ-3, estimated net vehicle emissions would not exceed the SBCAPCD thresholds for ROC and NOx, and estimated net combined area

25
source (including energy source) and vehicle emissions would not exceed the SBCAPCD thresholds for ROC, NO\textsubscript{x}, or PM\textsubscript{10}.

The proposed project would not generate vehicular emissions that would exceed the ROC or NO\textsubscript{x} significance thresholds of 25 pounds per day. Additionally, the project’s combined area and vehicle emissions, associated with existing land use operation, would not exceed the ROC and NO\textsubscript{x} significance thresholds of 240 pounds per day or the PM\textsubscript{10} significance threshold of 80 pounds per day.

d) The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of pollutants. As stated, the project would not result in emissions levels that would exceed APCD thresholds or otherwise be considered significant. Micro-scale air quality impacts have traditionally been analyzed in environmental documents where the air basin was a non-attainment area for CO. City environmental review guidelines conclude that any project generating less than 800 peak hour trips would not likely create a CO “hot spot.” The project would generate 13 AM peak hour trips and 13 PM peak hour trips; therefore the project is not expected to result in a CO hot spot. This impact is less than significant.

e) The project, an existing gas station and expanded convenience store, is not expected to generate any sources of objectionable odors. Therefore, the project will have no impacts due to such sources.

Cumulative Impacts

c) The significance thresholds used for air quality analysis on a project level (25 lbs. per day of NO\textsubscript{x} or ROG from transportation sources only) are also intended to address cumulative air quality impacts. The project’s operational emissions as outlined in Table AQ-2 would not exceed these thresholds; therefore the project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts are considered less than significant.

A project’s consistency with the Clean Air Plan (CAP), the County’s plan to achieve attainment status of the ozone standard, is based on consistency with growth forecasts used in developing the CAP. The 2013 CAP was adopted by the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) Board on March 19, 2015, and is the most recent applicable air quality plan. The 2013 CAP used Santa Barbara’s County Association of Government’s Regional Growth Forecast 2010-2014 (adopted December 2012), to project population growth. The current CAP (2010) used forecast data from the 2007 Regional Growth Forecast prepared by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). This forecast is based on development anticipated by general plans, including the Goleta General Plan. The Goleta General Plan denotes the land use for the entire City, including this project site, and based on the adopted General Plan Land Use Plan anticipates an increase of 1.3 million square feet of additional industrial land uses by the year 2030, including the project site. The project site been and continues to be shown for commercial use on the City’s General Plan Land Use Map.
Although the project would minimally increase the number of trips generated at the site, and thus associated air emissions, the assessment of consistency is based on whether the project would result in an increase beyond that anticipated by the General Plan. Continued use of this site for gas station and related uses was anticipated as part of the General Plan's build out. Additionally, the assessment of consistency is based on whether the project would result in an increase in total population that would exceed the forecast population. The project, an existing gas station and expanded convenience store, and its projected 4 full time equivalent employees are not anticipated to result in an increase in the City's residential population that exceeds the forecasts used in the 2010-2013 CAP. Therefore, the project is accounted for in the 2040-2013 CAP growth projections and would not result in an inconsistency with the 2040 current CAP. The project's contribution to regional cumulative air quality impacts is considered less than significant.

**Required Mitigation Measures**
As no significant impacts to air quality are anticipated to occur as a result of project implementation, no mitigation measures are required.

**Residual Impact**
Based upon the above analysis, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on Air Quality would remain less than significant.
## BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

### Existing Setting

The site has been predominately covered with impervious surfaces for approximately 50 years. Presently, about 7% of the project site is landscaped with ornamental/non-native trees, shrubs and grass. The remainder of the site is covered with buildings, parking, or walkway areas. Pursuant to the City’s adopted General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (Conservation Element 4-1), the closest identified Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) is the Las Vegas Creek which is located approximately 1000 feet west of the property's western property line adjacent to Fairview Avenue.

### Thresholds of Significance

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

1. **Types of Impacts to Biological Resources**

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

   a. Substantially reduce or eliminate species diversity or abundance.
   b. Substantially reduce or eliminate quantity or quality of nesting areas.
   c. Substantially limit reproductive capacity through loss of individuals or habitat.
   d. Substantially fragment, eliminate, or otherwise disrupt foraging areas and/or access to food resources.
   e. Substantially limit or fragment range and movement (geographic distribution of animals and/or seed dispersal routes).
   f. Substantially interfere with natural processes, such as fire or flooding, upon which the habitat depends.

2. **Less Than Significant Impacts**

The *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* provides examples of areas in the City where impacts to habitat are presumed to be less than significant, including:

   a. Small acreages of non-native grassland if wildlife values are low.
   b. Individuals or stands of non-native trees if not used by important animal species such as raptors or monarch butterflies.
   c. Areas of historical disturbance such as intensive agriculture.
   d. Small pockets of habitats already significantly fragmented or isolated, and disturbed or degraded.
   e. Areas of primarily ruderal species resulting from pre-existing man-made disturbance.

**Project Specific Impacts**

Given the existing improved condition of the site and the distance to the closest ESHA, the project will not affect the habitat of any sensitive or special status species nor impact a riparian habitat. The closest sensitive habitat is approximately 1000 feet to the west of the site. The site is separated from this ESHA by Fairview Road (a fully improved major arterial road carrying approximately 15,000 trips per day) and the Fairview Shopping Center (234,995-square feet of retail with approximately 853 parking spaces). The construction and on-going use of the gas station will not have an adverse effect on said habitat given the distance and the intervening structures.

Further, the construction and on-going use of the gas station will not entail the removal, filling, hydrological interruption of any wetland, marsh or vernal pool given the project’s location and condition of the existing site. As there are no creeks, streams or known wildlife corridors on the site, the construction and on-going use of the gas station will not interfere with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife. Additionally, the reconstruction of the gas station building will not
conflict with any local policies or adopted habitat conservation plans regarding biological resources as there are none applicable to the site or the area in which the gas station is located.

Cumulative Impacts
Based on the above analysis and the projects consistency with local, regional, and state conservation plans, cumulative impacts on biological resources would be less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
Based on the above analysis, no mitigation measures are necessary.

Residual Impact
Residual impacts on biological resources, as well as residual contribution to cumulative biological resource impacts would be less than significant.
CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

Existing Setting
Prehistoric Setting

The local prehistoric chronology is divided into three major periods all occurring before the common era (BCE) – Paleoindian (10,000 to 8,000 BCE), Early Period (8,000 to 3,350 BCE), Middle Period (3,350 to 800 BCE), and Late Periods (800 to 150 BCE). *Phase I Archaeological Resource Survey, Fuel Depot, APN 069-110-054.* The Paleo-Indian period consisted of the earliest unquestioned evidence of human occupation in southern Santa Barbara County (Erlandson and Colton 1991). Paleoindian groups focused on hunting Pleistocene megafauna, including mammoth and bison, as well as, plants and smaller animals.

The Early Period of the Santa Barbara Channel mainland was originally defined by Rogers (1929) who called it the "Oak Grove" Period. The diagnostic feature of this period is the mano and metate milling stones, which were used to grind hard seeds such as sage for consumption. Toward the end of the Early Period, sea mammal hunting appears to have supplemented subsistence strategies (Glassow et al. 1990).

The middle period is characterized by larger and more permanent settlements, related to a generally wetter environment. Materials from this period reflect a greater reliance on marine resources and include marine shells, fish remains and fishhooks. A major shift in vegetable food exploitation occurred, as the mano and metate milling stones were replaced by the stone mortars and pestles. Toward the end of this period, the plank canoe was developed, making ocean fishing and trade with the Channel Islands safer and more efficient (Arnold, 1987).

The Late Period was a time of increased social and economic complexity. The increased number of permanent and semi-permanent villages clustered along the Santa Barbara Channel and on the Channel Islands indicates a substantial increase in prehistoric population. Intensification of terrestrial as well as marine resources corks. Acorns continued to be processed, and land mammals were hunted with the bow and arrow,
rather than spear. Trade networks expanded and played an important role in Chumash culture, reinforcing status differences and encouraging craft specialization.

By the time of the first European contact, the Goleta Valley was one of the most densely populated areas in all of aboriginal Southern California. The arrival of the Portola Expedition in 1769 marks the end of the prehistoric culture of the native Chumash inhabitants of the area. Induction of the native Chumash into the Mission system during this time had a deleterious effect on the population as a result of the introduction of European diseases and cultural shock brought about through the adaptation to a new lifestyle. (Timeframes after European contact occurred are denoted as “Anno Domini or AD”.)

