The Draft Negative Declaration (Draft ND) was circulated for a 30 day public review period. The public review period began on March 3, 2017 and concluded on April 3, 2017. Three comments letters/emails were received on the Draft ND and are provided as Attachment B to this document. One of the written comments provided raised cultural resources questions and the extent of previous development. One letter noted that there were no wells on or within proximity of the project site and the last email was in support of the project. None of comments introduced significant new information or changed the conclusions of the IS-ND. 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:**
   749/759 Ward Drive - Renovations and Lot Split
   Case No. 15-126-TPM-DP(A/B)
   State Clearinghouse Number: 2017031008

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:**
   Joe Pearson II, Associate Planner, (805) 961-7573

4. **APPLICANT:**
   Ed Mark
   7779 Goldfield Court
   Goleta, CA 93117

   **AGENT:**
   Mr. Pete Ehlen
   East Beach Ventures Architect
   P.O. Box 2220
   Santa Barbara, CA 93120

5. **PROJECT LOCATION:**
   The project site is located at 749/759 Ward Drive, south of Hollister Ave between the Highway 217 and Ward Drive in the City of Goleta (City). The triangular shaped property encompasses a total of 3.4 acres within the coastal zone. The Assessor Parcel Numbers (APN) are 071-170-035 and 071-170-014.
6. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project includes the following applications:

1. A Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) to subdivide the existing lot into two separate lots. Proposed Lot 1 would be 2.164 gross acres and would contain the building addressed as 749 Ward Drive. Proposed Lot 2 would be 1.253 gross acres and would contain the building addressed as 759 Ward Drive. The parcel map will also include an approximately 10 foot right of way dedication along the Ward Drive frontage.

2. A Development Plan (DP) for each lot to regulate the aspects of the existing development on each of the two proposed lots. Development Plan A would regulate the development on Proposed Parcel 1 (749 Ward) and Development Plan B would regulate the development on Proposed Parcel 2 (759 Ward). The DP's will also include the following improvements to the existing developed site:

   • Redesigning of the Project Site to increase parking from 53 spaces to 118 spaces, and landscaping will be increased from 12 percent to approximately 30 percent. The site changes will be accomplished through the removal of an
existing outdoor storage area and reconfiguration of the parking; thereby resulting in additional parking spaces and landscaping.

- The west elevation of 749 Ward Drive will be elevated approximately two feet to allow for truck loading. The driveway approach to the parking lot between the two buildings will be reduced in width from 65 feet to 50 feet.
- Remodeling the exterior facades of both buildings, including the addition of a new covered walkway along the east building façades.
- Interior remodeling of 749 Ward to remove the existing mezzanine and redoing the ground floor so it is one level within the building.
- Remodeling the building at 759 Ward to remove approximately 2,900 square feet of second floor area in order to create one single industrial tenant space. The resulting building will have approximately 8,100 square feet of interior space.

The DP also includes a request for modifications to allow:

- The placement of parking in the front setback area along Ward Drive for both proposed Parcel 1 and Parcel 2.
- The placement of parking in the side yard setbacks for both proposed Parcel 1 and Parcel 2.
- The placement of the existing buildings and new patio covers in the front setback along Ward Drive for both proposed Parcel 1 and Parcel 2.
- The placement of the existing building on proposed Parcel 1 within the rear yard setback of Parcel 1.

Table 1 below shows the building setbacks for the existing and proposed lot configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Existing and Proposed Building Setbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front Setback (Centerline/Right-of-Way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>80 feet/50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Parcel</td>
<td>80 feet/50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Parcel 1</td>
<td>60 feet/38 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Parcel 2</td>
<td>62 feet/40 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 below shows the parking setbacks for the existing and proposed lot configurations.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing and Proposed Parking Setbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback (Centerline/Right-of-Way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Parcel 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Parcel 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This work will require grading throughout most of the site, consisting of approximately 1,500-cubic yards of cut and 1,000 cubic yards of fill, over approximately 13 working days. Approximately 250 cubic yards of concrete will be recycled with 250 cubic yards of cut to be exported. This would generate approximately 112 one-way truck trips, based on the assumption of 9 cubic yards per truck. The grading will require 1-2 feet of excavation.

Uses
The Project would only contain Industrial related uses.

Site Plan
The proposal is to subdivide the existing lot into two lots (Parcel 1 and Parcel 2), each containing one of the existing buildings. Parcel 1 (2.164 acres) will contain the building located at 749 Ward Drive, which is a single story 17,084-square foot industrial building. Parcel 1 will have building and landscape coverage of 22 percent and 34 percent, respectively. Parcel 2 (1.253 acres) will contain the building located at 759 Ward Drive, which will be a single story 8,132-square foot industrial building. Parcel 2 will have a building and landscape coverage of 18 percent and 31 percent, respectively. The Project Site will contain 118 parking spaces across the two new parcels, with 79 spaces located on Parcel 1 and 39 spaces located on Parcel 2. Access to the Project site will be provided via the three existing driveways off of Ward Drive. The two new parcels will share a common center driveway and drive aisles, shared access will be provided under a shared access agreement.
The Goleta Water District and the Goleta Sanitary District would continue to provide water and sanitary sewer service to the proposed project.

7. **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The building addressed as 749 Ward Drive was the first building developed on the site, and was approved by the County of Santa Barbara via a Land Use Rider\(^1\) on January 9, 1962. On April 1, 1964, an addition to 749 Ward Drive was approved by the County of Santa Barbara. The second building on site addressed as 759 Ward Drive, was approved by the County of Santa Barbara via a Land Use Rider on June 2, 1966.

*Application Information*

The proposed project was submitted in September 2015 and was deemed complete in October 2016. The site plan, site landscaping and building architecture received conceptual review by the City of Goleta Design Review Board ("DRB") on October 27, 2015.

\(1\) A Land Use Riders were a ministerial permit issued by the County of Santa Barbara for construction, prior to the use of Land Use Permits.
**Ward Drive Bike Path Project**
The bike project is a future capital improvements project that will include improvements along proposed Project frontage, and will include improvements to the 10 foot right of way dedication. The bike path project will construct 4-5 ft. Class II Bike Lanes along both sides of Ward Drive from just south of Hollister Avenue to the terminus of Ward Drive at the Atascadero Creek/Obern Trail Class I bike path. In order to accommodate the project minor widening will take place along the west side of Ward Drive including structural section widening, reconstruction of curb and gutter and minor grading. The bike path project also includes a slurry seal and restriping of Ward Drive.

8. **APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:**

California Coastal Commission  
Santa Barbara County Fire Department  
Goleta Water District

9. **SITE INFORMATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing General Plan Land Use Designation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Ordinance, Zone District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present Use and Development</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Surrounding Uses/Zoning**       | North: Highway 217/n/a  
South: Industrial/ M-RP  
East: Agriculture/ AG-I-10 (County of Santa Barbara Zoning)  
West: Highway 217/n/a |
| **Access**                        | Existing: Ward Drive  
Proposed: Ward Drive |
| **Utilities and Public Services** | Water Supply: Goleta Water District  
Sewage: Goleta Sanitation District  
Power: Southern California Edison  
Natural Gas: Southern California Gas  
Cable: Cox Cable  
Telephone: Verizon  
Fire: Santa Barbara County Fire  
School Districts: Goleta Union Elementary and Santa Barbara High School District |
10. NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with this area have been notified of the project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, and no requests for consultation have been received.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is a fully developed site, which was developed throughout the early to mid-1960s, as noted above. The site is sandwiched between Highway 217 and Ward Drive, which run adjacent to each other. The project site currently contains two industrial buildings. The first building addressed as 749 Ward Drive, is a 17,200-square foot single-story industrial building. The second building addressed as 759 Ward Drive is a 13,028-square foot two-story industrial building. The existing development also contains 53 parking spaces.

