CITY OF GOLETA
REVISED DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
08-MND-003
JANUARY 21, 2009

1. PROJECT TITLE: Towbes/ATK Space Systems Project; Case No. 08-157-OA, -DP RV01.

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME and ADDRESS: City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117

   An original Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the Towbes/ATK Space systems Project and released in December 2008. The Draft MND was issued for a 20-day review period in December 2008. Comments received during the review period indicated the need for a 30-day review period as a result of “Trustee Agency” jurisdiction over the project by responding public agencies. This resulted in the issuance of a Revised Draft MND on January 21, 2009 and recirculation for a 30-day period.

3. CONTACT PERSON and PHONE NUMBER:
   Laura Vlk, Associate Planner, (805) 961-7546.

4. APPLICANT:
   ATK Space Systems
   600 Pine Avenue
   Goleta, CA 93117

PROPERTY OWNER:
The Towbes Group Inc.
21 East Victoria Street, Suite 200
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

AGENT:
Laurel Perez/Heidi Jones
Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services
800 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
5. PROJECT LOCATION: 600 Pine Avenue

6. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The application requests approval of an Ordinance Amendment (OA) and a Development Plan Revision (DP RV) for ATK Space Systems (ATK). The OA proposes that the City amend the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance (GGMO) to exempt the proposed project from its requirements. The development plan revision includes a proposal to construct a clean room and office addition located at 600 Pine Avenue. The property has a General Plan land use designation of Business Park, a zoning designation of M-RP Industrial Research Park and is within the Goleta Old Town Redevelopment Area overlay. It should be noted that the City is currently processing an extension to Ekwill St., which is projected to encroach into, approximately, the northern 100-feet of the project site. Specific elements of proposed project include the following:

Ordinance Amendment (08-157-OA):
The proposal includes a request to amend the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance (GGMO) to exempt the project from its provisions subject to the condition that the property owner execute and deliver and Irrevocable Offer to Dedicate the right of way for the extension of Ekwill Street.
Development Plan Revision (08-157-DP RV01):
The property includes a 59,535-square foot 28.25-foot tall research and
development building, consisting of a 42,875-square foot first-floor and a 16,660-
square foot second-floor mezzanine, a 475-square foot detached masonry
building, an 875-square foot storage building, an 850 square foot storage building
a 2,500-square foot mechanical yard, two existing liquid nitrogen tanks, 165
automobile parking spaces, 3 loading zones, 20 indoor bicycle parking spaces
and 161,350 square feet of landscaping on a 6.58-acre parcel.

The two, existing storage buildings on site located on the southeast corner of the
property were both previously approved under 06-091 -SCD and 07-1 90-SCD.
However; these approvals were never effectuated with a building permit. As
such, these two as-built structures are included as a part of the proposed project.

Also, the two existing liquid nitrogen tanks on-site (one measuring 8 feet in
diameter, 20 feet vertical and one measuring 10 feet in diameter and 25 feet
horizontal - screening is provided by an approximately 10 foot high fence) were
installed without permits. As such, they are also included as a part of the
proposed project.

The applicant proposes to construct a 23,376-square foot manufacturing/office
addition (18,694-square foot first-floor & 4,682-square foot second-floor
mezzanine) on the east end of the building and a 1,650-square foot “airlock”
addition on the north side of the building. The application also includes a parking
lot expansion from 165 to 226 parking spaces including 43 compact stalls
(19.7%) and seven (7) accessible spaces. 218 of these spaces will be
permanent while 8 spaces will be demolished when the future Ekwil extension is
installed by the City. The percentage of compact stalls (19.7%) is based on the
final 218 permanent parking spaces. The existing 3 loading zones and the 20
indoor bicycle parking spaces would be retained.

The resulting 2-story structure would be 84,561 square feet with a maximum
height of 35 feet, consisting of a 63,219-square foot first-floor & a 21,342-square
foot second floor mezzanine. Landscaping would be reduced to 33,994 square
feet and would require the removal of 18 trees (2 Jacaranda, 1 Liquidambar, 2
Lophostemon, 3 Brazilian Pepper, 5 Tipuana, 1 mature Coast Live Oak, 3 oak
tree saplings, and an Island oak tree sapling). However, 78 new trees (25
Jacaranda/Purple-Leaf Plum, 45 Australian Willow/Brisbane Box, 10 Coast Live
Oaks, and 8 Queen Palm) and additional shrubs and ground cover are proposed.
Grading would consist of 3,500-cubic yards of cut and 300-cubic yards of fill.
Stormwater would be directed to two detention basins prior to reaching Old San
Jose Creek.
Requested Modifications

The proposed addition would be contained within the required set backs; however, the existing building encroaches into the front-yard (west) setback and parking encroaches into the setbacks in the front-yard (west), sideyard (south) and rear yard (east). With the future Ekwill extension, additional setback encroachments into the newly created secondary front yard (north) along the Ekwill extension will occur. These future encroachments include: northwesterly portions of the existing building and existing and proposed parking located on the north side of the parking lot. Therefore, we are requesting a modification to the setback requirements for the existing building and proposed parking.

The future Ekwill extension would reduce the net parcel size, essentially, increasing the site building coverage and reducing landscape coverage. The Zoning Ordinance requires landscape coverage of 30%. With the proposed Ekwill extension, a modification will be required to allow landscape coverage to be 16.5%.

7. **APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:** None.
8. SITE INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Land Use Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Ordinance, Zone District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present Use and Development


Surrounding Uses/Zoning

- North: Old San Jose Creek, University Mobile Home Park and Research/Manufacturing (DR-20 and M-RP Industrial Research Park, respectively)
- South: General Industrial (M-1 Light Industry)
- East: Agriculture (C-V Regional/Visitor Serving Commercial)
- West: Pine Avenue, United Parcel Service, and General Industrial (M-RP and M-1 Light Industry, respectfully)

Access

- Existing: Two driveways off of Pine Avenue: one is a two-way driveway and the other is a one-way driveway.
- Proposed: Two, one-way access driveways off of Pine Avenue

Utilities & Public Services

- Water Supply: Goleta Water District
- Sewage: Goleta Sanitary District
- Fire: SB County, Fire Station 12
- School Districts: N/A

9. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Slope/Topography

The project site is relatively flat with slight surface drainage to the south for an overall slope of less than 1% across the property.

Fauna and Flora

The property is bounded by Old San Jose creek on the northern edge of the property, and an undeveloped field is located on the property between the existing parking lot and Old San Jose Creek (reference Figure 1 below). The developed portion of the site contains ornamental trees, shrubs and turfgrass. The undeveloped portion of the site contains cottonwood riparian woodland, locust riparian woodland, arroyo willow riparian
woodland, and nonnative grassland/ruderal (Watershed Environmental Biological Analysis, October 9, 2008).

Figure 1

Archaeological Sites
The Phase I Archaeological Investigation for the site prepared by David Stone, M.A., RPA of Dudek (October 2008) concludes that no prehistoric or cultural materials were identified within any of the proposed development areas.

Surface Water Bodies
The existing drainage currently flows into two different areas. The improved area north of the building flows into an existing storm drain system and outlets into Old San Jose Creek. This drainage is the relic channel for San Jose Creek and flows in a west-to-east direction. This channel was the historic creek channel prior to the creek being realigned and channelized to its current location adjacent to (west of) Ward Memorial Boulevard. The old creek channel currently receives surface water runoff from urban areas of Goleta and flows ephemerally (during and immediately after rainfall events) into the current San Jose Creek channel via a combination of surface channels and buried storm drain pipes. Old San Jose Creek is not a USGS blue-line stream and is not mapped by the City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Conservation
Element Figure 4-1 as a creek (Watershed Environmental Biological Analysis, October 9, 2008). The southern portion of the site is collected by inlets and transported into and underground sump pump. (Preliminary Drainage Analysis for ATK Space Systems, Penfield & Smith, August, 2008).

Surrounding Land Uses
The project site is bordered north by Old San Jose Creek, University Mobile Home Park and industrial/manufacturing uses, on the south by general industrial uses, on the east by an agricultural use and on the west by Pine Avenue, and a general industrial use (United Parcel Service).

Existing Structures
The property is currently developed with a 59,535-square foot research and development building, a 540-square foot detached masonry utility building, a 2,500-square foot mechanical yard.

10. 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
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
11. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

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

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

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

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

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier environmental document, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project and that a subsequent document containing updated and/or site specific information should be prepared pursuant to CEQA Sections 15162/15163/15164.

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

[Signature]
Patricia S. Miller, Manager
Current Planning Division

[Signature]
Date

20 January 2009
12. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

(a) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including project specific, cumulative, construction, operational, onsite, offsite, direct, and indirect impacts. The explanation of each issue should identify the existing setting, any applicable threshold of significance, impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impact statement.

(b) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact.” The discussion must be supported by appropriate information sources. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to requests such as the proposed project.

(c) The checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is: Potentially Significant, Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated, Less than Significant, or No Impact.

(d) A “Potentially Significant” response is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant” entries when the determination is made, then an EIR is required.

(e) A “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” response is appropriate where such incorporation of mitigation would reduce a potentially significant impact to a less than significant level. If there are one or more “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” entries when the determination is made, then a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared.