Historic Setting

Historically, settlement in the vicinity of the project site was defined by three periods; the Mission Period (1769 to 1830 AD), the Rancho Period (1830 to 1865 AD), and the American Period (1865 AD to present). The missions during the Mission Period served as the center of Spanish culture in the area and substantially affected settlement patterns, trade, industry, and agriculture in the area. Upon secularization of the mission lands in 1821, the Rancho Period focused primarily on the raising of cattle. Upon statehood in 1850 and the subsequent commencement of the American Period, farming and more intensive land uses replaced cattle raising as the primary economic activity in the area.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) There are no historic resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines on the project site. The closest registered site is the Fairview Gardens farmhouse and outbuildings located at 500 North Fairview Avenue, approximately 1/3 mile to the north of the project site. Given the distance between the project site and numerous intervening buildings, project implementation will not impact this historic resource.

Further, a records search through the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) and the State Historic Resource Commission (SHRC) indicated that the project site does not contain any historical or paleontological sites. In addition, the project site is not on the List of Historical Resources (GP/CLUP, Table 6.1) in the Goleta General Plan. Based on these factors, the project would not result in any impacts to historical or paleontological resources.
b, d) A Phase I archaeological survey was prepared for the project site (Stone 2013). It did not identify prehistoric archeological materials within the project site. The proposed project site was intensively inspected on May 24, 2013 in accordance with the City of Goleta Cultural Resource Guidelines, as adopted by the County of Santa Barbara Regulations Governing Archaeological and Historical Projects Undertaken in Conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Related Laws: Cultural Resource Guidelines (revised January 1993). No prehistoric or historical archaeological materials were identified within the proposed project site. The absence of prehistoric resources on the ground surface in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site is a reliable indication that no prehistoric resources are present in the project area. The potential for unknown, buried prehistoric deposits is unlikely, as the project site is substantially distant from a source of alleviation such as the ancestral Goleta Slough or Las Vegas Creek. Therefore, it is improbable that intact prehistoric resources exist or are likely to exist within the project site and within the proposed impacted areas extending at least three feet below the existing project ground surface. As a result, no impacts on cultural resources are expected with the proposed project ground disturbances. Therefore the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on any historical or archeological resources.

c) Due to past grading activities, the project site has been substantially disturbed. Further, a records search through the CCIC indicated that the project parcel does not contain any paleontological sites. Therefore, the project would not result in any impacts to paleontological resources.

Cumulative Impacts
Based on the above analysis, the project’s potential cumulative impact on archeological/cultural resources would be less than significant.

Residual Impact
As no significant impacts to cultural resources are anticipated to occur as a result of this project, no mitigation measures are required. However, there remains at least a theoretical potential that a prehistoric site or archaeological resource could be located on the property given the prevalence of Native American activity in the region. In an abundance of caution, a condition of approval will be included to require the stopping of work and bringing out a certified monitor, if cultural resources are uncovered during the demolition and/or excavation portion of the construction.


## GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

**Existing Setting**

The underlying geologic structure of the proposed project site is of Recent Quaternary Age Younger Alluvium (GP/CLUP FEIR Figure 3.6-1, September 2006). The soils on site consist of Goleta loam. (GP/CLUP FEIR Figure 3.2-3, September 2006). In the area where the project is proposed, the area slopes from the east to the west towards Fairview Avenue. There is approximately one foot of fall, creating a gentle slope towards the northwest corner of the site.

The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California that has experienced ground motion in response to earthquakes in the past. All of the City of Goleta is located within Seismic Zone D as designated by the California Building Code.
Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on geology/soils would occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual stipulates that a proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact on geological processes if the project, and/or implementation of required mitigation measures, could result in increased erosion, landslides, soil creep, mudslides, and/or unstable slopes. In addition, impacts related to geology have the potential to be significant if the project involves any of the following characteristics:

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

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

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

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

Project Specific Impacts
a,c) There are no Alquist-Priolo mapped earthquake faults or zones identified in the project area. The closest fault is an unnamed Fault approximately 1.0 miles to the north of the site (GP/CLUP Figure 5-1, Geologic Hazards Map dated Nov. 2009). As strong ground shaking during seismic activity is a hazard common to the entire City and most of California, there is no substantially greater risk to the subject property. The project’s construction would be subject to compliance with the seismic safety standards of the California Building Code, adopted and incorporated into the Goleta Municipal Code.

The topography of the site and surrounding parcels is relatively flat and the site is not mapped in an area of moderate or high landslide potential (GP/CLUP Figure 5.1, Geologic Hazards Map dated Nov. 2009). Therefore, it is expected that there would be no impacts due to seismic activity or exposure to landslide hazards as a result of the project.

b) The proposed project would be located on a currently developed site, which has relatively flat topography. Grading/excavation to accomplish the installation of the project would be minimal, with an estimated earthwork quantity of 175 cubic yards of cut and an estimated earthwork quantity of 25 cubic yards to fill.

d-e) The Goleta loam soil found on the site is typically not expansive in nature and as such development here would not create substantial risk to life or property. The site is already connected to the sanitary sewer which will continue to be used;
septic systems are not used on the property. Therefore, no geologic hazard related to the use of alternative waste water would exist.

Cumulative Impacts
Project contribution to cumulative, adverse erosion and soil loss in the area would be considered less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
Based on the above analysis, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impact
Based on the above analysis, residual project specific and cumulative impacts on geology would be less than significant.
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>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting
The project site is developed and has been operating as gas station since 1966.

Climate Change Background

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

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

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

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

Federal U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
California Air Resources Board
California Executive Order S-3-05
California Executive Order S-13-08
Senate Bill (SB) 97 enacted in 2007 (Public Resources Code § 21083.05)
State of California Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan
Senate Bill (SB) 375
Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
City of Goleta Energy Efficiency Standards
City of Goleta Climate Action Plan (Goleta General Plan, Conservation Element Implementation Action 5 (CE-IA-5)

Thresholds of Significance
The CEQA Guidelines provide regulatory guidance on the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions in CEQA documents. According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the project would have a significant impact if it would:

A. Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

These CEQA regulations require a lead agency to make a good-faith effort based, to the extent possible, on scientific and factual data in order to describe, calculate, or estimate
the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. They give discretion to the lead agency in whether to:

1. Use a model or methodology to quantify GHG emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use; and/or
2. Rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

2 In March 2012, an Alameda County Superior Court (California Building Industry Assoc. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (March 5, 2012) Alameda Super. Ct. Case No. RG10-548693) ruled that BAAQMD needed to comply with CEQA before adopting its 2010 Air Quality CEQA Guidelines, which included significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants and GHGs. On August 13, 2013, the Court of Appeal (California Building Industry Assoc. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 1171, rev. granted) reversed the lower court’s decision and upheld the BAAQMD Guidelines. That decision was appealed to the California Supreme Court, which granted review on November 26, 2013. On December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court made a partial ruling, but remanded the substantive question, i.e., whether the 2010 Air Quality CEQA Guidelines were valid, back to the Court of
Table GHG-1
Bay Area Air Quality Management District GHG Thresholds of Significance

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


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

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


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

The City of Goleta is located in Santa Barbara County and shares meteorological attributes, as well as similar land use patterns and policies, and thresholds deemed applicable in Santa Barbara County would also reasonably apply to projects within the City Goleta. In addition, the City of Goleta would rely upon the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD), as a commenting agency, to review the GHG analysis, and these thresholds would represent a consistent approach and uniformity for impact determinations for City and County projects under the District’s review. Therefore, this analysis uses the BAAQMD/Santa Barbara County Interim Thresholds of Significance to determine the significance of GHG emissions related to this project, based on the 1,100


MT CO$_2$e/year or 4.6 MT CO$_2$e per service population per year threshold for commercial and residential land uses. There is no BAAQMD threshold of significance for construction emissions.

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

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

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

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

**Project Specific Impacts**

a,b) The project's "business as usual" GHG emissions have been calculated for the project. "Business as usual" refers to emissions that would be expected to occur in the absence of GHG reduction measures. These emissions include operation of the project and forecast trip generation, as well as the GHG emissions from project construction. The CalEEMod v.2012.2.2 computer model was used to calculate direct and indirect project-related emissions. Table GHG-2 presents the estimated CO$_2$, N$_2$O, and CH$_4$ emissions of the project.

*Construction.* Project construction activities would generate approximately 35.29 MT CO$_2$e. Construction GHG emissions are typically summed and amortized over the lifetime of the project (assumed to be 30 years), then added to the operational emissions. Construction GHG emissions have been amortized and would result in 1.17 MT CO$_2$e/yr.

*Mobile Source.* The CalEEMod V.2013 2.2 model relies upon project-specific land use data to calculate mobile source emissions. The proposed project would directly result in 47.04–90.69 MT CO$_2$e/yr of mobile source-generated GHG emissions.