The project is currently listed as a hazardous materials site on a list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. A contamination case was opened on the site in 1996 by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), due to contamination of groundwater and soils a previous operator (Applied Magnetics). Upon reaching an agreement with the previous operator remediation activities began in 1999, with verification monitoring beginning in 2000. To date, the case is still active with bioremediation activities and site monitoring ongoing to clean up the solvent plume. Due to the ongoing remediation, the project required an initial study, otherwise the project would have qualified for a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemption under Sections 15315 Minor Land Divisions and 15301 Existing Facilities.

Surrounding Land Uses
The surrounding area is primarily comprised of one and two-story industrial and research building and agricultural farming located to the east. To the south of the project site are one-story and two-story industrial/office buildings. Along the northwest property line runs Highway 217.

Aesthetics
Highway 217 located along the northwest property line is designated as a Local Scenic Corridor, as identified in the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, 2006 as amended, (GP/CLUP).

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 12% 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.
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Topography and Soils
The project site is generally flat with a Westerly/southwesterly slope towards Highway 217 and the westerly 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 industrial complex.

Transportation/Traffic
The transportation system is comprised of regional highways, arterial roadways and residential streets. The principal components of this street network are Ward Drive, Hollister Avenue, Highway 217 and US Highway 101. Area roadway segments and intersections currently operate in acceptable ranges of Level of Service C or better.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

- [x] 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 the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

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

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

Lisa Prasse, AICP, Interim Planning and Environmental Review Director

Date

14. **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.
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(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.
15. ISSUE AREAS:

AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, 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 west side of Ward Drive, south of Hollister Avenue and east of Highway 217. The project site contains existing one-story and two-story industrial/office building. Both of the existing buildings are setback approximately 59 feet from the right-of-way line of Ward Drive and approximately 79 feet from the street centerline of Ward Drive. The building addressed as 749 Ward Drive has a peak height of 15.1-feet and the building addressed as 759 Ward Drive has a peak height of 21.3-feet. The buildings are traditional flat roofed buildings with both stucco and a CMU finish.

To the northwest the project site is bordered by Highway 217 (See Figure 1), which is slightly higher or equal in elevation than the project site and is separated from the project site by a low laying vegetated swale. To the south of the project site are one and two story industrial/office buildings (See Figure 2). To the east of the project site is undeveloped agricultural farm land, which is generally screened by a row of trees running along the farm land property line (See Figure 3).
Figure 1
View of the Property from Highway 217 (Looking South)

Figure 2
View of Office/Industrial Development to the South
Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project Specific Impacts
a.b.c) The project site is bordered along the rear property line by Highway 217, which is a Local Scenic Corridor under the Scenic and Visual Resources Map in Figure 6-1 of the GP/CLUP. As the proposed project's physical changes would only include building façade and landscape, and parking lot renovations, with no changes to building size or height, the project would not have an adverse impact on the scenic corridor. The building encroachment into the front yard setback will be increased due to a new front awning to be placed on both buildings, as well as a 10-feet right-of-way dedication along the front property line. These changes will not affect views of the project from any local scenic corridors. Additionally, the building façade renovations and increased landscaping will improve the overall aesthetic quality of the site. Tree types and spacing along Highway 217 has been carefully chosen to help break up the development, while not impeding all views from the local scenic corridor. In doing so, the project will provide an improved visual.

d) Proposed project lighting will be consistent with the existing project lighting. The only new lighting will be the lighting provided under the proposed awning, which will be shielded and low level. All project lighting would remain night sky compliant. No additional parking lot lighting is proposed. 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, since the development is already existing and will remain in line with the existing industrial nature 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 would not change the existing developments size, bulk and scale 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? | | | | |
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Existing Setting
The project site is located within an urbanized area and has no forest lands or timberlands that exist on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. While there are not agricultural lands onsite, adjacent to the project site across Ward Drive is an active agricultural use.

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

Project Specific Impacts
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 properties under a Williamson Act contract in the vicinity of the project site, including the adjacent agricultural land in the County of Santa Barbara. The agriculturally zoned property adjacent to the project site is within the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara and would not be affected by this proposed project. The proposed project would not result in any environmental changes that would involve the conversion of any farmland to non-agricultural uses. Additionally, the existing buildings have been present on the project site since the 1960s. 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 project site contains existing industrial/office buildings 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

Meteorological Setting

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

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

Existing Air Quality

The project site is located in the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB). The SCCAB encompasses San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties. The site is located in Santa Barbara County. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) operates ambient air monitoring stations that measure pollutant concentrations throughout the SCCAB. The nearest monitoring stations to the project site are: the Goleta monitoring station, located at 380 North Fairview Avenue, which monitors ozone \( \text{(O}_3 \text{)}, \) carbon monoxide \( \text{(CO)} \) and nitrogen oxides \( \text{(NO}_x \text{)} \); and the Santa Barbara station, located at 700 East Canon Perdido, which measures inhalable particulate matter \( \text{(PM-10)} \), and fine particulate matter \( \text{(PM-2.5)} \). Data from the monitoring stations have been published for the last five years. The following conclusions can be drawn from this data:

1. Photochemical smog \( \text{(ozone)} \) levels infrequently exceed standards. The State 1-hour ozone standard was only exceeded once between 2012 and 2015, and the State and Federal 8-hour standards were each exceeded once in 2016.

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 4 days in 2016, while the more lenient Federal standard was not exceeded at all in 2016.

4. A substantial fraction of PM-10 is comprised of ultra-small diameter particulates capable of being inhaled into deep lung tissue \( \text{(PM-2.5)} \). Even with the revision of the national 24-hour PM-2.5 standard from 65 micrograms per cubic meter \( \text{(µg/m}^3 \text{)} \) to 35 \text{µg/m}^3, 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 \( \text{NO}_x \), 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, state regulations have stricter standards than those at the federal level. AAQS are set at concentrations that provide a sufficient margin of safety to protect public health and welfare. Air quality at a given location can be described by the concentration of various pollutants in the atmosphere. The significance of a pollutant concentration is determined by comparing the concentration to an appropriate federal and/or state ambient air quality standard.

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

Air Quality Planning

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**APCD Operational Impacts Thresholds**

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

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

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

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

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

i) Cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality standard (except ozone);
j) Exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board (10 excess cancer cases in a million for cancer risk and a Hazard Index of more than 1.0 for non-cancer risk); or

k) Be inconsistent with Federal or State air quality plans for Santa Barbara County.

The cumulative contribution of project emissions to regional levels should be compared with existing programs and plans, including the most recent Clean Air Plan (SBCAPCD 2013).

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 (NO\textsubscript{X} or ROC), exceed the operational thresholds, then the project's cumulative impacts are considered significant.

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

**APCD Construction Impacts Thresholds**

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

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

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

**Project Specific Impacts**

The following analysis is a summary response to all of the applicable thresholds identified above.