(f) Supporting Information Sources: References and sources should be attached, including but not limited to, reference documents, special studies, other environmental documents, and/or individuals contacted.
13. 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 surrounded by a mix of residential, general industrial, industrial/manufacturing and agricultural uses. Surrounding structures range from one to two stories, and this area of the City does not exhibit any particular architectural theme. The setbacks of the developed portion of the property are lined with short hedges and trees, which contribute to the screening Pine Avenue and neighboring properties from the development on site.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant Aesthetic impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, the City’s Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual instructs the project evaluator to assess visual/aesthetic impacts through a two step process. First, the visual resources of the project site must be evaluated including the physical attributes of the site, its visual uniqueness, and its relative visibility from public viewing areas. Of particular concern are visibility from coastal and mountain areas, as well as its visibility from the urban fringe and travel corridors. Secondly, the potential impact of the project on visual resources located onsite and on views in the project vicinity which may be partially or wholly obstructed must be determined. This step includes an evaluation of the project’s consistency with City and State policies on the protection of visual resources.
Project Specific Impacts

a) Although more expansive views of the surrounding area from Pine Avenue are limited due to existing development and landscaping in the vicinity of the project site, views of the Santa Ynez Mountains are available from many vantage points in the area including from the front of the project site along Pine Avenue. Furthermore, development of the vacant portion of the property could obstruct views of the existing agricultural use on the adjacent property to the east. However, that property is designated and zoned as Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial and Visitor Serving, respectfully. As currently proposed, the vacant portion of the site would be developed with a parking lot and associated landscaping and would provide an approximately 130-foot buffer from the northern property line. This buffer could provide continued views of the agricultural lands, however obstructed. As such, project impacts to scenic vistas are potentially significant.

b) The proposed project does not lie within, or affect any views from, a Scenic Highway as designated by the State of California. As such, the project would not result in any impacts on scenic resources within a Scenic Highway.

c) Existing development surrounding the project site is comprised of manufacturing/industrial buildings of both one (1) and two (2) stories, a mobile home park, and an agricultural use. The proposed addition would have a maximum height of 35-feet. This proposed height would meet the maximum height allowed the M-RP zoning designation height of 35-feet as well as the Business Park land use designation’s recommended height, also 35-feet. Moreover, the project includes architectural detailing that will blend the proposed additions into the existing architectural theme of the existing building. This includes use of the same materials and colors for the proposed additions, and the use of parapet walls to match the existing parapet wall. If the proposed additions are not built in conformance with the existing project description, they could be visually obtrusive and create an adverse visual impact on the visual character and quality of both the project site as well as the surrounding neighborhood. Such visual impacts are considered potentially significant.

Project landscaping is an integral component of any development proposal to ensure minimization of adverse visual impacts and effects on neighborhood compatibility. The submitted preliminary landscape plan includes perimeter and parking area landscaping covering 16.5% of the lot area; hence, a modification would be required as the zoning ordinance required amount of landscaping is 30% of the lot area. If the proposed modification is not approved, and if the additions are not built in conformance with the existing project description, the proposed project could be visually obtrusive and create an adverse visual impact on the visual character and quality of both the project site as well as the
surrounding neighborhood. Such visual impacts are considered potentially significant.

Signage is also an important element of development projects. The proposed project is an expansion of an existing use via additions to an existing building occupied by ATK. ATK has two existing signs, 1) a non-illuminated wall sign on the front of the existing building, and 2) a monument sign along the property’s Pine Avenue frontage. The City’s current sign regulations (Article I, Chapter 35 of the Municipal Code) requires that signs in commercial and industrial districts are subject to the limitations and restrictions set forth in Section 35-17 to ensure that all such signage is designed to “harmonize by regulations the legitimate private purpose of signs; that is, the identification and promotion of the seller to the buyer, with the public purpose of public safety, health, and welfare (Section 35-2). Signage that is not carefully designed and located can have a significant adverse effect on the visual quality of an area or neighborhood. Since the project does not include a request for any additional signage or changes to the existing sign, the project does not create a visual impact related to signage.

Finally, the project may require both roof mounted heating, ventilating and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment as well as ground mounted utility connections. If not properly screened and/or integrated into the project design and landscaping plan, such roof-mounted equipment and above ground utility connections can be visually obtrusive and create an adverse visual impact on the visual character and quality of both the project site as well as the surrounding neighborhood. Such visual impacts are considered potentially significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Due to the project specific visual impacts on scenic views, night lighting, and the visual character of the surrounding area, project contributions to cumulative visual/aesthetic impacts would also considered to be potentially significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall be resubmitted for Preliminary/Final Review by DRB consisting of complete site plan, architectural floor plans, exterior elevations and landscape plans. The preliminary development plans shall be revised to address the issues raised by DRB in its Conceptual Review and shall also incorporate all applicable mitigation measures/conditions of approval. Plan Requirements & Timing: The preliminary development plans shall be revised and resubmitted to DRB for review and approval prior to issuance of a Land Use Permit (“LUP”) for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall withhold issuance of an LUP pending approval of the final development plans by DRB. City staff shall verify that the project is
constructed per the final architectural plans approved by DRB prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy.

2. The applicant shall prepare detailed landscape and irrigation plans for the project that identifies the following:

   a. Type of irrigation proposed;
   b. All existing and proposed trees, shrubs, and groundcovers by species;
   c. Size of all planting materials including trees; and
   d. Location of all planting materials.

The project landscaping shall consist of drought-tolerant native and/or Mediterranean type species which adequately complement the project design and integrate the site with surrounding land uses. Landscaping shall be compatible with the character of the surroundings, the architectural style of the structure and shall be adjusted necessary to: (i) provide adequate vehicle stopping sight distance at all driveway entrances (as determined by the City of Goleta); (ii) visually screen parking areas from street view to the maximum extent reasonable; and (iii) screen, through plantings and other features, loading and services areas of the proposed addition and minimize view blockages of the Santa Ynez mountains and the existing agricultural use to the east. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** The landscape plans shall be revised and resubmitted for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. The plans shall first be submitted for review by staff of the City of Goleta, and following approval, the plans shall be submitted for Preliminary/Final Approval by DRB. All elements of the final landscape plan, including irrigation improvements, shall be installed prior to any occupancy clearance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall withhold issuance of an LUP pending Final Approval of the landscape plans by DRB. City staff shall also field verify installation of all landscaping and irrigation system improvements per the approved final landscape plan prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy for the project.

3. To ensure installation and long-term maintenance of the approved landscape plans, the applicant shall enter into an agreement to install required landscaping and water-conserving irrigation systems as well as maintain required landscaping for the life of the project. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** Performance securities for installation and maintenance for at least three (3) years shall be subject to review and approval by City staff. A signed Maintenance Agreement and Performance Securities (in a form and in an amount acceptable to the City) guaranteeing installation of the landscaping and maintenance thereafter for a period of at least three years, shall be furnished by the applicant for review and approval by the City prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.
Monitoring: City staff shall photo document installation prior to occupancy clearance and shall check maintenance as needed. Release of any performance security requires City staff signature.

4. All exterior night lighting shall be of low intensity/low glare design, and shall be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels and the adjacent Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA - Old San Jose Creek riparian corridor). Exterior lighting fixtures shall be kept to the minimum number and intensity needed to ensure the public safety of employees, residents, and visitors to the business park. All upward directed exterior lighting shall be prohibited to protect night sky views of the stars. All exterior lighting fixtures shall be appropriate for the architectural style of the proposed structure and the surrounding area. The applicant shall develop a lighting plan incorporating these requirements and provisions for dimming lights after 11:00 p.m. to the maximum extent practical without compromising public safety. Plan Requirements: The locations of all exterior lighting fixtures and an arrow showing the direction of light being cast by each fixture and the height of the fixtures shall be depicted on the preliminary/final lighting plan and shall be reviewed and approved by DRB and City staff. Timing: The preliminary/final lighting plan shall be reviewed and approved by DRB and City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall inspect all exterior lighting to verify that exterior lighting fixtures have been installed consistent with their depiction on the final lighting plan.

5. To prevent construction and/or employee trash from blowing offsite, covered refuse/recycling receptacles shall be provided onsite prior to commencement of grading or construction activities. Waste shall be picked up weekly or more frequently as directed by City staff. Plan Requirements & Timing: Prior to issuance of any LUP for the project, the applicant shall designate and provide to City staff the name and phone number of a contact person(s) to monitor construction trash/waste and organize a clean-up crew. Additional covered receptacles shall be provided as determined necessary by City staff. This requirement shall be noted on all plans. Trash control shall occur throughout all grading and construction activities.

Monitoring: City staff shall inspect periodically throughout grading and construction activities to verify compliance.

6. The applicant shall submit a composite utility plan for DRB and City staff Preliminary/Final Review. All external/roof mounted mechanical equipment on the existing building and proposed additions (including HVAC condensers, switch boxes, etc.) shall be included on all building plans and shall be designed to be integrated into the structure and/or screened from public view in a manner
deemed acceptable to the City. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** Detailed plans showing all external/roof mounted mechanical equipment shall be submitted for review by DRB and City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify installation of all external/roof mounted mechanical equipment per the approved plans prior to the approval of any certificate of occupancy.