*Energy Consumption.* Energy consumption emissions were calculated using the CalEEMod V.2013 2.2 model and project-specific land use data. Electricity would be provided to the project site via Southern California Edison. The project would indirectly result in 9.81 CO$_2$e/yr due to energy consumption.

*Water Demand.* The project's water supply would be provided by Goleta Water District that uses a combination of water sources such as groundwater and imported sources. Emissions from indirect energy impacts due to water supply would result in 0.54 MT CO$_2$e/yr.
Solid Waste. Solid waste associated with operations of the proposed project would result in 3.54 MT CO$_2$e/yr.

**Table GHG-2**  
**Business as Usual Greenhouse Gas Emissions**  
(2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Emissions</th>
<th>MT CO$_2$</th>
<th>MT CH$_4$</th>
<th>MT N$_2$O</th>
<th>MT CO$_2$E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Land Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Source Emissions</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle (Mobile) Source Emissions</td>
<td>35.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Emissions</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply and Wastewater Emissions</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.84</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Land Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Source Emissions</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle (Mobile) Source Emissions</td>
<td>90.54</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Emissions</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply and Wastewater Emissions</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>102.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>104.58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Emissions**  
Amortized Construction Emissions$^6$  
Net Operation + Amortized Construction Emissions  
Total Project Emissions (Existing and Proposed)  
GHG Significance Threshold  
GHG Significance Threshold Exceeded?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.91 MT CO$_2$e/yr</td>
<td>105.75 MT CO$_2$e/yr</td>
<td>1,100 MT CO$_2$e/yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Total Project-Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases.** As shown in Table GHG-2, the total amount of project-related "business as usual" GHG emissions from all sources combined would total 105.75 MT CO$_2$e/year. Therefore, the total project-related unmitigated operational GHG emissions would not exceed the 1,100 MT CO$_2$e/year threshold utilized by the City, resulting in a greenhouse gas emissions impact that is less than significant.
Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
As the impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant, no mitigation would be required.

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

### Existing Setting
The site is an operating Fuel Depot retail filling station and Fast Lane Autolube and mini-mart located on the southeast corner of North Fairview Avenue and Encina Road in Goleta, CA. Predominant land use in the site vicinity is retail commercial with a residential multifamily complex and golf course to the north across Encina Road. The gas station operation is currently served by two 12,000-gallon Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) and four pump islands installed in June 1999. In January 1999, prior to the installation of the
current UST system, three 10,000-gallon USTs and associated dispensers and piping were removed from the Site.

Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact with regards to hazards and hazardous materials may occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's Thresholds Manual addresses public safety impacts resulting from involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. These thresholds focus on the activities that include the installation or modification to facilities that handle hazardous materials, transportation of hazardous materials, or non-hazardous land uses in proximity to hazardous facilities.

a,b) Given the age of the existing building, there is the potential for asbestos to be present. This could be hazardous if not removed and disposed of properly. With the implementation of the Mitigation Measure H-HM 1, the impact can be mitigated to less than significant.

Further, the construction and use of the proposed expanded convenience store would not be expected to generate hazardous waste or create the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Existing fuel storage tanks associated with the gas station follow specific protocols for handling, transporting, and storing the fuel onsite. Once the project is constructed, there would be continued routine maintenance of the existing UST's. Once constructed, the proposed expansion to the convenience would not generate hazardous waste; therefore, the risk of exposure of the public and/or the environment to hazardous waste, either used or transported on site, would be less than significant.

c) There are no existing or proposed schools within 0.25 mile of the project site. The nearest school to the project site is the Good Shepherd's Children's Center Preschool located approximately 0.6 miles to the north. There will not be a change in the use of the site, as it will continue to operate as a gas station and convenience store. Therefore, the potential hazard to schools in the area resulting from an accidental release of any hazardous material would not be any greater than it is presently and is considered less than significant.

d) The project site is listed on the Cortese List (Government Code §65962.5) within the State Water Resources Control Board database, classified as a Leaking Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Site (RB Case #S281).

In January 1999, three 10,000-gallon USTs and associated dispensers and piping were removed from the Site. In February 1999, excavation of impacted soils during station renovation activities was completed and a total of 470 cubic yards of impacted soils and pea gravel, etc. were removed from the site and disposed/recycled at McKittrick, California. Since 1999, the site has been the location of on-going remediation activities (e.g. vapor monitoring wells, ozone and oxygen injection wells) overseen by the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services Division (EHS).
Recent on-site tests have concluded that the gasoline hydrocarbon contaminants in the upper ten feet of the soil column are present at concentrations below the Low Threat Closure Policy criteria and pose no threat to human health. As a result, EHS has determined that the site qualifies for low risk closure and intends to close this UST site in the near future. The public notice expressing EHS intent to close this case was sent to adjacent property owners on June 10, 2016. It is possible that this site will be removed from the Cortese list of hazardous sites after August 12, 2016.

The active remediation and time have reduced the potential environmental impacts from the petroleum release to levels that no longer pose a significant level of threat to human health or beneficial waters of the State. The case is not technically closed as of yet and as such there is a potentially significant impact in this issue area. However, with the mitigation measure outlined below, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.

e) The project site lies approximately 0.5 miles north of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBMA) and is not located within any Airport Approach or Clear Zone. However, given the proximity of the project site to the approach zone and aircraft traffic pattern, the site could be subject to occasional aircraft overflights as well as some noise annoyance from aircraft flying in the vicinity of the area. Furthermore, the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport reviewed the project and did not find any objection to the project.

f) No private airstrips are located within the vicinity of the project site, so no impacts would result from proximity to such private airstrips.

g-h) The project would not result in the construction of any new facilities or establishment of new uses that could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is located outside of the City’s Wildland Fire Hazard area (GP/CLUP Figure 5-2, Fire, Flood and Tsunami Hazards Map June 2010). Therefore there would be no exposure to risks involving wildland fires.

Cumulative Impacts
Given that the project site is listed on the Cortese List (Government Code §65962.5) within the State Water Resources Control Board database, as a classified as a Leaking Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Site (RB Case #S281), verification from the Santa Barbara County Health Services Department stating closure would be needed to assure that a cumulative risk of exposure to the public and/or environment would be less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

H-HM-1: Before the City issues a demolition permit, the applicant must notify the Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District and test for asbestos. If asbestos is found, then the applicant must abate and dispose of the materials in a manner consistent with the California Building Code, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District requirements, and any other regulatory requirements.
Plan Requirements and Timing: Submit test results and/or verification of proper disposal to APCD with confirmation to the Building Department prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.

Monitoring: Prior to the issuance of the demolition permit, the Building Official or designee must receive the appropriate paperwork confirming the abatement.

H-HM-2: Before the City issues a Land Use Permit, the applicant must submit a Regulatory Closure Letter from the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environment Health Services stating that the former leaking underground storage tank case has been closed.

Plan Requirements and Timing: A letter from the Santa Barbara County Health Department, Environmental Health Services confirming the regulatory closure for the former Leaking UST must be submitted by the applicant for approval of issuance of a Land Use Permit.

Monitoring: The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must receive a regulatory closure letter from the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environment Health Service for the former leaking underground storage tank case has been closed.
## HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

**Existing Setting**
Currently, stormwater runoff from the project site is collected by the roof-drain system and discharged into the existing drive-aisle/parking area on the west side of the existing building and sheet flows to the northwest and southwest corners of the site. From there,
stormwater is taken into the City's storm drain system on Encina Road and North Fairview Avenue. The project site lies well outside of the regulatory floodway and the 100 and 500-year floodplains of Las Vegas Creek as designated on the FEMA FIRM maps. All sewage effluent from the existing Service Station and Convenience Store on site is handled by the Goleta Sanitary District's (GSD's) collection and treatment system and would also service the proposed project when built. Water for the existing Service Station and Convenience Store on the site is supplied by the Goleta Water District (GWD), which would also service the proposed project when built.

Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on hydrology and water quality may occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual stipulates that a significant impact on hydrology and water resources would occur if 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.