**Construction Period 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. Construction emissions will also include approximately 250 cubic yards of export. The
remaining 250 cubic yard of asphalt and base will be recycled on site. Pollutant emissions associated with construction activity were quantified using CalEEMod (Version 2016 3.1). Table AQ-1, below, show the estimated maximum unmitigated daily short-term construction emissions associated with the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table AQ-1</th>
<th>Total Short-Term Construction Unmitigated Emissions</th>
<th>Fugitive and Exhaust Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(tons/year)</td>
<td>(tons/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Emissions</td>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>NOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(tons/year)</td>
<td>0.1960</td>
<td>1.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thresholds</td>
<td>25 tons/year</td>
<td>25 tons/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod v. 2016.3.1 model

As shown in Table AQ-1, 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<sub>10</sub>. 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.
Operational Impacts:

a,b,d,e) As the project site is already fully developed and operation, and there will be no project related operational changes, the project will not result in any operational changes.

Cumulative Impacts:

c) The significance thresholds used for air quality analysis on a project level (25 lbs per day of NOx or ROG from transportation sources only) are also intended to address cumulative air quality impacts. As mentioned above there would be no project related operational emissions; therefore, there would be no impact to cumulative air quality.

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

The project site has been mostly developed with existing buildings and paving since the 1960s. The remaining approximately 12-percent of the site is landscaped with ornamental/non-native trees, shrubs and grasses. Pursuant to the City's adopted
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General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (Conservation Element 4-1), the closest identified Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) is the un-vegetated San Jose Creek Channel which is located approximately 124 feet west of the property's western property line on the other side of Highway 217.

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

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

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

Project Specific Impacts
a-f) Given the existing improved condition of the site and the distance and disconnect from 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 124 feet to the west of the site. The site is separated from this ESHA by Highway 217 (a fully improved highway) that carries approximately 16,000 average annual daily trips (Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR (GP FEIR). The site renovations and on-going use of the buildings onsite will not have an adverse effect on said habitat given the distance and the intervening roadway.
Further, the renovations and lot-split of the existing developed site 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 renovations, lot split and on-going use of the existing buildings will not interfere with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife. Additionally, proposed project 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 existing development is located.

Cumulative Impacts
Based on the above analysis and the projects consistency with the 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 dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting
Ethnographic and Historic Setting

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

As provided in the City's General Plan Final EIR (Section 3.5, Cultural Resources), the City is known to contain prehistoric, ethnographic, historical and paleontological resources. The GP FEIR (Figure 3.5-1, Historic Resources), shows areas containing sensitive historic/cultural resources, identifying 46 historic resource locations. The proposed project site is an existing developed site which was originally constructed in the 1960s. As part of that original development the entire project site was graded.

No known unique paleontological resource or site has been identified onsite. Additionally, the project site does not contain any unique geologic features or historic resources.
Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on cultural resources would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. The City’s adopted thresholds indicate that a project would result in a significant impact on a cultural resource if it results in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of such a resource would be materially impaired.

Project Specific Impacts
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 John Begg Family House located at 469 Kellogg Way, approximately 1/4 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 records search through the CCIC determined that the project site and surrounding area has been the subject of multiple surveys in the past. The previous studies did not identify prehistoric archeological materials within the project site. The proposed project site is not itself a mapped site, with majority of known resources located greater than a ¾-mile away. The project site has also been subject to substantial subsurface disturbance associated with the development of the existing buildings and other improvements done in the 1960s. While the project site is in relative close proximity to the Goleta Slough, which is a known aggregation site, the potential for archeological resources to be located on site is minimal, given that the project site and surrounding area have been substantially developed and that no archeological sites have been identified on the project or adjoining parcels. While the possibility of disturbance is low, to prevent any disturbance the conditions listed below would be required. Therefore, the potential for disturbance of any remaining artifacts and/or human remains onsite is considered to be less than significant. While no mitigations are needed, as there will not be an impact, the below conditions of approval will be made part of the Development Plan.

c) Due to past grading and development 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
Continued loss of cultural resources on a project-by-project basis could result in significant cumulative impacts to such resources over time. If cultural resources are found on site, the project’s potential contribution to these cumulative impacts is potentially significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
Based on the analysis above, no significant impacts to cultural resources are anticipated to occur as a result of this project implementation, no mitigation measures are required. No archeological resources are anticipated based on the analysis of the information above.

Required/Recommended Conditions of Approval
However, out of abundance of caution, given the historical prevalence of Native American activity in the region the following conditions of approval will be required:

1. A City-approved archaeologist and local Chumash observer shall monitor project implementation during the initial grading and excavation activities until such time as sufficient subsurface soil has been uncovered/excavated to ascertain that no additional prehistoric archaeological/cultural resources are located on the project site.

2. In the event archaeological resources are encountered during grading, work must be stopped immediately or redirected until the City-approved archaeologist and Native American representative can evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigation standards set forth in the City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 2 study must be funded by the applicant. If resources are found to be significant, they must be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 3 mitigation program must be funded by the applicant.

3. In the event human remains are discovered, the following actions must be taken immediately upon the discovery of human remains, consistent Public Resources Code 5097.98:
   - Stop work in the affected area.
   - Notify the coroner.
   - Fence off the area.
   - Leave all items in the area as is.

In some situations, (as determined appropriate by the City, the site archaeologist, and Native American observer), work may be allowed to continue in another part of the parcel. City staff shall also be notified of the discovery of human remains. Public Resources Code 5097.98 also addresses specific timing and other criteria with regard to MLD recommendations for the disposition of human remains.
Residual Impact
Given that the project specific and cumulative impacts are considered to be less than significant, residual project specific impacts on Cultural Resources would be less than significant.

### 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>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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. | | | | | *
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | | | *
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | | | *
| iv. Landslides? | | | | | *
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | | | | *
| 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? | | | | | *
| 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? | | | | | *
| 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? | | | | | *
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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 Elder sandy loam on the northern portion of the site and Camarillo fine sandy loam on the southern portion. (GP/CLUP FEIR Figure 3.2-3, September 2006). The project site surface coverage consists primary of asphalt, concrete paving, and buildings with minimal landscaping. The site generally flat, however slopes gently in a westerly and southwesterly direction.

The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California that has experienced ground motion in response to earthquakes in the past. All of the City of Goleta is located within Seismic Zone D as designated by the California Uniform Building Code.

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

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

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

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

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

Project Specific Impacts
a,c) There are no Alquist-Priolo mapped earthquake faults or zones identified in the project area. The closest fault is More Ranch Fault approximately 2,000 feet to the south 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 building improvements 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
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5.1, Geologic Hazards Map dated Nov. 2009). Additionally, as there would be no new building area, there would no additionally risk of liquefaction. 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 consist of an estimated earthwork quantity of 1,500 cubic yards of cut and an estimated earthwork quantity of 1,000 cubic yards to fill. Pursuant to the City of Goleta, Municipal Code, Section 15.09.290, an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan would be required by the applicant as part of the grading plan and permit requirements, containing requirements of the City’s best management practices (BMP’S) for erosion and sediment control. As such, due to the relatively flat topography of the project site, the relatively small area of sediment disturbance from grading, and the City’s requirements of BMP’s for erosion and sediment control, the proposed project would have less significant impacts and/or occurrence of soil erosion or loss of the top soil.

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. However, the building foundation would be designed to meet the California Building Code’s seismic and soil parameters based on site conditions. As such any impacts resulting from expansive soils would be less than significant. 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 contributions to cumulative, adverse erosion, and soil loss in the area would be considered less than significant, as the site is currently developed and all grading will be subject to erosion and sediment controls.

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,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either directly or indirectly, that may</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a significant impact on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy or regulation adopted for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose of reducing the emissions of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting
The project site is currently a fully developed site operating as an industrial business park. The business park has been operating as an industrial park containing both industrial and office uses since the 1960s.