7. All new utility service connections and above-ground mounted equipment such as backflow devices, etc, shall be shall be screened from public view, not within the public right-of-way and painted in a soft earth-tone color(s) (red is prohibited) so as to blend in with the project. Screening may include a combination of landscaping and/or masonry or lattice walls. Whenever possible and deemed appropriate by City staff, utility transformers shall be placed in underground vaults. All gas and electrical meters shall be concealed and/or painted to match the building. All gas, electrical, backflow prevention devices and communications equipment shall be completely concealed in an enclosed portion of the building, on top of the building, or within a screened utility area. All transformers and vaults that must be located within the right-of-way shall be installed below grade unless otherwise approved by the City, and then must be completely screened from view. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** The site and building plans submitted for DRB Preliminary/Final Review shall identify the type, location, size, and number of utility connections and above-ground mounted equipment as well as how such equipment would be screened from public view and the color(s) that it would be painted so as to blend in with the project and surrounding area.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify that all above-ground utility connections and equipment is installed, screened, and painted per the approved plans.

8. All new utilities on site shall be installed underground. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** All composite utility plans for the project shall note this undergrounding requirement and shall be submitted for City staff review and approval prior to and as a condition precedent to issuance of any LUP for the project.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance in the field prior to occupancy clearance.

**Residual Impact**

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific and project contributions to cumulative Aesthetic impacts would be considered less than significant.
### AGRICULTURAL 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. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Setting

The project site is located within a developed area of Old Town Goleta, and a portion of the site has been developed for many years (the initial building on site was approved in 1973). The vacant portion of the site has been called out in the City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (GP/CLUP FEIR) as fallow agricultural land containing prime agricultural soils. The last known agricultural use on this portion of the property occurred between 1970 and 1974 (based upon aerial imagery). The adjacent site to the east of the project site contains an existing agricultural use and prime soils. The City's GP/CLUP designates this adjacent property Visitor Serving and the property has a zoning designation of Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial.

### Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact to Agricultural Resources would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, a project may pose a significant environmental effect on agricultural resources if it conflicts with adopted environmental plans and goals of the City or converts prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use or impairs the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land.
Project Specific Impacts

a-b) The proposed project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as mapped by the California Resources Agency. The maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency indicate that the entirety of the property is urban and built-up land (vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and is less than 40 acres in size). There are no agriculturally zoned properties or properties under a Williamson contract in the vicinity of the project site (the adjacent property to the east with an existing agricultural use is zoned and designated Visitor Serving). As such, the proposed project poses no impacts related to the conversion of farmland mapped by the California Resources Agency.

c) The proposed project would result in the conversion of 2.37-acres of land containing prime soils (City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR) to a non-agricultural use.

The City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds Manual states that, as a general guideline, an agricultural parcel of land should be considered viable if it is of sufficient size and capacity to support an agricultural enterprise independent of any other parcel. To qualify as agriculturally viable, the area of land in question need only be of sufficient size and/or productive capability to be economically attractive to an agricultural lessee. This productivity standard should take into consideration the cultural practices and leasehold production units in the area, as well as soil type and water availability.

This property does contain Class II, prime soils and is partially surrounded by agriculture/open space; however, the adjacent property with the agricultural use is zoned and designated as Visitor Serving. Also, the ATK property is less than five (5) acres, has not been farmed since the 1970’s, is part of an already developed research/manufacturing site, is zoned M-RP Industrial Research Park and designated Business Park, cannot qualify for an agricultural preserve, and is not a part of any combined farming operations. Moreover, this parcel would not qualify for the Goleta Water District’s agricultural water rate as it is less than 3-acres and not used exclusively for agricultural purposes (Section 1.04.020 Water service classifications, GWD code). As such, this property cannot be considered viable agricultural land and therefore, the project presents less than significant impacts to the conversion of farmland.

Cumulative Impacts

Viable agricultural land is becoming scarcer and scarcer in California, and the South Coast is one of the most important regions economically and physically for agricultural production in the State. The competing growth pressures in the region have led to rapid
conversion of agricultural lands in the City, County and throughout the South Coast. The build out of the GP/CLUP would result in the conversion of approximately 29 acres of important farmland that are either currently in active agricultural productions or may be able to support agricultural operations, the latter including the undeveloped portion of the project site. However, as stated above, this property is not agriculturally viable, and the GP/CLUP FEIR has already brought the level of significance of the conversion of this (and other) agricultural lands within the City to below a level of significance. Therefore, cumulative impacts are less than significant.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are identified.

**Residual Impact**

Residual project specific and project contributions to cumulative Agricultural Resources impacts would be considered less than significant.
### AIR QUALITY

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

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

**Greenhouse Gases**

| f. Emissions equivalent to or greater than 25,000 metric tons of CO₂ from both stationary and mobile sources during long-term operations. |                   |                        |           |                |

### Existing Setting: Criteria Pollutants

To protect human health, State and Federal air quality standards have been established for 11 pollutants. According to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD), Santa Barbara County is currently considered in attainment of the federal eight-hour ozone standard, and in attainment of the state one-hour ozone standard. The County does not meet the state eight-hour ozone standard or the state standard for particulate matter less than ten microns in diameter (PM₁₀); and does meet the federal PM₁₀ standard. There is not yet enough data to determine the attainment status for the state standard for particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM₂.₅), although the County has been designated as "unclassifiable/Attainment" by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the federal 24-hour PM₂.₅ standard (Molly Pearson, SBCAPCD, 01/05/09 comment letter on the DMND for this project).

Ozone air pollution is formed when nitrogen oxides (NOₓ) and reactive organic compounds (ROCs) react in the presence of sunlight. According to the APCD, the major sources of ozone precursor emissions in Santa Barbara County are motor vehicles, the petroleum industry, and solvent usage (paints, consumer products, and certain industrial processes). Sources of PM₁₀ include grading, demolition, agricultural tilling, road dust, mineral quarries, and vehicle exhaust.
Existing Setting: Global Climate Change/Greenhouse Gases
Emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) accumulate in the atmosphere, where these gases trap heat near the Earth’s surface by absorbing infrared radiation. This effect causes global warming and climate change, with adverse impacts on humans and the environment. These impacts stem from reduced water supplies in some areas, ecological changes that threaten some species, reduced agricultural productivity in some areas, increased coastal flooding, and other effects.

GHGs include water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. Combustion of fossil fuels constitutes the primary source of GHGs. Projects can directly release GHGs, or indirectly increase GHGs by increasing combustion of fossil fuels via increased energy consumption or vehicular trips. Some projects can also exacerbate climate change by significantly reducing Albedo or sequestration of carbon dioxide (i.e., removal of many trees). California emitted 484 million metric tons of GHGs in 2004 (California Air Resources Board, California 1990 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Level and 2020 Emissions Limit, November, 2007: p.7).

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32, Health and Safety Code, §§ 38500 et. seq.) requires reduction of California’s GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. While neither the California Air Resources Board (CARB) nor the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District has estimated CEQA criteria or threshold for GHGS, CARB has established California’s 1990 level at 427 million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent emissions.

Thresholds of Significance: Criteria Pollutants

A significant Air Quality impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The City’s Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual has identified a long term quantitative emission threshold of significance of 25 pounds/day (PPD) for ozone precursors nitrogen oxides (NOₓ) and reactive organic gases (ROGs). In addition, the City’s thresholds establish criteria for conducting carbon monoxide (CO) emission modeling. However, the Santa Barbara County APCD has indicated that due to the relatively low background ambient CO levels in Santa Barbara County, localized CO impacts associated with traffic at congested intersections are not expected to exceed the CO health-related air quality standards. As a result, “hotspot” analyses are not required anymore. (Vijaya Jammalamadaka, SBCAPCD, 08/05/08)

Short term thresholds for NOₓ and ROG emissions have not been established by the City. Under prior modeling by the County of Santa Barbara, such emissions were determined to account for only 6% of total NOₓ and ROG emissions. However, due to the fact that Santa Barbara County is not in compliance with State standards for
airborne particulate matter (PM$_{10}$), construction generated fugitive dust (50% of total dust) is subject to the City’s standard dust mitigation requirements.

Thresholds of Significance: Global Climate Change/Greenhouse Gases

Currently, neither the State of California nor the City of Goleta has established CEQA significance thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions. However, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) has issued a Technical Advisory titled CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review (dated June 19, 2008, available at the OPR website, www.opr.ca.gov). This advisory provides guidance to land use agencies in the interim period, until the state CEQA Guidelines are revised. The advisory states on page 4, in the third paragraph, “Public agencies are encouraged but not required to adopt thresholds of significance for environmental impacts. Even in the absence of clearly defined thresholds for GHG emissions, the law requires that such emissions from CEQA projects must be disclosed and mitigated to the extent feasible whenever the lead agency determines that the project contributes to a significant, cumulative climate change impact.” Furthermore, the advisory document indicates in the third bullet item on page 6 that “in the absence of regulatory standards for GHG emissions or other scientific data to clearly define what constitutes a ‘significant impact’, individual lead agencies may undertake a project-by-project analysis, consistent with available guidance and current CEQA practice.”