Project Specific Impacts

a) No additional wastewater will be generated by the demolition and reconstruction of the convenience store building and sewage effluent generated after construction will continue to be collected by the Goleta Sanitary District and conveyed to the District's sewage treatment facility. The project is being placed within an area already covered with impervious surfaces and will not add to the hardscape of the site. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts concerning water quality standards or waste discharge.

b) The proposed development would decrease the amount of impervious surfaces on the site as the applicant's proposing to increase the amount of landscape coverage on the site from 7-percent to 15-percent. After construction, the convenience store is expected to use a similar amount of water as currently being used given the nature of the building. Further Goleta Water District (GWD) has issued a Conditional Can and Will Serve Letter. This letter confirms confirms that the proposed project has sufficient water to serve the development based on current water usage. Therefore, impacts related to groundwater supply as a result of the project would be less than significant.

c-e) The proposed project will not alter the existing drainage pattern on the site, or alter the course of any streams/bodies of water given the site's location. Further, there is a decrease in the amount of impervious surface on the project parcel as the applicant is proposing an increase of landscaping from 7-percent to 15-percent area within the existing paved parking area. The proposal will not alter any existing offsite drainage patterns in the area and onsite drainage flows will continue to be directed to Fairview Avenue and Encina Road as presently occurs. Lastly, the applicant will be required as part of construction documents to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) as standard requirements of the DP to further minimize impact on runoff.
h) The site of the proposed project located in Flood Zone X as identified on FEMA Panel 06083C1361G (dated 12/4/12). Flood Zone X has a minimal risk of flood (less than a 1% to 0.2% annual chance of inundation) from a 100-year or 500-year storm event. General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Figure 5-2 (Fire, Flood and Tsunami Hazard Map dated June 2010) also confirms that the site is not in a flood zone area. Therefore, potential exposure of people and property to flooding risks because of the proposed project would be less than significant.

i-j) There are no levees or dams near the site of within the upstream and the parcel does not lies within the City’s potential Tsunami Run-Up Area as mapped by the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Plan Figure 5-2 (Fire, Flood and Tsunami Hazard Map dated June 2010). Therefore, potential impacts to people and property associated with a tsunami or the failure of an upstream levee and/or dam would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts
All project contributions to cumulative hydrology/water quality impacts would be less than significant.

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

Residual Impact
The project would not result in any residual impacts to Hydrology and Water Resources.


**LAND USE AND PLANNING**

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

**Existing Setting**

The project site is located at the intersection of Fairview Avenue and Encina Drive, approximately 350 feet north of the Fairview Avenue/Calle Real intersection, within the urban core of the City of Goleta. The General Plan land use designation for the project site is Commercial Intersection (C-I). According to Land Use Policy 3.5, the intent of the C-I designation is to provide for a limited variety of commercial uses of low to moderate intensity located at major roadway intersections. Uses are limited to various commercial and retail services oriented to the traveling public including, without limitation, gas stations, convenience markets, highway-oriented restaurants, and similar uses.

The current zoning designation of the site is SC (Shopping Center), which allows uses consistent with the C-I land use category.

**Thresholds of Significance**

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

**Project Specific Impacts**

a) The proposed development would not result in the physical division of any established community or neighborhood. The proposal represents an infill project within a developed area of the City. The project site is surrounded by a mix of commercial, retail and service oriented uses. In addition, the project does not involve modifications to the existing circulation network within the community. Therefore, there would be no impact related to dividing an established community.

b) The proposal does not conflict with any applicable/adopted plans or policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. There are no such policies/plans applicable to this site given the site's location within the urban core, the type of development presence, and longstanding presence of
development on the site. The project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Commercial Intersection (CI) on the site. Further, the project’s land use, a service station and convenience store, is an allowed and permitted use of the SC Zone District within Article III, Inland Zoning Ordinance.

The CI land use category includes lands intended to provide for a variety of commercial uses of low to moderate intensity located at major roadway intersections. Customers are anticipated to drive to these establishments. Uses are limited to various commercial and retail services oriented to the travelling public, including, but not limited, to gas stations, convenience markets, highway-oriented restaurants, and other uses.

c) As discussed in the Biological Section above, there are no habitat or natural community conservation plans that apply to the proposed project site. Per the General Plan Conservation Element Figure 4-1, an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) or special status species does not occur on the project site or adjoining parcels. This parcel contains an existing gas/service station and has been developed for more than 45 years. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to habitat conservation plans.

Based upon the above analysis and lack of conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations of the lead agency and other agencies with jurisdiction over the project, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts for this subsection.

Cumulative Impacts
Based on the above analysis, there are no cumulative impacts associated with land use and planning.

Required Mitigation Measures
Based on the above analysis, there are no potentially significant impacts; therefore no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impact
Based on the above analysis, no residual impacts to Land Use and Planning would occur.
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>
<th>See Prior Document</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>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on mineral resources may occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts in the checklist above.

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

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

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
No mitigation measures are warranted.

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

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

### Existing Setting

As used in this document, noise constitutes unwanted or objectionable sound. The measurement of sound takes into account three variables: 1) magnitude, 2) frequency, and 3) duration.

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

The frequency of a sound relates to the number of times per second the sound vibrates. One vibration/second equals one hertz (Hz). Normal human hearing can detect sounds ranging from 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz.

Duration is a measure of the time to which the noise receptor is exposed to the noise. Because noise levels in any given location fluctuate during the day, it is necessary to quantify the level of variation to accurately describe the noise environment. One of the best measures to describe the noise environment is the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). CNEL is a noise index that attempts to take into account differences in
the intrusiveness of noise between daytime hours and nighttime hours. Specifically, CNEL weights average noise levels at different times of the day as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

3. A project would generally have a significant effect on the environment if it would increase substantially the ambient noise levels for noise sensitive receptors in adjoining areas. Per Threshold 1 above, this may generally be presumed to occur when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors are increased to 65 dBA CNEL or more. However, a significant affect may also occur when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors increase substantially but remain less than 65 dBA CNEL, as determined on a case-by-case level.

4. Noise from grading and construction activity proposed within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors, including schools, residential development, commercial lodging facilities, hospitals or care facilities, would generally result in a potentially significant impact. According to the US EPA guidelines, the average construction noise is 95 dBA at a 50-foot distance from the source. A 6 dB drop occurs with a doubling of the distance from the source. Therefore, locations within 1,600 feet of the construction site would be affected by noise levels over 65 dBA. Construction within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors on weekdays outside of the hours of 8:00AM to 5:00PM and on weekends would generally be presumed to have a
significant effect. Noise attenuation barriers and muffling of grading equipment may also be required. Construction equipment generating noise levels above 95 dBA may require additional mitigation.

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

Project Specific Impacts

a-c) The project site lies within the 60-70dBA CNEL noise exposure contour of the City, as indicated on GP/CLUP Figures 9-1 (dated November 2009). The primary source of noise in the area is vehicular traffic on Fairview Avenue. Per Figures 9-3 and 9-4 in the GP/CLUP, future noise levels (2030) are not expected to exceed 60-70dBA. The Noise Element of the GP/CLUP indicates that the range of normally acceptable noise levels for office buildings, business commercial and professional uses is 50-67.5dBA. "Normally Acceptable" for a specified land use is defined as:

Satisfactory based on the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.

Pursuant to Table 9-2 of the Noise Element, the anticipated roadway noise level is less than 60dBA.

The expanded convenience store would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels and would not exceed the “Normally Acceptable” standards set forth in Table 9-2 in the Noise Element. The gas station and the existing 1619 sq. ft. building already exist on site and contributes the ambient noise levels of the area. The impact on noise ambient noise levels will be minimal as the convenience store activities will occur inside an enclosed building and the service bays will be removed. Therefore, less than significant impacts on ambient noise levels would occur as a result of project implementation.

b) The proposed project would not expose persons, including neighboring sensitive receptors, such as the multifamily residences to the north to excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels since construction of the project would not require such vibration/noise generating construction techniques, such as the driving of foundation piles. Therefore no such impacts are expected to occur.
d) Pursuant to the Goleta General Plan Noise Element, residential areas are considered sensitive noise receptors, making them the closest sensitive receptors to the project site. Multifamily residential units are approximately 50-feet from the project site. Pursuant to Table 9-2 of the Noise Element, the limit of acceptable noise exposure for sensitive receptors is 60 dBA. Short term construction noise impacts, such as earth moving equipment and power tools are capable of producing noise levels 75 to 95 dBA within 50 feet of the source. The City permits construction hours from 8:00AM to 5:00PM Monday through Friday to limit noise exposure to sensitive receptors outside those hours in the mornings, evenings and weekends. However, during weekdays there is a potential for construction noise to pose a significant short term impact on sensitive receptors in the area. As such, mitigation has been included as noted below which would reduce impacts to less than significant.