Climate Change Background

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

Climate change could impact the natural environment in California by triggering, among others things:
• Rising sea levels along the California coastline;
• Extreme-heat conditions, such as heat waves and very high temperatures, which could last longer and become more frequent;
• Increase in heat-related human deaths, an increase in infectious diseases, and a higher risk of respiratory problems caused by deteriorating air quality;
• Reduced snow pack and stream flow in the Sierra Nevada mountains, affecting winter recreation and water supplies;
• Potential increase in the severity of winter storms, affecting peak stream flows and flooding;
• Changes in growing season conditions that could affect California agriculture, causing variations in crop quality and yield; and
• Changes in distribution of plant and wildlife species due to changes in temperature, competition from colonizing species, changes in hydrologic cycles, changes in sea levels, and other climate-related effects.

According to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a GHG is any gas that absorbs infrared radiation in the atmosphere. This absorption traps heat within the atmosphere creating a greenhouse effect that is slowly raising global temperatures. California law defines GHG to include the following: carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF6) (Health and Safety Code, § 38505(g)).

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

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

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

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

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

B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.
The adopted CEQA amendments require a lead agency to make a good-faith effort based, to the extent possible, on scientific and factual data in order to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. They give discretion to the lead agency in whether to:

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

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

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

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

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

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

In June 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) became the first regulatory agency in the nation to approve guidelines that establish thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. 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. RG1–548693) ruled that BAAQMD needed to comply with CEQA before adopting its 2010 Air Quality CEQA Guidelines, which included significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants and GHGs. On August 13, 2013, the Court of Appeals (California Building Industry Assoc. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 1171, rev. granted) reversed the lower court's decision and upheld the BAAQMD Guidelines. That decision was appealed to the California Supreme Court, which granted review on November 26, 2013. On December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court made a partial ruling, but remanded the substantive question, i.e.,
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

whether the 2010 Air Quality CEQA Guidelines were valid, back to the Court of Appeals for a decision (California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2015) 62 Cal.4th 369).

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.

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 only GHG emissions from project construction, as there will be no change to operational impacts as part of this project. The CalIEEMod v.2016.3.1 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 181 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 6.04 MT CO$_2$e/yr.

Mobile Source. As the project site is already fully developed and operational there will be no project related change to Mobile Source emissions.

Energy Consumption. As the project site is already fully developed and operational there will be no project related change to emissions from energy consumption.

Water Demand. As the project site is already fully developed and operational there will be no project related change to emissions from water demand.

Solid Waste. As the project site is already fully developed and operational there will be no project related change to solid waste emissions.
Table GHG-2
Business as Usual Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total Metric Tons of CO$_2$e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Source$^2$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy$^2$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Demand$^2$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste$^2$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $\text{Total Project Emissions}^2$        | 6.04 MT CO$_2$e/yr.           |
| GHG Significance Threshold                 | 1,100.00 MT CO$_2$e/yr.      |
| GHG Significance Threshold Exceeded?       | No                            |

Notes:
1. Emissions calculated using CalEEMod v.2016.3.1 computer model.
2. Existing site is fully developed and operational, so operational emissions are not included.

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 6.04 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 Scorpo-rated</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 project site has contained industrial and office uses since it was developed in the 1960s. The predominant land uses in the site vicinity are other industrial and office uses, including the development west of Highway 217. The lone non-industrial use adjacent to the project site is the active agricultural use to the east of the project site across Ward Drive. The project is currently listed as a hazardous materials site on a list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. A contamination case was opened on the site in 1996 by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), due to contamination of groundwater and soils by a previous onsite operator (Applied Magnetics). Upon reaching an agreement with the previous operator, remediation activities began in 1999, with verification monitoring beginning in 2000. To date the case is still active with bioremediation activities and site monitoring still ongoing to clean up the solvent plume.

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

Project Specific Impacts
a,b) Given the age of the existing buildings, there is the potential for asbestos to be present. This could be hazardous if demolished portion is not removed and disposed of properly. As such, the Project will be conditioned to comply with Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District (SBAPCD) regulatory requirements, requiring testing for asbestos and dispose of any materials found in a manner consistent with the California Building Code, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District requirements, and any other regulatory requirements. With the required condition the project impacts would be less than significant.

Further, the proposed site renovation and lot split would not be expected to generate hazardous waste or create the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project would not generate any additional 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. There will not be a change in the use of the site, as it will continue to contain industrial and office uses. 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 Spills, Leaks, Investigation, and Cleanups (SLIC) Site (RB Case #S110).
Since 2000, the site has been the location of on-going remediation activities (e.g. anaerobic bioremediation for dissolved solvents in groundwater) overseen by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB).

Recent on-site tests remedial efforts to enhance biodegradation have been successful and contamination concentration levels are generally in decline. However, concentration levels in two of the monitoring wells remain too high to allow for case closure. The relatively shallow construction related grading activities will not encounter the contaminated ground water onsite. The proposed site plan has been designed, through the use of hardscape and a surface drainage system divert runoff into vegetated areas away from the contaminated areas. This design will prevent the percolation of water into the contaminated area of the site, which could have a potential negative effect of the bioremediation project. Should the project take place prior to case closure the project will be conditioned to protect all existing monitoring wells in place during construction activities. Given that the proposed project will not affect existing remediation activities on site, the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, the projects impact in this issue area would be less than significant.

e) The project site lies approximately 0.5 miles east of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBMA), within the Approach Zone the one-mile marker of the end of Runway 7-25. The City’s zoning regulations for the Airport Overlay contains restrictions on height and land use compatibility to implement the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) (adopted October 1993). These regulations apply to the project site. The proposed project will not increase the building size, height or alter the intensity of the uses on site and therefore would not alter the sites conformance with the ALUP. The height of the buildings would remain below the height restrictions for development within the Approach Zone of Runway 7-25 and the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) for height requirements for development within 2000 feet of a runway. The proposed project will not alter the uses on site. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on the sites exposure to potential airport hazards.

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 project specific hazards risk and risk of exposure to hazardous materials would be less than significant, project contributions to cumulative hazards risk and exposure to hazardous materials would be less than significant.
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Required Mitigation Measures
Based on the analysis above, no significant impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials are anticipated to occur as a result of this project implementation, no mitigation measures are required.

Required/Recommended Conditions of Approval
However, out of abundance of caution, the following conditions of approval are required:

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.

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

**Existing Setting**
Currently, the project site has no identified special flood hazard areas and surface coverage consist primarily of asphalt or concrete paving and buildings, with minimal landscaping.

Ward Drive, which is crowned in the center does not have curb and gutter along the project frontage. The majority of stormwater runoff generated on the westerly half of Ward Drive flows onto the property into the vegetated planters along the project frontage, while a small portion of the Ward Drive runoff sheet flows into the project site via the driveways.

Ward Drive runoff that comes on site enters the onsite drainage system. The onsite drainage system consists of surface drainage features including curbs/gutters and valley gutters in the parking lot. The site generally drains in a westerly and southwesterly direction with runoff crossing the most of the westerly property line, into a roadside swale in the Highway 217 California Department of Transportation (Cal Trans) right of way. As the runoff transverses, a considerable distance, in conjunction with the relatively flat grades, results in dispersed runoff at low velocity and therefore, development of minimal erosion forces.

The swale, which is densely vegetated and thus, resistant to erosive forces, convey runoff southerly toward the Goleta Slough and subsequently to the Pacific Ocean. Drainage from the adjacent half street width of Ward Drive flows into and through the project site.