The City’s methodology to address Global Climate Change in CEQA documents is evolving. The current methodology entails three steps: (1) quantification of the project’s GHG emissions, or provide a qualified discussion where quantification is not yet feasible, (2) identification of opportunities to reduce the project’s GHG emissions, and (3) identification of global climate change impacts on the project, such as increased incidence of wildfires, increased bluff erosion, and rising sea levels. The first two steps are addressed below; while step 3 is addressed in the Geology/Soils, Hydrology/Water Quality, and Public Services sections of this document.

Furthermore, the City has reviewed much of the available subject analysis including the CAPCOA paper on CEQA and climate change and the California League of Cities Review of SB 375. Based on this review, the City believes the intent of the stakeholder agencies at this time is to target the larger sources of GHG emissions rather than every potential project with regards to CEQA analysis and subsequent impact discussion. To that end, until a good threshold is determined, the City believes it is safe to say that any project with GHG emissions (inclusive of construction and operational emissions as estimated by APCD’s latest URBEMIS software program – URBEMIS 2007, Version 9.2.4) greater than the GHG reporting requirement required under ARB Resolution 07-54 (25,000 metric tons or more of CO$_2$ equivalent per year) should be considered
significant. Projects below these levels remain unclassifiable until more evidence becomes available.

Project Specific Impacts

Short Term Construction Impacts

a-d) Short term air quality impacts generally occur during project grading. Preliminary earthwork quantities are estimated at 3,500 yd$^3$ of cut and 300 yd$^3$ of fill (3,200 yd$^3$ of excess fill material to be removed from the site). As a result of this much proposed grading, and the air basin’s current non-attainment of State PM$_{10}$ standards, any project generated fugitive dust would be considered to pose a potentially significant air quality impact associated with PM$_{10}$ emissions.

Although the City has not established short-term quantitative thresholds for NO$_x$ and ROGs emissions generated by construction equipment, fine particulate emissions from diesel equipment exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the State of California. As such, project specific impacts on air quality standards or existing air quality violations as well as project contributions to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations in the City as a result of construction activities would be considered potentially significant.

e) Construction of a new parking lot would require application of aggregate concrete (AC aka asphalt) that could create objectionable odors. Such odors would be temporary and localized. Because the City has no adopted thresholds of significance for such impacts, odors associated with AC paving would be considered adverse but not significant. However, APCD Rule 339, a prohibitory rule governing the application of cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials in the County, would apply to all project paving activities. Therefore, impacts related to objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people are considered potentially significant.

f) The proposed project would generate GHGs including water vapor, CO$_2$ and fluorocarbons which absorb infrared radiation in the atmosphere. Because different GHGs have varying levels of heat absorption, CO$_2$ is commonly used as a “reference gas” to relate the amount of heat absorbed to the level of GHGs emitted. As such, project generated levels of CO$_2$ would be considered the project’s contribution to cumulative GHGs and global climate change. Using URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4 air quality modeling software, it is anticipated that project generated CO$_2$ emission levels (vehicular & source) would be 2,573.86 pounds-per-day (PPD) or 426.13 metric tons per year, and construction CO$_2$

---

1 California Air Resources Board Resolution 07-54 establishes 25,000 metric tons of GHG emissions as the threshold for identifying the largest stationary emission sources in California for purposes of requiring the annual reporting of emissions. This threshold is just over 0.005% of California’s total inventory of GHG emissions for 2004.
emissions would be 6,144.53 PPD or 1,017.3 metric tons per year. As both the project and construction generated levels of CO\textsubscript{2} would be less than the City's interim threshold for GHG's of 25,000 metric tons per year threshold, the project's contribution to GHG emissions is not classifiable.

**Long Term Operational Impacts**

a-e) Traffic from future use of the proposed clean room and office space would lead to a corresponding increase in vehicular emissions in the area. To determine whether vehicular emissions resulting the proposed project would likely exceed the City's significance threshold of 25 PPD for stationary and mobile sources combined of reactive organic gases (ROGs) or nitrous oxides (NO\textsubscript{x}), the APCD Land Use Screening Table (June 2008) was consulted. Based on such screening criteria, the proposed project falls below the thresholds identified in the table based on project size. APCD's latest URBEMIS software program (URBEMIS 2007, Version 9.2.4) was also used to calculate long term emissions from both project generated motor vehicle trips and stationary emissions from the project itself (e.g. water heaters, space heaters, landscape maintenance, consumer products, architectural coatings, etc). Using this air quality modeling software (using trip generation numbers from the project's traffic study – Associated Transportation Engineers 10/21/08) it is estimated that project generated vehicular emissions would be approximately 2.20 PPD of ROGs and 2.74 PPD NO\textsubscript{x}, while stationary emissions would be 0.46 PPD of ROGs, and 0.93 PPD of NO\textsubscript{x} for a total estimated project generated air emission load of 2.66 PPD of ROGs and 3.67 PPD of NO\textsubscript{x}, well below the 25 PPD threshold for either ozone precursor. Furthermore, due to the relatively low background ambient CO levels in Santa Barbara County, localized CO impacts associated with traffic at congested intersections are not expected to exceed the CO health-related air quality standards. Therefore, criteria pollutant project impacts are considered less than significant.

f) As stated above in the project specific air quality impacts, the significance of the proposed project's contribution to long term operational impacts to global GHG emissions and thereby climate change, pursuant to CEQA, cannot be classified as the project would emit less than the City's interim significance threshold for GHG's of 25,000 metric tons per year.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Per the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual*, a project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considered significant if the project's total emissions of either NO\textsubscript{x} or ROG exceed the long term threshold of 25 PPD. The proposed project's contribution to overall emissions associated with buildout of the new clean room and office building would be less than this threshold, and therefore the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts involving NO\textsubscript{x} and ROC would be
considered less than significant. However, as noted above, the project’s contribution to cumulative PM$_{10}$ emissions would be considered potentially significant as a result of the area’s current non-attainment status regarding the State standard.

As stated above in the project specific air quality impacts, the significance of the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative global GHG emissions and thereby climate change, pursuant to CEQA, cannot be classified as the project would emit less than the City’s interim significance threshold for GHG’s of 25,000 metric tons per year.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

1. If the construction site is graded and left undeveloped for over four weeks, the applicant shall employ the following methods immediately to inhibit dust generation:

   a) Seeding and watering to revegetate graded areas; and/or
   b) Spreading of soil binders; and/or
   c) Any other methods deemed appropriate by City staff.

**Plan Requirements & Timing:** These requirements shall be noted on all plans submitted for issuance of any LUP for the project.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance as well as contact the designated monitor as necessary to ensure compliance with dust control measures.

2. Dust generated by construction activities shall be kept to a minimum with a goal of retaining dust on the site. The following dust control measures listed below shall be implemented by the contractor/builder:

   a. During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems are to be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day’s activities cease.
   b. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the later morning and after work is completed for the day and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.
   c. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.

The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering as necessary to prevent transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods
when work may not be in progress. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** All of the aforementioned requirements shall be noted on all plans submitted for issuance of any LUP for the project. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to City staff and the APCD and shall be posted in three locations along the project site's perimeter for the duration of grading and construction activities.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance as well as contact the designated monitor as necessary to ensure compliance with dust control measures.

3. During all project grading and hauling, construction contracts must specify that construction contractors shall adhere to the requirements listed below to reduce emissions of ozone precursors and particulate emissions from diesel exhaust:

   a. All portable diesel-powered construction equipment shall be registered with the state's portable equipment registration program OR shall obtain an APCD permit.
   b. Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.
   c. Diesel construction equipment meeting the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used. Equipment meeting CARB Tier 2 or higher emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
   d. Other diesel construction equipment, which does not meet CARB standards, shall be equipped with two to four degree engine timing retard or pre-combustion chamber engines. Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California shall be installed.
   e. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
   f. All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.
   g. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.
   h. The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
   i. Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

**Plan Requirements & Timing:** The construction emission requirements shall be printed all plans submitted for any LUP, building, or grading permits.
Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance with requirements for printing the aforementioned construction emission requirements on all plans submitted for any LUP, building, or grading permits. APCD inspectors shall verify compliance in the field.

4. Idling of diesel trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to a maximum of five (5) minutes. In addition, drivers of diesel trucks shall not use diesel-fueled auxiliary power units for more than five (5) minutes to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on the vehicle equipped with a sleeper berth, at any location. Plan Requirements & Timing: The aforementioned restrictions of diesel truck idling shall be printed on all plans submitted for any LUP, building, or grading permits.

Monitoring: City staff shall monitor in the field for compliance.

5. Soils stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin. Gravel pads must be installed at the access points to the construction site to minimize tracking of mud on to public roads. Plan Requirements & Timing: All of the aforementioned requirements shall be noted on all plans submitted for issuance of any LUP for the project. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to City staff and the APCD and shall be posted in three locations along the project site's perimeter for the duration of grading and construction activities.

Monitoring: City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance as well as contact the designated monitor as necessary to ensure compliance with dust control measures.