e-f) The parcel is not within the direct flight path associated with the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBMA). As a result is located outside of the 60dBA or higher noise contour of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBMA) as depicted on Figure 9-4 of the GP/CLUP (dated November 2009). As such, the workers constructing the convenience store and the subsequent employees, and customers will not be exposed to unacceptable/excessive noise levels associated with SBMA. Further, the site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As a result, such impacts are less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts
Incremental increases in ambient noise level as a result of project implementation would be a less than significant contribution to cumulative noise impacts in the vicinity of the project site.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
N-1: The following measures must be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise:

a. All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, must be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. Noise attenuation barriers and mufflers of grading equipment must be required for construction equipment generating noise levels above 95 dB at 50 feet from the source;

b. Construction noise reduction methods such as but not limited to shutting off idling equipment, installing acoustic barriers around significant sources of stationary construction noise sources, maximizing the distance between equipment and staging areas occupied residential areas, and use of electric air compressors and similar power tools (rather than diesel equipment) must be used when feasible;

c. During construction, stationary construction equipment must be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers;
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d. During construction, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas must be located as far as practicable from noise sensitive receptors

e. Earthmoving equipment operating on the construction site must be as far away from vibration-sensitive sites as possible; and

f. Construction hours, allowable workdays, the telephone number of the job superintendent and the telephone number of City staff contact(s) must be clearly posted at all construction entrances to enable surrounding owners and residents to contact the job superintendent directly. If the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent must notify the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, and investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action taken to the reporting party and the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** The location of the three signs stating these restrictions must be identified on a site plan. The three signs stating these restrictions must be provided by the applicant/contractor and posted on site at each entrance to the project. All signs must be in place before the start of site preparation and grading activities and maintained through to occupancy clearance. Requirements a-f must be incorporated as text into all plan sets and must be incorporated graphically into all plan sets submitted for approval of any Land Use, building, or grading permits before permit approval.

**Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before Land Use, building, or grading permit approval. The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must periodically inspect the site to verify compliance with all noise attenuation requirements.

**N-2:**

Stationary construction equipment that generates noise which exceeds 65 dBA at the project boundaries must be shielded to the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, satisfaction.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** The applicant/contractor must submit a list of all stationary equipment to be used in project construction which includes manufacturer’s specifications on equipment noise levels as well as recommendations from the project acoustical engineer to shielding such stationary equipment so that it complies with this requirement for review and approval by the Planning and Environmental Review Director. The equipment area with appropriate acoustic shielding must be designated on building and grading plans. Equipment and shielding must remain in the designated location throughout construction activities. This information must be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, before issuance of any Land Use Permit. All City approved noise attenuation measures for stationary equipment used in any construction and/or demolition activities must be
implemented and maintained for the duration of the period when such equipment is on-site.

**Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must perform site inspections to verify compliance.

**Residual Impact**
With implementation of the required mitigation measures, the residual short term construction and long term operational impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.
### POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

#### Existing Setting
As of January 2015, California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates that City has a population of 30,765 people, has approximately 11,640 housing units, and has an average household size of 2.76 people per household. Upon build out of the GP/CLUP (anticipated to occur by the year 2030), the City’s population is expected to reach 38,100.

#### Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on population and housing may occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

#### Project Specific Impacts
a-c) Given the nature of the project (convenience store re-build) and the proposed location, there will not be an impact on either population or housing. The proposed project would not displace any existing housing units nor will induce population growth either directly or indirectly. The gas station use currently operates with 4 full time equivalent (FTE) positions and the service bays currently operate with 3 employees. The gas station with the expanded convenience store will continue to operate with 4 FTE positions. Therefore, the project would result in no impacts to population or housing given the reduction in the number of employees and no impact on existing housing stock.
Cumulative Impacts
The project’s impact to cumulative population growth or on the area’s housing supply would be less than significant as the project does not affect housing stock or induce population growth.

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

Residual Impact
The project’s residual population and housing impacts would be less than significant for the reasons outlined above.
### PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of these public services:</td>
<td>fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 Protection District (SBCFD) under contract with the City. The closest fire station to the project site is Station #12 located at 5330 Calle Real (approximately 1.13 miles east of the project site). The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and SBCFD identify the following three guidelines regarding the provision of fire protection services:

1. A firefighter-to-population ratio of one firefighter on duty 24 hours a day for every 2,000 persons is the ideal goal. However, one firefighter for every 4,000 persons is the absolute maximum population that should be served.

2. A ratio of one engine company per 12,000 persons, assuming three firefighters per station (or 16,000 persons assuming four firefighters per station), represents the maximum population that should be served by a three-person crew.

3. A five-minute response time in urban areas.

The mandated California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) requirement for firefighter safety, known as the “two-in-two-out rule,” is also applicable. This rule requires a minimum of two personnel to be available outside a structure before 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 fire fighter on scene, in order to meet the "two-in-two-out."

Station #12 has an engine company with a staff of four personnel, consisting of an engine company captain, engineer, firefighter and battalion chief. This engine company provides immediate response on incidents as determined by the type of call.

**Police Protection**

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

**Schools**

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

**Parks**

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

**Libraries**

Services at the Goleta Public Library are provided by contract with the City of Santa Barbara in a facility owned by the City at 500 North Fairview Avenue. The 2-acre library site includes a 15,437 square foot (SF) building and parking areas. The facility provides services to the City and nearby unincorporated areas. In 2014/2015, library visits were 256,996 and circulation was 596,980. Services were provided by 5 full-time and 2 part-time employees.
Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on public services may occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual include thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools. Specifically, under these thresholds, any project that would result in enough students to generate the need for an additional classroom using current State standards would be considered to result in a significant impact on area schools. The City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual notes current State standards are: Grades K-2, 20 students per classroom; Grades 3-8, 29 students per classroom; and Grades 9-12, 28 students per classroom.

Project Specific Impacts
a) Given the scope and nature of the proposal, there will not be a substantial adverse impact that would affect acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives associated with fire protection, police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities.

Cumulative Impacts
Given the scope and nature of the proposal, the project specific and the cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
Based on the above analysis, no mitigation measures would be required.

Residual Impact
The residual project related impacts on public services would be less than significant.
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>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on recreation may occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project Specific Impacts
a-b) Given the scope and nature of the proposal (convenience store rebuild), the project would not create a demand nor increase the use of existing park/recreational facilities within the community. Further, no recreational facilities are proposed with this project, nor given the nature of the proposal would the project require the construction of additional recreation space. Therefore, no impacts associated with the construction of recreational facilities would occur.

Cumulative Impacts
The project would not result in any significant project-specific effects on recreational facilities or create any substantial new demand for such recreational amenities.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
Based on the above analysis, no mitigation measures would be required.

Residual Impact
Residual project related impacts on public services would be less than significant.
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

Existing Setting
The traffic/circulation setting information is derived from the Updated Traffic and Parking Analysis for the Fairview Fuel Depot Project, Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE), dated January 15, 2016 (on file in the Planning and Environmental Review Department and incorporated herein by reference), that was peer-reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta Public Works Department. The proposed project site is located north of the Calle Real and Fairview Avenue intersection on an existing lot containing a gas station, 3-bay automobile service, and a small convenience store. The project site (180 North Fairview Avenue) is located at the northwest-southeast corner of Fairview Avenue and Encina Road. Ingress and egress to the project would continue to be provided via existing driveway connections to Fairview Avenue and the existing driveway connection to Encina Road. An existing network of highways, arterial streets,
and collector streets serve the area. These include U.S. Highway 101 located to the south of the project site, Calle Real to the south, and Cathedral Oaks to the north.

**Trip Generation Analysis**
Traffic generation at service stations is primarily related to the gas pumps and the number of fueling positions provided. The number of fueling stations will remain the same, thus the trips related to the gas sales are not expected to change as a result of the station reconstruction. The trip generation analysis focuses on the conversion of the Fast Lane Smog and Oil Change Facility and the expanded convenience market area only. The project statistics are summarized in Table TT-1 below.

### Table TT-1
**Project Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Existing Station</th>
<th>Proposed Station</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fueling Positions</td>
<td>8 Fueling Stations</td>
<td>8 Fueling Stations</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Size</td>
<td>1,619 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2,396 sq. f.t.</td>
<td>+777 sq. f.t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Lube and Oil &amp; Smog</td>
<td>3 Bays</td>
<td>0 bays</td>
<td>-3 Bays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Market</td>
<td>432 sq. f.t.</td>
<td>2,396 sq. f.t.</td>
<td>+1,964 sq. f.t.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The size of the convenience market will increase by 1,964 square feet as result of the project for a total building area of 2,396-square feet. The majority of customers at the service station will be there to purchase gas, thus these trips are not related to the convenience market operations. In order to determine the increase in traffic that would be directly attributable to the expanded market area, ATE utilized trip generation data collected at the existing Fairview Fuel Depot site (Fairview) and a similar Fuel Depot site located at 1929 Cliff Drive (Mesa) in the City of Santa Barbara, which contains 8 fueling stations and a recently renovated 2,700-square foot convenience store. The trip generation surveys quantified the total number trips to the sites and the number of trips associated with customers that purchased items at the convenience store without getting gas. Table TT-2 summarizes the customer data collected at the two sites.