All sewage effluent from the existing development on site is handled by the Goleta Sanitary District’s (GSD’s) collection and treatment system and would continue to serve the site. Water for the existing development on the site is supplied by the Goleta Water District (GWD), which would continue to serve the site.

**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 site renovation or lot split, and sewage effluent generated after the project 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 increase the amount of hardscape on 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 12-percent for the current parcel to over 30-percent for both of the proposed parcels. After completion of the project the site is expected to use a similar amount of water as currently being used given there will be no changes to the use of the buildings or any additional square footage. Increased project landscaping will be drought tolerant low water use and will not substantially affect water use on the site. Further Goleta Water District (GWD) has issued a Preliminary Water Service Determination Letter (PWSD). This PWSD Letter estimates 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-f) The proposed project will maintain existing drainage patterns with surface flow being conveyed by the proposed final grading design. Runoff from the westerly half of each existing building will be directed into a proposed bioretenion basin adjacent to Ward Drive for treatment, detention and infiltration. Stormwater beyond the capacity of the basins will overflow to the surface grades to concrete gutters which lead to a bio retention basin in the southwesterly corner of the site. Stormwater runoff exceeding the capacity of the bio retention facilities will follow the existing drainage pattern to the existing swale in the adjacent Highway 217 right of way. The water retained on site and will be recharged in to the ground safely away from concentrations of contamination onsite. 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 12-percent for the current parcel to over 30-percent for both proposed parcels.

g, h) The site of the proposed project located in Flood Zone X as identified on FEMA Panel 06083C1362G (dated 12/4/12). Flood Zone X has a minimal risk of flood (less than a 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. Also, no housing is proposed as part of this project. 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 lie 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, there would be no impacts to people and property associated with a tsunami or the failure of an upstream levee and/or dam.

**Cumulative Impacts**
All project contributions to cumulative hydrology/water quality impacts would be less than significant, as the project is existing and would not significantly impact hydrology or water quality.

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

**Residual Impact**
Based on the above analysis, residual the project would not result in any residual project specific and cumulative 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 749/759 Ward Drive, south of Hollister Ave between the Highway 217 and Ward Drive in the City of Goleta. The General Plan land use designation for the project site is Business Park (I-BP). According to Land Use Policy 4.2, the intent of the I-BP designation is to provide for attractive, well-designed business parks that may include a wide variety of research and development, light industrial, and office uses, as well as small scale commercial to serve the business park employees. Allowed uses include general manufacturing (no noxious impacts), research and development, eating and drinking establishments, personal services, business services, financial services, and similar uses.

The current zoning designation of the site is M-RP (Industrial Research Park), which allows uses consistent with the I-BP land use category.

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

Project Specific Impacts
a) The proposed development would not result in the physical division of any established community or neighborhood. The project site is surrounded by a mix of industrial, office, and agricultural 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 Business Park (I-BP) on the site. Further, the project's land use, an industrial park, is an allowed and permitted use of the M-RP Zone District within Article II, Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

The I-BP land use category includes lands intended to provide a variety of research and development, light industrial, and office uses. The land use is intended provide employment opportunities to the community and surrounding area. The proposed project will not alter the use of the project site; therefore, for the site will remain consistent with the intent of the I-BP land use. The increase in landscaping from 12-percent for the current parcel to over 30-percent for both of the proposed parcels, will bring the site into compliance with the landscape requirements for the M-RP zone district. With the approval of the setback modifications, the project will be consistent with the setback requirements of the M-RP zone district.

The project site is located within the Airport Land Use Plan Approach Zone, however the will be no change to the building height and the existing building heights are consistent with the allowed 35-foot height limit requirement within the Airport Land Use Plan Approach Zone, and does not require review by the Airport Land Use Commission.

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, neither Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) nor special status species occur on the project site or adjoining parcels. This parcel contains an existing industrial development and has been developed since the 1960s. 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, as the project would not change the land use or lead to a change in the land use and planning in the area.

Required/Recommended 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 would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts in the checklist above.

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

#### Cumulative Impacts
The project would have no impact on any cumulative loss on mineral resources or resource recovery sites, as there are none onsite.

#### Required/Recommended 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, 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

The project site lies within the 60 to 70 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise exposure contour within the City. Noise exposure contours map points of equal average noise levels in the same way that topographic contours map points of equal elevation. The primary sources of noise in the area are vehicular traffic on Highway 217, and aircraft operations at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, and neighboring industrial and farming operations.

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

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

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

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 consider differences in the
intrusiveness of noise between daytime hours and nighttime hours. Specifically, CNEL
weights average noise levels at different times of the day as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project Specific Impacts

a,c) The project site lies within the 65-70dBA CNEL noise exposure contour of the City, as indicated on GP/CLUP Figures 9-1 and 9-2. The primary sources of noise in the area are vehicular traffic on Highway 217 and the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. Per Figures 9-1, 9-2, 9-3, and 9-4 in the Noise Element existing and future (2030) noise levels are not expected to exceed 70 dBA. The Noise Element of the GP/CLUP indicates that the range of normally acceptable noise levels for industrial related uses is 50-70 dBA. "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 (70 dBA) and airport noise level (65 dBA) are compatible for industrial uses.

The proposal consists of improvement to an existing development and a lot split of a fully developed site therefore it would not increase traffic in the immediate project vicinity. As a result, given that there is will be no increase to the intensity of the site, the proposal would not result in an increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels. No such impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of project implementation.

b,f) The proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels during operation of the facility. There may be some increase in vibration and noise as a result of construction; however, construction is short-term in nature and anticipated to only last a few months. There are no private airports or airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. As a result, such impacts are less than significant.

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 (Rancho Goleta Mobile Home Park) are approximately 500-feet to the south of the 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. Additionally, given the ambient noise from the Highway 217 and the Airport, construction noise impacts to any sensitive receptors would be less than significant. However, out of abundance of caution the conditions below will be required to further reduce any potential impacts.

e) Although the project site does lie within the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Approach Zone, pursuant to the Noise Element Figures 9-2 and 9-4, the SBMA noise levels at the project site would not exceed the "Normally Acceptable" noise exposures levels for industrial uses. As such, noise impacts from airport operations on the proposed project would be 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, as there are no other projects underway in the immediate vicinity and the noise level drops as you move away from the project sign.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**
Based on the analysis above, no significant impacts with respect to noise are anticipated to occur as a result of this project implementation, no mitigation measures are required.
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Required/Recommended Conditions of Approval

However, out of abundance of caution, the following conditions of approval will be required:

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;
   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.

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.

Residual Impact

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

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

### Project Specific Impacts
a-c) Given the nature of the project (site renovations and lot split) 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. As there will be no increase in the building size or development potential, the project will not induce population growth. Therefore, the project would result in no impacts to population or housing given that there will be no increase in the intensity of the development and no impact on existing housing stock.

### Cumulative Impacts
There would be no project impacts to cumulative population growth or on the area's housing supply 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
There would be no residual project impact on population and housing 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting
Fire Protection
The project site is located within the urban area, in a central portion of the City of Goleta. Fire services would be provided by Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD) under contract to the City. The closest fire station to the project site is Station #12 located at 5330 Calle Real (approximately 2.5 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 prior to
entry by firefighters to provide an immediate rescue for trapped or fallen firefighters, as well as immediate assistance in rescue operations.