Recommended Mitigation Measures

6. The following energy-conserving techniques, that substantially exceed the minimum Title 24 energy conservation requirements, shall be incorporated unless the applicant demonstrates their infeasibility to the satisfaction of City of Goleta staff:

a) Use of water-based paint on exterior surfaces;
b) Use of passive solar cooling/heating;
c) Use of energy efficient appliances;
d) Use of natural lighting;
e) Installation of energy efficient lighting;
f) Use of drought-tolerant native or Mediterranean landscaping subject to Planning and Environmental Services staff and Design Review Board (DRB) approval to shade buildings and parking lots;
g) Encouragement of the use of transit, bicycling, and walking by providing infrastructure to promote their use; 
h) Provision of segregated waste bins for recyclable materials; and

Plan Requirements & Timing: These requirements shall be shown on applicable building plans prior to issuance of any land use permit.

Monitoring: City of Goleta staff shall site inspect for compliance prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.

Residual Impact

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project specific as well as project contributions to cumulative air quality impacts involving ROGs, NOx and PM$_{10}$ would be considered less than significant. Project contributions to GHG emissions, would be reduced through implementation of the recommended mitigation measures noted above.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

Existing Setting

The subject site is occupied by a manufacturing/industrial use building, a detached masonry building, a mechanical yard, and associated parking, miscellaneous paving, and landscaping. The property contains 5 vegetation types: 1) cottonwood riparian woodland, 2) locust riparian woodland, 3) arroyo willow riparian woodland, 4) nonnative grassland/ruderal, and 5) ornamental landscaping trees, shrubs, and turf grass. (Watershed Environmental, Inc 10/09/08)

The site is nearly level, and a drainage channel known as Old San Jose Creek is located along the northern property line. This drainage is the relic channel for San Jose Creek and flows in a west-to-east direction. This channel was the historical creek
channel prior to the creek being realigned and channelized to its current location adjacent to (west of) Ward Memorial Boulevard. The old creek channel currently receives surface water runoff from urban areas of Goleta and flows ephemerally (during and immediately after rainfall events) into the current San Jose Creek channel via a combination of surface channels and buried storm drain pipes. Old San Jose Creek is not a USGS blue-line stream and is not mapped by the General Plan's Conservation Element (Figure 4-1) as a creek. However, the Old San Jose Creek channel, which extends northeasterly from Kellogg Way through the northern portion of the ATK property and continues south toward the airport, is mapped as ESHA due to the presence of native and nonnative riparian vegetation. This area includes approximately 39,840-square feet of the vacant portion of the ATK site. (Watershed Environmental, Inc 10/09/08)

A total of 62 different species of plants were observed on the property. Approximately 74 percent of the species present are nonnative and 26 percent are native. The number of nonnative plant species is higher than normal, but reflects the fact that the site is in the middle of an urban environment and most of the property has been landscaped with nonnative ornamental vegetation. Habitat present in the undeveloped portion of the property includes native and nonnative riparian woodlands and nonnative grassland/ruderal vegetation. The riparian habitat is significantly degraded by the presence of nonnative vegetation; urban pollution (trash, noise, lighting); and lack of connectivity to any high-quality riparian or other native habitat. The riparian habitat on the property does, however, provide shelter for roosting and nesting birds and shelter for small mammals. (Watershed Environmental, Inc 10/09/08)

Wildlife use of the nonnative grassland habitat is limited to small, burrowing mammals, foraging by raptors, and seed- and insect-eating birds. The lack of tree and shrub cover within the grasslands and periodic disturbance (i.e., mowing and use of the volleyball court) preclude wildlife from establishing residence or breeding/bird nesting in these grasslands. Wildlife use is limited to a few relatively common species that are adapted to an urban environment and can tolerate high levels of noise, night lighting, and human disturbance. The only wildlife species observed during the performance of the survey were common birds (Anna's hummingbird, northern mockingbird, house finch, yellow-rumped warbler, rock dove, American crow, black phoebe, Say's Phoebe, red-tailed hawk, scrub jay, California towhee, and turkey vulture); western fence lizards; and pocket gophers. Other species not observed but expected to occur include raccoon, Virginia opossum, striped and spotted skunks, black rat, domestic and feral cats and dogs, alligator lizards, and Pacific tree frogs. (Watershed Environmental, Inc 10/09/08)

The only species records with a potential to occur in the project area are: Coulter's saltbush (Atriplex coulteri), southern tarplant (Centromadia parryi ssp. australis), monarch butterfly (Danaus plexippus) winter aggregation sites, raptors, the least Bell's vireo and tidewater goby. There are two known monarch butterfly aggregation (roosting) sites within one mile of the property located in eucalyptus groves adjacent to Atascadero Creek (approximately 2,500-feet south of the project site) and a eucalyptus
grove along San Jose Creek on the north side of the 101 Freeway (approximately 4,000-feet north of the project site). While there are groves of eucalyptus trees growing along the banks of Old San Jose Creek east and west of the 600 Pine Avenue property, these are not known to serve as roosting sites for overwintering monarch butterflies. (Watershed Environmental, Inc 10/09/08)

There are also two known raptor nest sites in the project vicinity, both within the Old San Jose Creek channel. One is a red-tailed hawk nest that was mapped by the City in 2006; it lies approximately 500-feet east of the project site in a grove of eucalyptus. The other is a red-tailed hawk nest identified by Watershed Environmental in 2005 in the same grove approximately 75-feet from the northeast corner of the 600 Pine Avenue property. (Watershed Environmental, Inc; 10/09/08)

A survey was also conducted for vernal pool branchiopod species (fairy shrimp). It was determined that there is no potential for the existence of fairy shrimp at this location, as no suitable habitat exists in or adjacent to the area where development is proposed. The majority of the proposed project would occur on land that is already developed (asphalt parking lots and existing structures). The only portion of the project that would occur in an undeveloped area is the expansion of 41,468 SF (0.95 acres) of new asphalt parking into an area that currently supports annual grassland habitat. This area is relatively flat, has no depressions (or swales, tire ruts, earthen slumps, etc), and the soil consists of Elder Sandy Loam (EaA), which is classified by the Soil Conservation Service as being well drained with moderate permeability, and which is not underlain by hardpan or impermeable layer. The proposed development area lacks the properties necessary for water to pond, pools to form, or standing water to persist for the minimum duration required (3 weeks) to support vernal pool branchiopods (Watershed Environmental, Inc; 1/15/09).

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. Additionally, per the City’s Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual a project would pose a significant environmental impact(s) on biological resources in any of the following would result from project implementation:

a) A conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located;
b) Substantial effect on a rare or endangered plant or animal species;
c) Substantial interference with the movement of any migratory or resident fish or wildlife species;
d) Substantial diminishment of habitat for fish, wildlife, or plants.
Project Specific Impacts

a) The loss of 41,468-square feet of nonnative grassland/ruderal vegetation will occur during the construction of the parking lot, and will cause wildlife that forage in this area to relocate to adjacent areas not affected by construction. It will also likely result in the loss of a few small burrowing mammals (i.e., gopher, California vole, and ground squirrel). Since there are no special-status species in this habitat and the wildlife species that use it for foraging are generalists adapted to a variety of habitats, including agricultural fields, vacant lots, and landscaped areas, the long-term effect to wildlife resulting from the conversion of this nonnative grassland/ruderal vegetation to asphalt pavement is considered to be less than significant. (Watershed Environmental, Inc 10/09/08)

However, there are two known historic red-tail hawk nests near the 600 Pine Avenue property. These nests are located on the adjacent properties to the east along the Old San Jose Creek drainage. The nearest historic nest is located approximately 75-feet from the northeast corner of the 600 Pine Avenue property. The other is located approximately 500-feet from the northeast corner of 600 Pine Avenue (refer to Figure 3). Raptor nests are protected by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) Code (Section 3503.5, 1992) and by the GP/CLUP Conservation Element Policy CE 8.4. Section 3503.5 states it is “unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the order Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds of prey) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto.” Disturbance that causes nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort is considered a “take” by the CDFG (Watershed Environmental, Inc 10/09/08).

Furthermore, the riparian willows in the Old San Jose Creek corridor could provide nesting habitat for the least Bell’s vireo, a federally listed species, hence, protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act), including section 7, 9 and 10. The Act is administered by the Fish and Wild Service. Section 9 of the Act prohibits the taking of any federally listed endangered or threatened species. Section 3(18) of the Act defines take to mean harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, would, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to engage in any such conduct. Service regulations (50 CFR 17.3) define harm to include significant habitat modifications or degradation which actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding or sheltering. Harassment is defined by the Service as an intentional or negligent action that crates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavioral patterns which include, but are not limited to breeding, feeding, or sheltering (Roger P. Root, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1/07/09).
The GP/CLUP Conservation Element Raptor Nest Protection Policy CE 8.4 requires development to "be designed to provide a 100-foot buffer around active and historical nest sites for protected species or raptors when feasible" and states that if an "active raptor nest site exists on the subject property, whenever feasible no vegetation clearing, grading, construction or other development activity shall be allowed within a 300-foot radius of the nest site during the nesting and fledging seasons." The proposed project does not encroach within the 100-foot wide buffer zone of these raptor nests, but the northeast corner of the new parking area is within 300-foot (radius) of a historic raptor nest (Watershed Environmental, Inc 10/09/08) While no least Bell’s vireo nests were identified in the project’s biological report, if any exist during project construction, impacts to this federally listed species could occur. Hence, such impacts are considered potentially significant.

b) The northern portion of the 600 Pine Avenue property contains three types of riparian woodlands: cottonwood, arroyo willow, and locust. The cottonwood and arroyo willow riparian woodlands contain native tree species and as such are subject to the City’s Native Woodland Protection Policies (Conservation Element 9.1, 9.2, 9.3). The locust riparian woodland contains nonnative locust (Robinia sp.) trees and is not subject to these policies. However, a portion of the new parking lot component of the proposed project would encroach into the required 50-foot buffer of an arroyo willow riparian woodland, and construction equipment could be staged in the required buffer areas. Ephemeral flows in the Old San Jose Creek can attract amphibians, which could potentially be affected by project constructions.