### Table TT-2
**Fuel Depot Convenience Market Customer Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel Depot Site</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>A.M./P.M. Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Trips</td>
<td>Market Only</td>
<td>Market Only %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATE; *Updated Traffic and Parking Analysis for the Fairview Fuel Depot Project, 2016*
The data presented in TT-2 indicate that 30% of all trips observed at the two sites were related to customers who visited the convenience market without purchasing gas. The convenience market customer data was then applied to rates presented in the ITE Trip Generation Report for Service Station with Convenience Market (Land Use #945) to develop trip generation rates for convenience market on a square foot basis. The analysis also assumes that 50% of all convenience market traffic would be considered pass-by trips based on data presented in the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Traffic Generation report⁴. The remaining 50% of the convenience market traffic would be primary that would be considered new to the area.

The project is proposing to remove on-site Fast Land Smog and Oil Change business and convert the 3 service bays into the convenience market. Trip generation estimates for the service bays were developed using the Quick Lubrication Vehicle Shop (ITE land use # 941) rates presented the ITE Trip Generation Report. Operational data provided for the project indicates that the service bays were staffed by 3 employees who did approximately 25 smog certificates and 28 oil change/vehicles per day. The level of activity fits within the traffic estimates generated from the ITE rates for the component of the project. No pass-by factors where applied to this use, since the trips made by employees and patrons of the service bays are primary in nature.

Table TT-3 presents the trip generation estimates developed based on the additional square footage only with the removal of service bay portions of the Fairview Fuel Depot service station.

⁴ SANDAG data was allowed due to the lack of sites in California studied within the ITE manual and the SANDAG data uses a more conservative passby rate.
## Table TT-3

*Project Trip Generation Estimates Based on Additional Square Footage Only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land-Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Station with Convenience Market (ITE Land-Use #945)</td>
<td>1,964 sq. ft. (net increased square footage)</td>
<td>1174.3⁵</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>82.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Market Only Trips – 30% of total trips (no fuel purchase)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Trips</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Only Trips new to the area (50% of the 30%):</td>
<td></td>
<td>692</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Smog/Oil Change to be Removed (ITE Land-Use #941) | - 3 Bays | 40.0 | -120 | 4.0 | -12 | 5.19 | -16 |

| Net New Market Trip Generation: | 226 | 13 | 13 |

The data presented in Table TT-3 show that the proposed expanded convenience market is forecast to generate 226 new daily trips, 13 A.M. peak hour trips, and 13 P.M. peak hour trips.

**Thresholds of Significance**

1) A significant project generated traffic impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds of significance are set forth in the City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* and include the following:

2) The Volume/Capacity Ratio (V/C) and LOS criteria is summarized below in Table TT-4. The City of Goleta acceptable roadway and intersection standard is LOS C.

---

⁵ Per 1,000 square feet of building area
### Table TT-4
Intersection LOS Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Signalized Intersections (V/C Ratio)</th>
<th>Non-signalized Intersections (Sec. of delay)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&lt; 0.60</td>
<td>≤10</td>
<td>Conditions of free unobstructed flow, no delays and all signal phases sufficient in duration to clear all approaching vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.61 – 0.70</td>
<td>&gt;10 and ≤15</td>
<td>Conditions of stable flow, very little delay, a few phases are unable to handle all approaching vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.71 – 0.80</td>
<td>&gt;15 and ≤25</td>
<td>Conditions of stable flow, delays are low to moderate; full use of peak direction signal phases is experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.81 – 0.90</td>
<td>&gt;25 and ≤35</td>
<td>Conditions approaching unstable flow, delays are moderate to heavy, significant signal time deficiencies are experienced for short durations during the peak traffic period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.91 – 1.00</td>
<td>&gt;35 and ≤50</td>
<td>Conditions of unstable flow, delays are significant, signal phase timing is generally insufficient, congestion exists for extended duration throughout the peak period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 1.00</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>Conditions of forced flow, travel speeds are low and volumes are well above capacity. This condition is often caused when vehicles released by an upstream signal are unable to proceed because of back-ups from a downstream signal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transportation Research Board, Highway Capacity Manual, 2010 Edition*

3) The City's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* states that a significant impact would occur if the addition of project traffic to an intersection increases the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio by the value provided below or sends at least 5, 10, or 15 trips to intersections operating at LOS F, E or D.
LEVEL OF SERVICE  
(including the project)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INCREASE IN V/C</th>
<th>(greater than)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR THE ADDITION OF

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

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

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

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

Project Specific Impacts

a-c) As outlined in Table 3.13.-9 of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR (dated September 2006) and Table 7-1 of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (date September 2006), the nearest intersections were operating at the following level of service (LOS):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>LOS A (Base Year -2005)</th>
<th>LOS A (Build Out – 2030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Encina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Calle Real</td>
<td>LOS D (Base Year-2005)</td>
<td>LOS C (Build Out -2030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/US 101 N</td>
<td>LOS C (Base Year - 2005)</td>
<td>LOS C (Build Out – 2030)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The buildout condition includes any planned improvements (e.g. capacity or signal timing changes) included within the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan circulation element. The City’s LOS standard is LOS C for each of the above listed intersections and timing improvements were made to the Fairview/Calle Real intersection in 2010. This intersection is currently operating at LOS C.

Comparing the data presented in Table TT-3 with the City’s Thresholds, the project would not have the potential to significantly impact the Level of Service Operation of the adjacent roadways and/or intersections. It is anticipated that the traffic generated by the expanded convenience market would be local in nature with traffic arriving from/departing to the adjacent residential neighborhoods. The
The project’s traffic additions would not significantly affect operations at the US 101/Fairview Avenue interchange or the Fairview Avenue/Calle Real intersection. Even if all peak trips (AM or PM) where to be distributed through the Fairview/Calle Real intersection, the trips would be below the threshold.

As discussed in Tables TT-5 and 6 the project is estimated to add 6 trips to the Calle Real/Fairview Avenue intersection, 6 trips to the U.S. 101 North Bound Ramp/Fairview Avenue intersection, and 4 trips to the U.S. 101 South Bound Ramp/Fairview Avenue intersection, which is well below the volume and capacity ratio used described above.

**Table TT-5**

**Existing+Project Intersection Operations – A.M. Peak Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Existing+Project</th>
<th>Project-Added</th>
<th>Project Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calle Real/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.101 NB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATE; Updated Traffic and Parking Analysis for the Fairview Fuel Depot Project, 2016

**Table TT-6**

**Existing+Project Intersection Operations – P.M. Peak Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Existing+Project</th>
<th>Project-Added</th>
<th>Project Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calle Real/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.101 NB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATE; Updated Traffic and Parking Analysis for the Fairview Fuel Depot Project, 2016

The results presented in the tables show that the project will not generate significant impacts to the study area intersections based on the City’s thresholds.

Further, the project site is not located within the Airport Approach Zone of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. The project would not generate any changes to existing air traffic patterns or impact access to the terminal. As such, there would be a less than significant impact in this area.
d-f) The proposed project will not affect the existing roadway patterns, will not change any roadway design features, nor will the project introduce a use with incompatible vehicles using the local roadways. The construction of the convenience store will not impact emergency access in the area. Further, the project will not result in inadequate emergency access to the existing building as the existing access points drive-aisles adjacent to Fairview Avenue and Encina Road will remain unchanged. Given the siting, clearance and access to the building, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access to adjacent parcels and buildings. Lastly, the convenience store reconstruction will not have an impact on public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities given the nature of the facility. The project is proposed on private property well away from any travel lanes/paths and will not generate demand for said modes of transportation.

Cumulative Impacts
Based upon the data provided in the above Tables, the project would not have the potential to significantly impact adjacent roadways and/or intersection. Given the scope and nature of the convenience store proposal, the project specific and the cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
Based on the analysis, no mitigation measures are warranted.

Residual Impact
Residual impacts to traffic and transportation systems would be less than significant.
## UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

### Existing Setting

#### Wastewater Treatment

Wastewater in the project area is collected and treated by the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD) at the Goleta Wastewater Treatment Plant (GWWTP). The GWWTP has a design capacity of 9.7 million gallons per day (mgd), based on an average daily flow rate. However, the discharge is restricted under the facility’s National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (Permit No. CA0048160) (a Clean Water Act Requirement by the U.S. EPA), to a daily dry weather discharge of 7.64 mgd (RWQCB, 2010). GSD owns 59.22 percent of the capacity rights at the GWWTP, which gives GSD an allotment of 4.52 mgd of treatment capacity. GSD currently contributes 2.54 mgd in flow to the GWWTP, leaving GSD 1.98 mgd of remaining capacity.
At the present time the plant's treatment system consists of primary settling, biofiltration, aeration, secondary clarification, chlorine disinfection, and dechlorination. Wastewater flows greater than 4.38 million gallons per day (MGD), receive primary treatment only and are blended with treated secondary wastewater prior to disinfection and discharge to the ocean. Treated wastewater is discharged to the Pacific Ocean through a diffuser 5,912 feet offshore at a depth of approximately 87 feet. The GSD treatment facilities are in the process of a major voluntary upgrade from the current partial secondary blended process to full secondary treatment, which consists of removing or reducing contaminants or growths that are left in the wastewater from the partial secondary treatment process. When the treatment plant upgrades are completed, the plant will be able to discharge effluent that has been treated to full secondary standards as well have the capacity to treat wastewater to the tertiary standards required for recycled water use.