The SBCFD has implemented a dynamic deployment system, for its fire engines, in addition to the traditional static deployment system from fire stations when the station's engine is "in house". Dynamic deployment allows for the dispatching of engines already on the road for emergency calls rather than dispatching by a station's "first in area", as has been the previous practice. Basically, dynamic deployment uses a Global Positioning System (GPS) to monitor the exact location of each engine in real time. Previously, when an engine was out on routine (non-emergency) activities, such as inspections or training, the engine company was considered "in-service" and its exact location at any given moment in time was not known to County Dispatch. However, with dynamic deployment using the County's GPS, County dispatch has real time information on the exact location of each engine at all times and can dispatch the closest, un-engaged engine to an emergency incident, regardless of which fire station's service area the call originates from. This precludes the need for an in-service engine to have extended run times when another fire engine would be closer. The Fire Department has also added a battalion chief as the fourth 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 16 public parks, 4 private parks, and 18 public open spaces. City parks are considered in combination with open space provide recreational opportunities and encompass approximately 526 total acres. This results in an existing ratio of 17 acres of open space 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. In Fiscal Year 2014/2015, services were provided by 6 full-time and 14 part-time employees.

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

Project Specific Impacts
a) Given the scope and nature of the proposal (site renovations and lot split of an existing developed site), 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, there would be no project specific or cumulative impacts.

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

Residual Impact
There would be no residual project related impacts on public services for the reasons outlined above.
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RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<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>
<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>
<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 of open space per thousand residents. The City has adopted a goal of providing 4.7 acres active recreation of parkland per thousand residents. The City’s single recreation center is the Goleta Valley Community Center.

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

Project Specific Impacts
a-b) Given the scope and nature of the proposal (site renovation and lot split of a developed industrial site), 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
There would be no residual project related impacts on Recreation.
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## TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

### Existing Setting

The proposed project site is located at 749/759 Ward Drive, south of Hollister Ave between the Highway 217 and Ward Drive. Primary ingress and egress is provided via three existing driveway connecting to Ward Drive.

An existing network of highways, arterial streets, and collector streets serve the area. These include U.S. Highway 101 located to the north of the project site, Hollister Avenue to the north, and Ward Drive along the east frontage.
Thresholds of Significance
A significant project generated traffic impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds of significance are set forth in the City’s Thresholds Manual and include the following:

1) The addition of project traffic to an intersection increases the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio by the value provided below or sends at least 5, 10, or 15 trips to intersections operating at LOS F, E or D, respectively.

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

OR THE ADDITION OF

- D: 15 trips
- E: 10 trips
- F: 5 trips

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

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

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

Project Specific Impacts
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>Base Year – 2005</th>
<th>Build Out - 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/SR-217</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>LOS E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/SR-217</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given that the existing site is fully development and the proposed project will result in a reduction in overall building area with the removal of the mezzanine, there will be no increase in the intensity of the use on the site. Additionally, the lot split will not increase the development potential of the two proposed parcels over the existing site. With the potential reduction in intensity, the proposed project will not generate any additional traffic trips or impacts. Therefore, the project will not generate any impacts to the study area intersections.

The project site is located within the Airport Approach Zone of the Santa Barbara Airport (see Hazards/Hazardous Materials, above, for a detailed discussion). The project would not generate any changes to existing air traffic patterns or impact access to the terminal. Additionally, the proposed project will not increase traffic levels in the area because there will be a reduction in building square footage. As such, there would be no 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 site renovations and lot split 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 adjacent to Ward Drive will remain in place. 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 project 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 above, the project would not have the potential to significantly impact adjacent roadways and/or intersection. 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 analysis, no mitigation measures are warranted.

Residual Impact
Residual impacts to traffic and transportation systems would be less than significant.
TRIBAL 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. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting
Ethnographic and Historic Setting

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

As provided in the City’s General Plan Final EIR (Section 3.5. Cultural Resources), the City is known to contain prehistoric, ethnographic, historical and paleontological resources. The proposed project site is an existing developed site which was originally constructed in the 1960s. As part of that original development the entire project site was graded and paved. Currently, the site contains two industrial buildings and

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

Project Specific Impacts
a-b) There are no known tribal cultural resources listed or eligible for listing, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code, on the project site. 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 sites of tribal cultural significance. The current site is a fully development industrial business park, which has been developed since the 1960s. There will be no significant soil removal or subsurface development. Additionally, local tribes were contacted with regard to this project and did not request a consultation on the project, nor provide any comments. Based on these factors, the project would not result in any impacts to sites, places, features or landscapes of tribal cultural significance. Also, while not specific to this section conditions will be required as mentioned under the cultural resources section in order to provide additional protections should any significant resources be encountered.

Cumulative Impacts
The projects impact on tribal cultural resources are less than significant, as the site is already developed and there are no known resources onsite.

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

Residual Impact
Based on the analysis above residual project related impacts on tribal cultural resources 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.

Drainage Facilities

Landfill Capacity and Solid Waste

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

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

---

4 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.
Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project Specific Impacts

a,b,e) Wastewater Treatment
The two building on site are currently being served under GSD permits 159 and 907, and originally connected to the sanitary district on June 1962. 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 3.12-5), however there is no increase in square footage proposed. Therefore, the project would not increase effluent flows into the GSD treatment plant and would have no impact on wastewater treatment.

The applicant has obtained a Sewer Service Availability letter from the District to ensure its capacity can be utilized. Based on the information provided, the proposed project would have no impact on the availability and adequacy of sewage disposal service.

c) Drainage Facilities
Site improvements will primarily consist of reconfiguration of the parking and circulation layout, and regrading and resurfacing of the site for improved surface drainage. The proposed improvements also include permanent water quality treatment and infiltration facilities consisting of 3 bio retention basins.

Existing drainage patterns will be maintained with surface flow runoff being conveyed by proposed final grading design. Runoff from the westerly half of each existing building location will be directed into a proposed bio retention basin adjacent to Ward Drive for treatment, detention and infiltration. Stormwater beyond the capacity of the basins will overflow to the surface grades to concrete gutters which lead to a bio retention basin in the southwesterly corner of the site. Stormwater runoff exceeding the capacity of the bio retention facilities will follow the existing drainage pattern to the existing swale in the adjacent Highway 217 right of way.

The proposed project will increase pervious area by approximately 27,638 square feet, through the increase of landscaping, going from 13 percent to over 30 percent for each proposed parcel. Additionally, runoff of impervious surfaces from the new building roof and portions of the existing parking lot will be directed to the landscaped drainage facility as described above. The physical impacts of the construction of the drainage facilities are within the envelope of the entire project. Therefore, the project would not result in the need for construction of new storm water drainage facilities off-site that would create significant environmental impacts. Impacts as a result of the storm drainage facilities are considered less than significant.
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. The existing development is currently served by the Goleta Water District. Given there will be an overall reduction in building square footage and there will be no change in use, the water demand is not expected to change. Per the preliminary water service determination letter from the GWD (dated November 20, 2015), the site has adequate historic water credit for the forecasted demand associated with the proposed project, and therefore 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 proposed project will not expand the use of the property and therefore will not generate any increase in the generation of solid waste. 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 Development Plan to reduce solid waste from construction. Therefore, the proposed project’s specific impact on solid waste disposal capacity at the Tajiguas Landfill would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts**
As the project is existing and included an overall reduction in square footage the 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.
### MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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 sensitive habitat is approximately 124 feet to the west of the site. The site is separated from this ESHA by Highway 217 (a fully improved highway that carries approximately 16,000 annual average daily trips). The site renovations and on-going use of the buildings onsite will not have an adverse effect on said habitat given the distance and the intervening roadway.