Additionally, construction related sediment could enter Old San Jose Creek. The Old San Jose Creek drains into Goleta Slough, which provides habitat for the federally listed tidewater goby. Fine sediment from construction runoff could degrade tidewater goby habitat and smother tidewater goby eggs. (Roger P. Root, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1/07/09 comment letter for this project’s DMND). Such impacts are considered potentially significant.

c) The proposed project would cover the project site with approximately 41.7% of the lot area with impervious surface. Most of these impervious surfaces would be comprised of a parking lot for employees on site. Runoff from large parking areas is often contaminated with a mix of petroleum products and other pollutants resulting from vehicular use. In addition, tailwater from landscape irrigation is often contaminated with fertilizers, pesticides, fungicides, and herbicides resulting from improper application methods and/or over-application. All such contaminants can pose potentially significant, adverse effects on sensitive riparian systems, surface water quality, and wetlands such as Goleta Slough.
Currently, all stormwater runoff flows into two different areas. The improved area north of the building flows into an existing storm drain system and outlets into Old San Jose Creek. The southern portion of the site is collected by inlets and transported into an underground sump pump. The proposed project would install two detention basins on site and replace the storm drain system along the north side of the site as the existing drainage system is undersized. Such improvements, if properly designed and maintained, can provide for significant runoff filtration which could ensure that stormwater discharged into the City’s storm drain system would not pose a significant threat to water quality in Old San Jose Creek and ultimately Goleta Slough. However, project impacts on surface water quality are considered potentially significant.

In addition, construction activities such as washing of concrete trucks, painting equipment, etc can result in the introduction of significant levels of pollutants into neighboring surface waterbodies. The potential for such activities to affect surface water quality in the area is especially heightened in this instance due to the fact that the project site drains directly into Old San Jose Creek and the City's storm drain system. Such short term impacts would be considered potentially significant.

d) Since the Old San Jose Creek is not a USGS blue-line stream and is not mapped by the GP/CLUP Conservation Element Figure 4-1 as a creek, the Old San Jose Creek is not habitat to any native resident or migratory fish species, and therefore, would not have any effect on the movement of such fish species. As stated above in a), the proposed project, would not have a significant effect on established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites with the exception of excessive exterior night lighting. Hence, the project poses a potentially significant impact to wildlife corridors.

e) The project as currently proposed would require the removal of one mature coast live oak tree (CLO4), three oak tree saplings (CLO1-3), and an Island Oak tree sapling. These trees may have been planted as part of the landscaping of the property or could be volunteers that were allowed to grow. In either case, GP/CLUP Conservation Element Policies 9.4 and 9.5, Tree Protection Standards and Native Tree Mitigation Policies, respectively, apply. These policies stipulate that removal of native trees shall be avoided if possible and that if removal of mature native trees cannot be avoided, replacement trees shall be planted at a 10:1 ratio. Watershed Environmental, Inc 10/09/08). If this mitigation is not properly applied, the project would pose potentially significant impacts related to consistency with the City's tree preservation policies.

f) There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans that either affect the project site or would be in conflict with the proposed
manufacturing/industrial center. Therefore, the proposed project poses no potential to generate such impacts.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Projects that result in potentially significant, project specific biological impacts, are generally considered to also make a potentially significant contribution to corresponding cumulative biological impacts. As such, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant contribution to water quality degradation and the resulting effects on riparian systems and wetlands associated Old San Jose Creek and the Goleta Slough.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

1. A 50-foot wide buffer zone shall be established around the perimeter of the City of Goleta GP/CLUP Figure 4-1 mapped ESHA starting from the outer edge of the riparian canopy (refer to Figure 2 of the Watershed Environmental Biological Report dated 10/09/08). This buffer would need to be reduced to 25-feet around the arroyo willow and locust riparian woodlands. As such, the applicant shall plant native drought-tolerant vegetation at a 2 to 1 ratio along the Old San Jose Creek (within the existing riparian canopy and, to the City’s best estimate, in a location not to interfere with the future Ekwill Street extension) to mitigate the riparian woodland buffer area lost. Nonnative trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation shall be removed from the 50- and 25-foot, respectfully, wide buffer zone. Management, maintenance, and fuel management activities within ESHA and the buffer zones shall be performed in accordance with GP/CLUP Conservation Element Policy CE 1.10, which restricts the use of insecticides, herbicides, and artificial fertilizers within these areas and requires use of low-impact weed abatement and brush clearing methods. The landscape plan must also include ten new coast live oak tree saplings as mitigation for the loss of one mature coast live oak tree. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** The landscape plans shall be revised and resubmitted for review and approval prior to and as a condition precedent to issuance of any LUP for the project. The plans shall first be submitted for review by staff of the City of Goleta, and following approval, the plans shall be submitted for Preliminary/Final Approval by DRB. All elements of the final landscape plan, including irrigation improvements, shall be installed prior to any occupancy clearance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall withhold issuance of an LUP pending Final Approval of the landscape plans by DRB. City staff shall also field verify installation of all landscaping and irrigation system improvements per the approved final landscape plan prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy for the project.

2. Temporary fence protection (marking the extent of allowed disturbance and the 25-foot and 50-foot habitat buffer areas) shall be provided within the creek buffer
area during and grading and construction. Fencing material shall be approved by the City of Goleta, shall be a minimum of six (6) feet high, and shall include staking every six (6) feet. Additionally, silt/sediment fencing or other appropriate erosion control structures (as determined by the City’s Community Services Department) shall be installed to prevent construction related silt/sediment from entering Old San Jose Creek. The silt/sediment fencing shall be attached to the 6-foot chain link fence and placed in other locations as appropriate as determined by the City’s Community Services Department. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Fence protection shall be identified on the final grading plan (and on future building plans as applicable) and shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta prior to the approval of a land use permit. Fencing shall be in place prior to commencement of grading/construction activities.

**Monitoring:** The City of Goleta shall site inspect to ensure fencing and sediment fencing or other appropriate erosion control structure (as determined by the City’s Community Services Department) is installed and maintained throughout grading/construction activities.

3. Should construction of the new asphalt parking lot occur during the bird breeding season (March through September), a City-approved biologist shall perform bird breeding surveys at least one month prior to construction and on a weekly basis until the start of construction to identify any active raptor or least Bell’s vireo nests within 300-feet of the project area. In the event that active nest(s) are found, construction shall be delayed and/or redirected to an area more than 300-feet from the active bird nest(s) and surveys shall continue on a weekly basis until the chicks have fledged and the adults have abandoned their nest. Construction activities shall resume as soon as surveys confirm that nesting activity has been completed. The 300-foot buffer from an active nest site may be adjusted by the monitoring biologist downward with City of Goleta approval based on the location of the nest relative to the construction site, the type of construction activity scheduled to occur, and susceptibility of the particular species to disturbance. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Mitigation shall be implemented prior to construction and during construction.

**Monitoring:** A City qualified/approved biologist shall be used for pre-construction surveys and construction monitoring as necessary.

4. Applicant shall submit drainage and grading plans with a Storm Water Management Plan for review and approval by Community Services and Building staff and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The plan shall incorporate appropriate Best Management Practices to minimize storm water impacts in accordance with the City’s Storm Water Management Plan and the City’s General Plan. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The plans shall also include an erosion control plan for review and approval by Community Services staff prior to the issuance of any LUP for the project. After installation of any drainage
improvements or erosion control measures, the applicant shall be responsible for on-going maintenance of all improvements in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications, the approved plans and conditions of approval.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify construction of all stormwater water quality/control facilities per the City approved final grading and erosion control plans prior to issuance of any LUP.

4. During construction, washing of concrete, paint, or equipment shall occur only in areas where polluted water and materials can be contained for subsequent removal from the site. Washing shall not be allowed near sensitive biological resources. An area designated for washing functions shall be identified on the plans submitted for issuance of any LUP for the project. The washoff area shall be in place throughout construction. Plan Requirements & Timing: The washoff area shall be designated on all plans and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance.

Monitoring: City staff shall site inspect throughout the construction period to ensure compliance and proper use.

5. To ensure that the City approved stormwater water quality protection improvements are adequately maintained for the life of the project, the applicant shall prepare a stormwater system maintenance program for review and approval by City staff. Plan Requirements & Timing: Said maintenance program shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. The plan shall include provisions for the submittal of an annual maintenance report to City staff outlining all system maintenance measures undertaken by the applicant in the prior year reporting period for a period of five (5) years after issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the project. Subsequent to this five year reporting period, the applicant shall maintain records of all yearly maintenance measures for review by City staff on demand for the life of the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. City staff shall review each yearly maintenance report for the required five year reporting period as well as all subsequent maintenance records if problems with the installed system are observed.