Water Sources, Supply, and Demand

The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water purveyor for the City of Goleta and surrounding areas. The GWD service area is located in the southern portion of Santa Barbara County with its western border adjacent to the El Capitan State Park, its northern border along the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains and the Los Padres National Forest, the City of Santa Barbara to the east, and the Pacific Ocean to the south. The service area encompasses approximately 29,000 acres and includes the City of Goleta, University of California, and Santa Barbara Airport (City of Santa Barbara property); the remainder of the service area is located in the unincorporated County of Santa Barbara. GWD provides water service to approximately 86,946 people through a distribution system that includes over 270 miles of pipeline, as well as eight reservoirs ranging in individual capacity from 0.3 million gallons to over 6 million gallons, with a total combined capacity of approximately 20.2 million gallons. The GWD issued a Conditional Can and Will Serve letter to the applicant on September 20, 2015.

Drainage Facilities

The drainage onsite currently sheet flows across the site. The high point of the site is located near the northeast corner of the site and water surface drains in towards the northwest corner of the site to Fairview Avenue and the street storm drain system.

Solid Waste

Solid waste collection services in Goleta are provided by Marborg Industries. All nonhazardous solid waste in the City and the surrounding South Coast area is handled at two local facilities: the South Coast Recycling and Transfer Station (SCRTS) and Tajiguas Landfill. Both sites are owned and operated by the Santa Barbara County Public Works Department, Resource Recovery and Waste Management Division.

The annual per capita residential waste generation in Goleta is estimated to be 0.95 tons per person. The City averages about 2,400 tons each month, which is approximately 8 percent of the solid waste that goes to the Tajiguas Landfill where solid waste generated within the City is disposed. The Tajiguas Landfill is located approximately 26 miles west

---

6 The source of the data provided in this section, except as otherwise noted, is Goleta Water District, Water Supply Assessment City of Goleta Proposed Amended General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, May 22, 2008.
of Santa Barbara and is one of five landfills currently operating in the County. The Landfill’s total permitted operation area is 357 acres, with an approved and permitted waste disposal footprint of 118 acres comprised of both lined and unlined areas. Waste filling operations are currently being conducted in both the unlined and the lined lateral expansion areas. Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services permits the landfill to accept up to 1,500 tons per day of municipal solid waste and yard waste. Based on current waste disposal rates, the landfill would reach permitted capacity in approximately 2023. The currently permitted landfill disposal capacity is 23.3 million cubic yards of waste, of which 71 percent is already utilized.

Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on utilities and service systems may occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project Specific Impacts

a.b.e) Wastewater Treatment
Applying the GSD’s wastewater generation factor for commercial uses of 100 gallons per day (gpd) per 1,000 square feet (City of Goleta General Plan FEIR, page 3.12-4), to the amount of new proposed project (2,489 SF), project generated wastewater effluent would be 248.9 gpd. This represents approximately 0.00013% of the 1.12 mgd remaining allocated capacity of the GSD. Therefore, the project’s incremental contribution to increased effluent flows into the GSD treatment plant would be less than significant.

The applicant has obtained a Sewer Service Availability letter from the District to ensure its capacity can be utilized. As such, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on the availability and adequacy of sewage disposal service.

c) Drainage Facilities
The City of Goleta requires that drainage facilities (inlets, pipes, swales, etc.) for new projects be designed to accommodate the runoff from a 25-year storm event. Good engineering practice indicates that parking lots should be designed with adequate overland escape capacity to accommodate a peak 25-year rainfall runoff and/or that redundant or oversized systems be employed in anticipation of potential failure. Where grated catch basins are used, the normal design capacity is doubled to account for potential plugging. The proposed project will drain the sum of the filtered runoff through existing storm drain pipes and inlets which will tie into the exiting storm drain system adjacent to Encina Real and North Fairview Avenue.

The proposed project will increase pervious area by 1,080 square feet, through the increase of landscaping. Additionally, runoff of impervious surfaces from the new building roof and portions of the existing parking lot will be directed to the landscaped drainage swale at the easterly portion of the project site.

---

8 Tajiguas Landfill operates 307 days per year and is closed on Sundays, and major holidays.
Volume reduction on the project site was accomplished by application of Low Impact Development techniques (US EPA) incorporated into the filtering devices. The increased absorption of storm flows and the slowing down on the runoff process along with the increased transpiration from plant material were modeled by using reasonable reductions in soil curve numbers and modest increases in time of concentration.

Due to the proposed project being tied to the existing storm water drain system, the reduction in post project run-off from the utilization of Low Impact Development techniques, such as landscaping swales, (which are depressions that follow the contour around the base of a slope (natural or created), channeling and to sink into the soil), the proposed project is within the expected demand requirements of the City of Goleta for site drainage design. Lastly, the applicant will be required to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) as standard requirements of the DP to further minimize impact on runoff. Therefore, the project will not result in the need for new construction of storm water drainage facilities and/or expansion and would have less than significant impacts.

d) Water Supplies and Service
The project would be served by the GWD and would not involve the use of groundwater pumped from private wells. Current usage at the project site is 0.28 acre feet/year (AFY) for the existing building and landscaping. Per the Conditional Can and Will Serve Letter from Jim Heaton of the GWD (dated September 30, 2015), the proposed projects water consumption will remain .028 AFY. Given these projections, the GWD has sufficient supply to service this project. The project also would not contribute to groundwater overdraft as no wells are proposed onsite.

f,g) The City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual provides solid waste generation factors. Using the rate for convenience stores and associated fuel stations, the proposed project would generate approximately 3.98 tons per year. The quantity of solid waste to be disposed of at landfills (non-recycled waste) is typically estimated at 50 percent of the total solid waste generation. The non-recycled waste from the proposed project is therefore estimated at 1.99 tons per year. This amount does not exceed the City’s project specific threshold of 196 tons per year. Lastly, the applicant will be required to prepare both a pre-construction waste reduction and recycling plan and a post construction waste reduction and recycling plan as standard requirements of the DP to further reduce solid waste. Therefore, the proposed project’s specific impact on solid waste disposal capacity at the Tajiguas Landfill would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts
Project contributions to cumulative impacts on public utilities or service systems such as wastewater collection and treatment, potable water supplies, storm drain and runoff control infrastructure, and the Tajiguas Landfill would be less than significant.
Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
Based on the above analysis and nature of the project, no mitigation measures are necessary.

Residual Impact
Residual impacts on utilities and services, as well as residual contributions to cumulative utilities and services impacts would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) The information in the Biological Resources Section of this study indicates that there are no candidate, sensitive, or endangered species that utilize the project site. The closest ESHA is the Las Vegas Creek, which is approximately 1000 feet west of the project site. Given this distance, the project would have less than significant impacts on the quality of the environment.