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, mitigation measures 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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ATTACHMENT A

PROJECT PLANS
ATTACHMENT B

COMMENTS PROVIDED ON DRAFT
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
To Whom It May Concern:

I thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced project. My name is Frank Arredondo. I am a member of the Native American Heritage commission MLD List for the Chumash Territory and listed on the Native American Contact list for Santa Barbara County. My comments today are of my own.

Being of Native American descendant, from the Chumash territory, I have a strong vested interest in the project. I currently provide comment on several Planning and Development projects in the surrounding areas that have cultural resources impacts. I have been an advocate for the preservation of those Cultural Resources within my community and for several years now as well as placing an emphasis on local governments adhering to policies and procedures. I thank you for taking the time to review my comments.

This letter addresses the adequacy and completeness of the environmental analysis described in the Draft ND. The Draft ND does not adequately carry out the process of identification and therefore cannot discuss potential impacts and residual impacts of the subject area. The California Environmental Quality Act, (CEQA) is a statute that requires state and local agencies to identify the significant environmental impacts of their actions and to avoid or mitigate those impacts, if feasible. The key here is to “identify”. The Draft ND has failed to properly “Identify” and therefore cannot discuss potential impacts. The data used to “Identify” impacts is incomplete or non-existent. No discussion or analysis can take place if the data is not complete. Therefore, it is unknown if the project described would not create any significant adverse effect on the environment.
After conducting a review of the statements made in the Draft ND I have been able to identify several portions of the draft ND that fail to carry out the process of identifying the potential for impacts to cultural resources.

1. I found no documentation that the parcel has been previously graded.
2. The parcel has not been extensively archaeologically surveyed. Only one cursory survey has actually been conducted.
3. One site designation “Locus 3” is adjoining the project parcel when the DND states “No archaeological site has been identified on the project or adjoining parcels” pg.28
4. I was not able to find a record that the City made a request for a “Sacred Lands file” with the Native American Heritage commission. (This is separate action aside from ABS2 requests.)
5. No clear data to show that the parcel actually contains “fill soils” from the development of existing industrial complex.

The project proposal intends to cause 1,500 – cubic yards of cut and 1-2 feet excavation of grading. Due to the sensitivity of the Goleta Slough and high potential to encounter subsurface cultural resources. All available sources of data should be investigated to properly identify the potential of cultural resources.

1. Grading

The Draft ND states that “As part of the original development the entire project was graded and paved”, Pg 27 & 64. A review of the development documents did not produce any evidence that the parcel was previously graded during the installation of the industrial buildings back in the 1960’s.

I reviewed 6 pdfs’ (PDF 4806-4812) that staff provided on the background permits and grading plans for the parcel. After a close review of each document no indication that the parcel had ever been developed. The site is generally flat, and slopes gently in a westerly and south westerly direction. The main roadway appears to be elevated and adjacent property across from the road way is at the same elevation of the project parcel. This leads towards the parcel itself having never been modified. Of the Pdf’s provided only pdf 4806 contains any information about what type of work may have taken place in the 1960’s. Zoning clearance, lot split notes, landscape and parking calculations make up the information from the 1960’s. Without any documentation, it cannot be concluded the parcel was every graded.

PDF 4806 - 33 pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>address 749 ward dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This zoning clearance and occupancy clearance is based upon the statement of the owner filed with the proposed lot split. That they have not &amp; do not intend to formulate or lease the portion of this new development &amp; separately and therefore do not need a lot split</td>
<td>8-26-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parking stall plans &amp; location of Hydronics pipeline and current fence lines</td>
<td>4/27/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flight zone vicinity maps-Assessor map / Site plan designs with building foot print established and plants and trees locations</td>
<td>3/27/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>lot split note</td>
<td>6/13/66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>letter from William R Girvan about action taken by County</td>
<td>4/28/61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning commission on April 26, 1961 that the front yard outback be taken from kellogg ave. only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LANP USE RIDER form for 749 S. Kellogg Ave. Pol.B of Lot Split Plat #1533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continued from pg. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Plot plan Map of 749. S. Kellogg ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Undiscernible Plot map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>County of Santa Barbara BOS letter request that bond be placed on parcel for landscaping performance and planting of 10 street trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Letter re: Landscaping cash deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Letter from SB CO BOS agreeing to release funds for landscaping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Land Use Rider form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Master Parking map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Area Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Land Use rider 2nd floor alteration requires A/H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Office memorandum Parking calculation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Letter on employment parking related facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Land Use Rider – Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Exhibit A Proposed storage location on plot map of parcel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Approval plan County imprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Letter on Illegal wall sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Land Use Permit – New Freight door</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Partial roof framing plan for new doors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Elevation (viewed from inside of building) plan of pg. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Letter about door jams wind resistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Land Use Permit for 8 ft. fence for security and storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Memorandum re: fencing being built</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Coastal Development Permit Industrial Interior Remodel and two industrial tanks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Letter of standards and conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Planning Development Permit application to add interior to add non-load bearing wall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PDF 4807 Pages 1-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Address 749 Ward dr.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Design for interior remodel</td>
<td>11-20-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elevation sketch drawing</td>
<td>2-12-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elevation, plot map and Site plan</td>
<td>4-01-93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PDF 4808 Pages 1-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Address 749 Ward dr.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Floor plan</td>
<td>Jan 93'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proposed interior wall &amp; title and</td>
<td>8-18-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>floor plan 1 of 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Proposed interior wall &amp; floor</td>
<td>8-18-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plan 2 of 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PDF 4809 Pages 1-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>address 759 Ward dr.</td>
<td>3-01-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trellis detail elevation</td>
<td>6-08-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Structural details</td>
<td>6-08-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Site plan, building improvement</td>
<td>Jan 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>General notes &amp; schedules and details</td>
<td>7-18-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>lighting and power floor plan</td>
<td>7-18-94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PDF 4811 Pages 1-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Address 759 Ward dr.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Planning dept. approval stamp</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interior floor plan</td>
<td>3-7-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Site plan</td>
<td>12-28-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Notice for parking layout, No map</td>
<td>5-26-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land Use Rider document, 2nd floor</td>
<td>9-24-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>addition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Office memorandum about employee</td>
<td>9-24-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Land Use rider, Mezzanine floor</td>
<td>5-26-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Land User Rider, Interior alterations</td>
<td>3-18-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Land Use Permit, Interior remodel</td>
<td>3-27-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Coastal Development Permit,</td>
<td>3-2-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior remodel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Standard conditions letter</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Certificate of conformance</td>
<td>8-13-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Permit application, install illuminated sign</td>
<td>7-22-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Land Use permit, Exterior stairways</td>
<td>6-11-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Letter proposal for a spray booth to</td>
<td>10-15-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be installed in vacant portion of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>letter for spray booth continued</td>
<td>10-15-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sketch drawing for spray booth</td>
<td>10-15-94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PDF 4812 Pages 1-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Address 759 ward dr.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>First floor plan for interior remodel</td>
<td>3-14-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Second floor plan for interior remodel</td>
<td>3-16-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Building elevation</td>
<td>3-14-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Building elevation</td>
<td>3-14-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Site plan, elevation, Awning details</td>
<td>5-2-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Site plan</td>
<td>3-01-90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Archaeological Surveys.

According to the DND the project parcel has been subjected to multiple surveys in the past and that previous studies did not identify archaeological sites on the parcel or adjoining the parcels. After my review of all 22 surveyed reports used by the DND to make this determination I was able to identify only one survey that was carried out on or near this parcel, report E-246.