Further mitigation measures to address night lighting are described under the discussion of Aesthetics.

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative impacts on biological resources would be considered less than significant.
CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

Existing Setting

As provided in Section 3.5 Cultural Resources of the City’s General Plan Final EIR, the city is known to contain prehistoric, ethnographic, historical and paleontological resources. The GP/CLUP identifies areas where known archaeological resources exist. Figure 3.5-1 of the GP/CLUP FEIR shows areas containing sensitive historic/cultural resources, identifying 46 historic resource locations. The project site is not shown to contain significant archaeological, paleontological or historical 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 & 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) The project site is not shown to contain significant archaeological, paleontological or historical resources (GP/CLUP Figure 6-2). The nearest identified resource occurs approximately 550-feet to the west on assessors parcel number 071-130-130 (469 Kellogg Way), which has been identified as the John Begg Family House dating back to 1885. Furthermore, a Phase 1 archaeological survey of the site was conducted by David Stone, M.A., R.P.A. of Dudek in October of 2008. The study did not reveal any cultural resources, and concluded that it is highly unlikely that any intact prehistoric or historical archaeological deposits
exist on site. As such, the project poses a less than significant impact to any historical resource as defined in §15064.5

b-d) Due to past grading activities the project site has been substantially disturbed, mostly the result of fill placed on top of native soil. Given the state of the site there are no unique geologic features. During construction of the project, grading activities would require the excavation of large amounts of the fill soil in order for it to be re-compacted to be suitable to support the proposed structures. Excavation on site may result in grading disturbance to the underlying native soils. Although there have been no previous archaeological or paleontological discoveries on-site, and given the historical presence of Chumash Indians in the Santa Barbara area, there remains the potential for such resources to be uncovered and adversely affected by construction activities. As such, the potential for disturbance of any remaining artifacts and/or human remains onsite while low, is considered to be potentially significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Continued loss of cultural resources on a project-by-project basis could result in significant cumulative impacts to such resources over time. The project’s potential impact is considered a considerable contribution to this cumulative impact.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. In the event that cultural resources are uncovered during grading/construction activities, work shall be ceased immediately and the applicant shall bear the cost of the immediate evaluation of the find’s importance and any appropriate Phase 2 or Phase 3 investigations and mitigation. Plan Requirements and Timing: The project grading plans and improvement plans shall include provisions in the Notes/Specifications to recover cultural resources as described above. Cultural resource investigations/recovery shall be conducted by an archaeological, paleontological, historic or ethnographic expert acceptable to the Planning and Environmental Services Department.

   Monitoring: Planning and Environmental Services staff shall check all plans prior to issuance of grading and construction permits and shall spot check during field investigations as necessary.

Residual Impact

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, the project’s residual 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 Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Setting
The project site is relatively flat with slight surface drainage to the south. The site is bounded by Pine Avenue to the west, an existing industrial development to the south, and vacant land to the east, and Old San Jose Creek to the north.

The soil type on site consists primarily of Elder sandy loam (EaA), which is a gently sloping to moderately sloping soil on alluvial fans in positions that occasionally overflow during heavy rainfall. Runoff is medium and the hazard of erosion is moderate because of overflow. (1980 Soil Survey of Santa Barbara County, California: South Coastal Part).

Near-surface soils underlying the proposed building area are artificial fill overlaying alluvial deposits. Artificial fill consists of 3 to 6 feet of loose to medium dense silty sand. The alluvial deposits consist of loose to dense interbedded sandy silts and silty fine sands and some soft clays. Soils encountered at approximate bearing depths are characterized by loose to moderate in-place densities. Testing indicates that anticipated bearing soils lie in the "very low" expansion range of Table 18-I-B of the 2001 California Building Code. It appears that soils can be cut by normal heavy grading and drilling equipment. Samples for near-surface soils were tested for pH, resistivity, soluble sulfates and soluble chlorides. Testing indicates that anticipated bearing soils lie within the "negligible" sulfate exposure range in Table 19-A-4 of the 2001 California Building Code. A soil resistivity measurement indicates that the soil is "moderately corrosive" to ferrous metals. (Update of Geotechnical Engineering Reports for ATK Space Systems, October 16, 2008).

The nearest earthquake fault, the potentially active More Ranch Fault, lies approximately 0.6-miles to the south of the project site. (USGS California Preliminary Geologic Map of the Santa Barbara Coastal Plain Area; Santa Barbara County (2006) by Scott A. Minor, Karl S. Kellogg, et al.).

Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on geology/soils would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The City's Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual assumes 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 are considered significant if the project would expose people and/or structures to major geological hazards such as earthquakes, seismic related ground failure, or expansive soils capable of creating a significant risk to life and property.
Project Specific Impacts

a,b) There are no Alquist-Priolo mapped earthquake faults or zones within the City of Goleta (Safety Element of the GP/CLUP; 2006). Due to the distance between the project site and the nearest, known, active fault (the More Ranch Fault approximately .7-miles to the south) potential seismic risks are considered to be adverse but less than significant.

c,d,f,g) Soil and geologic conditions onsite are of the type that pose a significant potential for becoming unstable as a result project implementation and could contribute to on or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. This is due to the classification of soils on site as highly compressible (GP/CLUP EIR Figure 3.6-3). The Update of Geotechnical Engineering Reports for ATK Space Systems, October 16, 2008 and the Liquefaction Evaluation Report, November 6, 2007 confirms that there is potential for liquefaction on site. Therefore, soils onsite are considered to be sufficiently expansive to pose a substantial risk to life or property, and hence, such potential impacts are considered potentially significant.

e) The proposed project does involve some grading and excavation which could result in erosion and sediment loss from stockpiled soils and graded areas onsite. Mitigation to address such potentially significant geologic impacts is discussed in detail under the Hydrology & Water Resources section.

h) The proposed project would be connected to the Goleta Sanitary District’s central sewage effluent collection system and would not involve the use of any onsite septic system, therefore no such impacts would occur as a result of the project.

Cumulative Impacts

Project contributions to cumulative, adverse erosion and soil loss in the area would be considered potentially significant. All other project contributions to cumulative impacts on geologic processes and soils would be considered less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The project shall comply with the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Update of Geotechnical Engineering Reports for ATK Space Systems, October 16, 2008 Plan Requirements & Timing: Said plan must be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department and Planning and Environmental Services Department prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit for the project.

   Monitoring: Santa Barbara County Fire Department and City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance.
2. The project shall comply with the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Liquefaction Evaluation Report prepared by Earth Systems dated November 06, 2007. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** Said plan must be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department and Planning and Environmental Services Department prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit for the project.

**Monitoring:** Santa Barbara County Fire Department and City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance.

Further mitigation measures to address erosion and sedimentation are described under the discussion of Hydrology & Water Resources.

**Residual Impact**

With implementation of the mitigation measure noted above, residual project specific and cumulative impacts on geology and soils would be considered less than significant.
## HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

### Existing Setting

The site has been used as a manufacturing/industrial site since its development in 1973, and operations on site currently include the manufacture and testing of small and micro-satellites, satellite components and subsystems, missile defense and strategic missile propulsion, lightweight space deployables and solar arrays by ATK. ATK currently uses hazardous materials including, but not limited to, methyl ethyl ketone, butanone, aeroglace, alodine chemfilm powder, acetone and typical household cleaning and building maintenance supplies. There is no known history of soil or groundwater
contamination, and the property is not within any airport safety zones or wildland fire hazard area.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact with regard to hazards and hazardous materials 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 & Guidelines Manual address public safety impacts resulting from involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. These thresholds focus on the activities that include the installation or modification to facilities that handle hazardous materials, transportation of hazardous materials, or non-hazardous land uses in proximity to hazardous facilities. The proposed project would be considered to pose a significant impact if it results in the exposure of people to a variety of hazards or hazardous materials as listed above.

Project Specific Impacts

a-b) The proposed additions to the existing manufacturing/industrial use development would involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of the aforementioned hazardous materials. The use of these materials is under the jurisdiction of the Santa Barbara County Fire Department’s Fire Prevention Division (SBCFD), which has approved a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) for the site. Nonetheless, the routine transport, use, or disposal of these hazardous materials pose a significant potential for the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment, and therefore, poses a potentially significant public health risk and/or environmental impact.

c) The proposed additions would not result in hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school as there is not a school within ¼ mile of the project site. Hence, the project would pose no impact related to hazardous emissions near schools.

d) The project site is not listed on any hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5, and as such, the project would not result in any impacts that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

e,f) Although the project site does lie within two miles of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBA), it is located approximately 300-feet and 250-feet well to the north of the main runway Clear and Approach Zones, respectfully. As such, the proposed project poses no safety risk or hazard resulting from its proximity to the airport for employees, residents, or visitors to the manufacturing/industrial building. There are no private airports or airstrips in the vicinity that could pose a safety hazard or risk to residents, employees, or visitors to the project.
g,h) The proposed project would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Due to its location within the urban core of the City, and well outside of the wildland fire hazard area (City of Goleta General Plan/Local Coastal Plan Figure 5-2), the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Hence, no such impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project in combination with other development anticipated in the area is not expected to result in significant cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Required Mitigation Measure

1. The applicant shall comply with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department conditions regarding the handling and storage of hazardous materials pursuant to the letter from County Fire dated September 10, 2008 as well as the site’s HMBP under the Fire Department’s jurisdiction. Plan Requirements and Timing: Prior to the issuance of any land use or building permits, the applicant shall provide written verification from the SBCFD that all conditions related to hazardous materials use and storage pursuant to the Fire Department’s letter of September 10, 2008 and the site’s existing HMBP have been complied with and that the applicant has clearance from County Fire to commence project construction.