The information in the Cultural Resources Section of this study indicates that no cultural resources were found on-site. However, in the event archaeological resources are encountered during grading, condition of approval will require that work must be stopped or re-directed for evaluation by a City-approved archaeologist and Native American representative. With this condition of approval, cultural resource impacts would be less than significant.
b) The project’s impacts for each issue area were analyzed and determined to be less than significant.

c) Project effects on human beings related to hazard and hazardous waste, and noise have been analyzed in this study. Impacts on human beings would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures, where required.
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B. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
C. Comments Received on Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration
ATTACHMENT 1

PROJECT PLANS
ATTACHMENT 2

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party Obligation</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td>The location of the three signs stating these restrictions must be identified on a site plan by applicant. The three signs stating these restrictions must be provided by the applicant/contractor and posted on site at each entrance to the project.</td>
<td>All signs must be in place before the start of site preparation and grading activities and maintained through to occupancy clearance. Requirements a-f must be incorporated as text into all plan sets and must be incorporated graphically into all plan sets submitted for approval of any Land Use, building, or grading permits before permit approval</td>
<td>PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-1. The following measures must be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, must be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. Noise attenuation barriers and mufflers of grading equipment must be required for construction equipment generating noise levels above 95 dB at 50 feet from the source;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Construction noise reduction methods such as but not limited to shutting off idling equipment, installing acoustic barriers around significant sources of stationary construction noise sources, maximizing the distance between equipment and staging areas occupied residential areas, and use of electric air compressors and similar power tools (rather than diesel equipment) must be used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when feasible;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. During construction, stationary construction equipment must be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. During construction, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas must be located as far as practicable from noise sensitive receptors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Earthmoving equipment operating on the construction site, must be as far away from vibration-sensitive sites as possible; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Construction hours, allowable workdays, the telephone number of the job superintendent and the telephone number of City staff contact(s) must be clearly posted at all construction entrances to enable surrounding owners and residents to contact the job superintendent directly. If the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent must notify the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, and investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action taken to the reporting party and the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee.</td>
<td>The applicant/contractor must submit a list of all stationary equipment to be used in project construction which includes manufacturer's specifications on equipment noise levels as well as recommendations from the project acoustical engineer to shielding such stationary equipment so that it complies with this requirement for review and approval by the Planning and Environmental Review Director. The equipment area with appropriate acoustic shielding must be</td>
<td>This information must be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, before issuance of any Land Use Permit. All City approved noise attenuation measures for stationary equipment used in any construction and/or demolition activities must be implemented and maintained for the duration of the period when such equipment is on-site.</td>
<td>PER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-2. Stationary construction equipment that generates noise which exceeds 65 dBA at the project boundaries must be shielded to the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated on building and grading plans. Equipment and shielding must remain in the designated location throughout construction activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hazards/Hazardous Materials**

**H-HM-1** Before the City issues a demolition permit, the applicant must notify the Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District and test for asbestos. If asbestos is found, then the applicant must abate and dispose of the materials in a manner consistent with the California Building Code, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District requirements, and any other regulatory requirements.

The applicant must submit test results and/or verification of proper disposal to APOCD with confirmation to the Building Department prior to the issuance of a demolition permit. Prior to the issuance of the demolition permit, the Building Official or designee must receive the appropriate paperwork confirming the abatement. PER

**H-HM-2** Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any work on site, the applicant must submit a Regulatory Closure Letter from the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environment Health Services stating that the former leaking underground storage tank case has been closed.

The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must receive a regulatory closure letter from the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environment Health Service for the former leaking underground UST. A letter from the Santa Barbara County Health Department, Environmental Health Services confirming the regulatory closure for the former Leaking UST must be submitted by the applicant for approval of issuance of a Land Use Permit. PER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party Obligation</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>storage tank case has been closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 3

COMMENTS PROVIDED ON DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
August 17, 2016

Darryl Mimick
City of Goleta
Planning and Environmental Review
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

Re: APCD Comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Fuel Depot Development Plan, 15-063-DP

Dear Mr. Mimick:

The Air Pollution Control District (APCD) has reviewed the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for the referenced project, which consists of a request to: demolish the existing 1,619 square foot (SF) structure containing a mini-mart and 3 auto service bays; construct a new 2,396 SF one-story, 24-hour convenience store building with storage; construct a new 128 SF covered trash/recycling enclosure; add 1,020 SF of new landscaping; and provide three new onsite parking spaces and two offsite employee parking spaces. The eight existing fueling stations would also be used as parking for the convenience store. No changes to the existing overhead canopy and fuel pumping stations are proposed. Grading consists of 175 cubic yards of cut and 25 cubic yards of fill. The subject property, a 12,450-SF parcel zoned Shopping Center (SC) and identified in the Assessor Parcel Map Book as APN 069-110-054, is located at 180 N. Fairview Avenue in the City of Goleta.

Air Pollution Control District staff offers the following comments on the Draft MND:

1. **AIR QUALITY, Long-term Operational Impacts, Page 22**: This page states that, “Emissions associated with project-generated daily traffic were estimated based on the trip generation rates provided by CalEEMod V. 2013.2.2 default data, including temperature, trip characteristics, variable start information, emissions factors, and trip distances were conservatively used for the model inputs.” We suggest revising the text to read “Emissions associated with project-generated daily traffic were estimated based on the trip generation rates provided by ATE in the Traffic and Parking Analysis dated August 11, 2015. CalEEMod V. 2013.2.2 default data, including temperature, trip characteristics, variable start information, emission factors, and trip distances, were conservatively used for the model inputs.”

2. **AIR QUALITY, Cumulative Impacts, Page 24**: The document analyzes consistency with the 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP); the currently adopted CAP is the 2013 CAP adopted in March 2015. Please update the document and analysis with the 2013 CAP which utilizes SBCAG’s Regional Growth Forecast 2010-2040, adopted December 2012, to project population growth and associated air pollutant emissions for all of the Santa Barbara County incorporated and unincorporated areas.

3. **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS, Project Specific Impacts, Page 38**: This page cites that the proposed project would directly result in 47.01 MT CO₂e/yr of mobile source-generated GHG emissions. Table GHG-2 on page 39 shows vehicle (mobile) source emissions as totaling 90.69 MT CO₂e/yr. Please correct the text.

Aaron Arlin Genet • Air Pollution Control Officer
260 North San Antonio Road, Suite A • Santa Barbara, CA • 93110 • 805.961.8800
OurAir.org • twitter.com/OurAirSBC
If you have any questions regarding these comments, please feel free to contact me at (805) 961-8890 or via email at BarhamC@sbcapcd.org.

Sincerely,

Carly Barham,
Air Quality Specialist
Technology and Environmental Assessment Division

cc: TEA Chron File
Concerning project at Fast Lane Gas Station on corner of North Fairview and Encinas,

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am the neighbor to this project and part of the same development plan on this corner. My property surrounds this project on two sides. I have recent received notice that if there was anything that I would like to discuss further on this project, object to or would like the City of Goleta to consider it should be sent in writing prior to August 22nd. This letter is intended to make one concern know to the Design Review Board, City Council and whomever else might be involved in the final decision on this process.

Our only current concern with this project is about the positioning of his main entrance to the gas/convenience shop. I have discussed this with John Price on numerous occasions going back six to eight months while he was getting approval with the county. Because he repeatedly indicated to me that he would have his architect work on changing the entrance door to the other side of the front of the building I have not previously expressed my opinion to the county planners. Since the current plans still show the door on the side directly adjacent to our property and the common easement I am asking you to consider requiring the change.

John has stretched the definition of adequate parking by all means available including using parking for employees at another property across a major intersection and counting the spots the cars stop for gas as customer parking sites. Since you approved these parking conditions you must believe that he has sufficient parking to enlarge this building in size and function while accommodating all of the increased parking within his property and you should be willing to require putting door where it will be most convenient for convenience store customers to park on the premise. It is our belief that with the door adjacent to our property many of his customers will simply park in our lot as that will be the closest parking to his front door. This will be especially true of someone running into the store to buy food, etc. when they are not buying gas or when the station is very busy.

We are not asking that he change the shape of the building nor any exterior wall. The tower can remain on the right side as you face it from Fairview. We are only asking that the front door be moved to the far left side, near Encina Street, as you face the building from Fairview. This may require the inside be flipped from right to left but, as John and I have discussed previously, a mirror image of the interior design would easily accommodate the change being suggested.

In addition, the current plans are out of compliance with ADA requirements since the closest parking places to the entrance as it is proposed now are those at the pumps. Maybe he could designate the pump closest to the front door exclusive to handicapped persons to be in compliance. It would be much more logical to move the front door to the side of the building closest to Encina Street adjacent to the handicapped space. I quote the ADA:
Location:
1. Based on a practical approach, ADA stipulates that parking spaces leading to a particular building should be built on the shortest accessible route of travel, from the point of parking till the entrance.

We object to this project as it is currently proposed and additionally believe it is out of ADA compliance.

Thanks you for your consideration,

Ronald J Garber 8/9/16

Rebecca Garbett 8/9/16
Lisa and Darryl,
We appreciate the release of the project’s MND. We agree with the MND’s overall conclusions.
There are a few discrepancies which warrant another look, namely:

Page 5:
7....”A reciprocal access agreement was recorded”.

We know of no reciprocal agreement.

(Paragraph 4)
“The property owner of 180 N. Fairview was unsuccessfully securing the other property”

This should be “…was unsuccessful in securing the other...” or some such.

Page 38
Project Specific Impacts

(Paragraph 5) “The project’s water supply would be provided by groundwater and imported sources.”

Water will be provided by Goleta Water District.

Page 67
(Paragraph 4)
“As discussed in Tables TT-5 and 6 the project is estimate to add 6 trips...”

This should be “is estimated”...
That’s it!

I will ask ATE to review the traffic analysis to make sure it’s all consistent previously submitted documents. Thank you.

Best regards,

Bendy