Report E-246 is the only report that surveys the area covering the project parcel. This was conducted in April of 1982 by Archaeological Systems Management by Larry Wilcoxen and Jon Erlandson, titled ‘Final Report Intensive Cultural Resources Survey for the Flood Protection Program Santa Barbara County California’. The parcel area was part of a larger survey of all Goleta watersheds and known established sites at the time. The focus was on known sites and the current condition. A surface survey was conducted along the parcel as part of a broad expansion of the San Jose creek watershed and along Ward Memorial Boulevard (Highway 217). The area East of highway 217 is identified on Map 6 of this report as “Survey Area poor; very poor visibility, primarily residential or industrial zones; survey of available ground surfaces”. Further information is gleaned from the DPR form filled out for this area.

Below is a breakdown of the 22 reports cited as surveying the parcel area.

**West of Highway 217**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Report #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E-121</td>
<td>Letter Report-Surface, shovel probes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E-1065</td>
<td>Trenching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E-1528</td>
<td>Phase 1, limited visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E-1584</td>
<td>Airport survey Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E-2187</td>
<td>Phase 1, Gol. Old town Revitalization Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E-2541</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey-Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E-3039</td>
<td>Phase 1, surface scrapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E-3566</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey-Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>E-4405</td>
<td>Assessment-Surface survey, historic accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>E-4949</td>
<td>Extended Phase 1, 2” geoprobes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Out of Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Report #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E-203</td>
<td>4 sentence letter report-phase 1,5% Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>E-216</td>
<td>Surface survey, no shovel scrapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E-1231</td>
<td>Pipeline-Coastal area-9 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>E-1642</td>
<td>Atascadero Creek-Significant finds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>E-1746</td>
<td>14 streams in County - surface survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>E-2004</td>
<td>Fiber optic, Hollister rd., Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>E-2555</td>
<td>Surface survey, Orchards off Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>E-2667</td>
<td>Creek Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>E-2690</td>
<td>San Jose Creek restoration study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>E-4638</td>
<td>Flood Control-Environmental Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>E-5025</td>
<td>Records Update, flood control dredging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In-Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Report #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>E-246</td>
<td>Major survey of G&amp;l. Waterways, 5% visibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Adjacent parcel site located- Locus 3

Report E-246 is the only report that survey the area covering the project parcel. It includes a DPR form that identified “locus 3”. The DPR 422 form is used for the recording and evaluation of resources for nominating properties to the California register of Historic resources. On this report, it describes a “low density shellfish scatter composed of estuarine and non-estuarine species”. The shellfish identified is Tivela stultorum, Mytilus californianus, Chione undatella, protosthace staminea. Everything known as food refuse for the Chumash. The temporary field number is listed as "Locus 3". After conferring with the CCIC office it is presumed that this “locus 3” is associated with CA-SBa-45. It is unclear why it was never recorded as a “site” as per the criteria listed below. This “locus 3" is approximately less than 20 meters from the parcel property.

The criteria for Site Recognition is presented on Page 60 of this report.

> "The criteria traditionally used for the recognition of archaeological sites in the Santa Barbara region include one or more of the following:

  Prehistoric sites

1) Presence of shellfish or other faunal materials
2) Presence of artifacts;
3) Presence of flaking debris from stone tool manufacture;
4) Soil discoloration associated with human occupation;
5) Other unusual soil discontinuities;
6) Presence of painted or incised rock surfaces associated with rock art."

Clearly Locus 3 meets the criteria for site recognition.

As a footnote; 2,220 feet or 670 meters from the project parcel is over 6 registered sites. Starting with CA-SBa-1696.
4. NAHC Sacred Lands File request.

The Sacred Lands File contains places that have been cataloged as places of special religious or social significance to Native Americans, and known graves and cemeteries of Native Americans on private lands. This is not AB521 But a separate action. As part of the NAHC response to these requests they outline all the various options for conducting a review for cultural resources. Had a professional archaeological survey been conducted this sacred lands file request would have been made.

5. Fill Soils

Since the documentation of grading is not evident the next step is to look at the soils that are located on the site. The DND states that the soils at the project site consist of fill soils from the development of existing industrial complex. Yet the current elevation is below the surrounding areas?

According to the Geology report in the DND it states that the soils on the site consist of Elder sandy loam on the northern portion of the site and Camarillo fine sandy loam on the southern portion. The site is generally flat, however slopes gently in a westerly and south westerly direction. According to the GP/CLUP it is Recent Quaternary Age Younger Alluvium (GP/CLUP FEIR figure 3.6-1 sept 2006) A Quaternary Period is divided into two epochs: the Pleistocene (2.588 million years ago, to 11.7 thousand years ago,) and the Holocene (11.7 thousand years ago, to today). Simply put this does not indicate that these are fill soils.

In conclusion, the process of identification of potential resources on this parcel has failed to show proper data to support the claim of no impact to resources. The crucial step in identifying potential resources in a sensitive area such as the Goleta slough requires a professional Archaeologist to carry out the task of addressing all possible areas of research and not to mention reading the reports. I can find no evidence that the parcel has been graded, a site designation of Locus 3 is less than 20 meters away and the project in located in known sensitive Goleta Slough area which deserves a detailed approach. No evidence that any fill soils are present based on the geological statements of the DND and current elevation topography of the parcel. Without the proper investigations carried out by a professional archaeologist the DND has failed to properly carry out the required identification of possible resources to be impacted. Without this process, no evaluation can take place. At this stage, it is important that all development proposal carry out the required detailed investigations regardless of mitigation measures proposed.

I thank you in advance for your time,

Best wishes, Frank Arredondo
Ksen~Sku~Mu
Chumash MLD
Po Box 161
Santa Barbara, Ca 93102
Email Ksen_Sku_Mu@yahoo.com
March 23, 2017

Mr. Joe Pearson II, Associate Planner
City of Goleta, Planning and Environmental Review
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA  93117

Dear Mr. Pearson:

DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION
749/759 WARD DRIVE, CASE NO. 15-126-TPM-DP

The Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (Division) has reviewed the Draft Negative Declaration Report for the above referenced project. The Division has no jurisdiction or statutory responsibility for the project. The Division is mandated by section 3106 of the Public Resources Code to supervise the drilling, operation, maintenance, and abandonment of oil and gas wells. This is for the purposes of preventing: 1) damage to life, health, property, and natural resources; 2) damage to underground and surface waters suitable for irrigation or domestic use; 3) loss of oil, gas, or reservoir energy; and 4) damage to oil and gas deposits by infiltration of water and other causes.

The Division has no record of any wells drilled for mineral extraction on or in close proximity to the Ward Drive Renovation and Proposed Lot Split. If any wells are located within the project then the Division should be contacted.

If you have any questions, please contact our district office

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Abel
District Deputy – Coastal District

cc: Environmental Subdivision Review
CEQA Unit
LOCATION MAP
BASE INFORMATION FROM WELL FINDER FEATURE
http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/docfr/index.html#close
Joe, I have reviewed the proposed project and I am writing with my support. I have leased those buildings over the years and they have become very unattractive and the applicants plan will provide growing companies with enhanced R&D space and will beautify what is a visible commercial property. I am familiar with the applicants other projects in town and have been impressed by the level of quality they bring. This is a complete win for the city. Thanks for your consideration,

Brad Frohling
Principal
Radius Group Commercial Real Estate
205 E Carrillo Suite 100 | Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Direct: 805.879.9613 | Fax: 805.965.5300
Main: 805.965.5500 | Cel: 805.698.0272 | DRE #: 01323736 | bfrohling@radiusgroup.com | www.radiusgroup.com