Monitoring: City staff shall not final the building permit until verification of compliance with this mitigation measure is received from SBCFD.

Residual Impact

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual project specific and cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be less than significant.
## HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

### Existing Setting
The site is located approximately one-mile from the Pacific Ocean and bounded by Old San Jose Creek on the north side of the property. The existing drainage on site currently flows into two different areas. The improved areas north of the building flows...
into an existing storm drain system and outlets into Old San Jose Creek. The southern portion of the site is collected by inlets and transported into an underground sump pump. The project site is currently within the 500-year storm event flood plain and is subject to average flood depths of less than one foot during a 100-year storm event, according to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) dated September 30, 2005 (Preliminary Drainage Analysis for ATK Space Systems, Penfield & Smith, August 2008).

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on hydrology and water quality 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 & Guidelines Manual assume 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, increase the rate of surface runoff to the extent that flooding, including increased erosion or sedimentation, occurs, create or contribute to runoff volumes exceed existing or planned stormwater runoff facilities, or substantially degrade water quality.

Project Specific Impacts

a) The proposed project would not result in any wastewater discharge violating any State or Federal water quality standards or requiring Wastewater Discharge Requirement Orders (WDRs) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). All sewage effluent would be handled via connection to the Goleta Sanitary District's central sewer system. Therefore, the project poses no impact to water quality or waste discharge requirements.

b) The project development would result in an increase of impervious surfaces, which would reduce infiltration on-site of rainwater. However, the site does not significantly contribute to groundwater basin recharge, and as such, no the project would create an impact related to groundwater recharge. Furthermore, the proposed project does not draw any water from any wells (all water supplied to the site is obtained from the Goleta Water District); therefore, the proposed project would not create any impacts related to groundwater supply.

c,d) In an attempt to detain the difference between the pre-project and the post-project storm runoff rate, two detention basins are proposed to detain the excess peak runoff. The smaller detention basin would have a 5-inch orifice at elevation 19.5' and a 6-inch orifice at elevation 20.9'. The larger detention basin would have a 4-inch orifice at elevation 19.5' and a 12-inch orifice at elevation 20.6' (Preliminary Drainage Analysis for ATK Space Systems, Penfield & Smith, August, 2008). The project's Drainage Analysis also analyzed the existing storm drain system to verify its capacity to carry a 25-year storm event. The existing
storm drain has a 16" diameter pipe outletting to Old San Jose Creek with smaller pipes completing the system. A Full Flow Storm Drain Hydraulics analysis was prepared for the existing system, and it concluded that the Energy Grade Line (EGL) was above the ground elevation at the first downstream catch basin in the system and the storm drain system upgrade would be required.

Preliminary earthwork quantities for the project are estimated at 3,500 yd$^3$ of cut and 3,000 yd$^3$ of fill (3,200 yd$^3$ of excess fill material to be removed from the site). Grading activities for project construction are estimated to occur over a several week period. If construction activities extend into the rainy season, the project site could generate a significant amount of sediment laden stormwater runoff. The discharge of sediment laden runoff from the project site could result in substantial site erosion and siltation of downstream receiving waterbodies such as the Old San Jose Creek and the Goleta Slough. Such impacts would be considered potentially significant.

e,f) A large percentage of the project site would be impervious with 36% (approximately 103,164 ft$^2$) consisting of paved parking, sidewalks and driveways. As noted in the discussion under Biological Resources of this document, large parking and driveway areas are prime sources for the introduction of petroleum and other vehicular pollutants to stormwater runoff while landscape irrigation tailwaters can potentially be contaminated with fertilizers, herbicides, insecticides, etc. As noted in the previous discussion, such a stormwater quality/control system has the potential to provide for significant filtration of runoff, if properly designed and maintained. Therefore, project impacts on water quality are considered potentially significant.

g) The project does not propose any housing, and therefore the project poses no impacts to flooding of new residences.

h,i) The virtual entirety of the project site lies within the 100-year floodplain except for a northerly portion of the site along the Old San Jose Creek lies within the regulatory floodway of Old San Jose Creek as mapped by FEMA. The 100-year floodplain is the area subject to inundation during the 100-year storm event (a storm with a 1% probability of occurring at any given time). The City's Floodplain Management Ordinance (Chapter 15 of the Municipal Code) allows structural development within the 100-year floodplain if the size of the addition is less than 50% of the existing floor area or if the finished floor elevation is raised at least two feet above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE). The regulatory floodway is defined as the portion of a floodplain designated for passage of the 100-year flood without increasing the elevation of floodwaters by more than one-foot. The proposed first floor elevation of the addition would be at 21.3 feet above MSL. The BFE for the 100-year event on site is 22.5 feet above MSL; however, since the proposed addition is less than 50% of the existing floor area, the project is permitted in the 100-year floodplain. As such, the resulting flood exposure
risk for both people and property would be considered adverse but less than significant.

j) As shown on Figure 5-2 of the GP/CLUP, the area around Goleta Slough and the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is subject to a moderate threat of exposure to tsunamis. However, only one tsunami has ever been well documented (1927) and only one other event (1812) is even noted in any records of the area (although poorly documented). Furthermore, due to topography of the ocean floor in the Santa Barbara Channel, presence of the blocking offshore Channel Islands, and lack of any near-shore oceanic trench that facilitates tsunami wave heights in other regions of the world (abrupt shallowing of coastal waters), tsunami wave heights are not expected to be significant in this area. Based on the very low frequency of previously recorded tsunamis as well as the limited potential for tsunamis of large height in this area, potential risks posed by future tsunamis on property and people in the vicinity of the project site is considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The City’s Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual assumes that projects resulting in significant, project specific, hydrologic and water quality impacts are also considered to result in a significant contribution to cumulative hydrologic and water quality impacts. As such, the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative hydrologic and water quality impacts, especially to Old San Jose Creek and the Goleta Slough, would be considered potentially significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. Applicant shall submit a drainage and hydrology study for review and approval by Community Services and Building staff. The drainage or hydrology study shall provide information on how the site drainage meets City’s Storm Water Management Plan and General Plan requirements to provide for retention and/or detention of stormwater on site to the maximum extent feasible. Plan Requirements: The scope of improvements for the project shall include but not be limited to bio-swales, permeable paving, on site detention, fossil filters and other operational features. The study shall include calculations showing that the post construction stormwater runoff is at or below the pre-construction storm water runoff, and the percent of effective impervious. The study shall include the Water Quality Detention Volume per Appendix G of the City’s Stormwater Management Plan. Timing: City staff shall verify compliance prior to the issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify construction of all drainage/hydrology facilities per the final drainage and hydrology study prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy.
2. To ensure adequate onsite filtration of all stormwater runoff prior to discharge into the City's stormdrain system and ultimately Old San Jose Creek/Goleta Slough, the applicant shall provide engineering details on the stormwater filtration elements of the proposed stormwater control system (stormdrains in landscaped planters and subsurface retardation facilities) as well as capacity specifications for such improvements for review and approval by City staff. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** Said specifications and engineering details shall be submitted to the City for staff review and approval prior to any LUP issuance for the project.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify construction of all stormwater water quality/control facilities per the City approved final drainage and grading plan prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy.

3. The applicant shall limit excavation and grading to the dry season of the year (i.e. April 15th to November 1st) unless a City approved erosion control plan, incorporating appropriate BMPs identified in the EPA guidelines for construction site runoff control (EPA Fact Sheet 2.6, Construction Site Runoff Minimum Control Measures, 01/00), is in place and all measures therein are in effect. All exposed graded surfaces shall be reseeded with ground cover vegetation to minimize erosion. **Plan Requirements:** This requirement shall be noted on all grading and building plans. **Timing:** Graded surfaces shall be reseeded within four (4) weeks of grading completion, with the exception of surfaces graded for the placement of structures. These surfaces shall be reseeded if construction of structures does not commence within 4 weeks of grading completion.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall site inspect during grading to monitor dust generation and four (4) weeks after grading to verify reseeding and to verify the construction has commenced in areas graded for placement of structures.

4. The applicant shall obtain proof of exemption or proof that a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Permit from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board has been applied for by registered mail. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** The applicant shall submit proof and City staff shall review and approve documentation prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall review the documentation prior to LUP issuance.

**Residual Impact**

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts would be considered less than significant.
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 lies on the east side of Pine Avenue and south of the Old San Jose creek in the Old Town district of the City, and is surrounded by other similar manufacturing/industrial development, a mobile home park and a parcel currently used for agricultural purposes (zoned and designated for a visitor serving use). The project site is subject to the goals, policies, and objectives of the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan as well as the Article III of the City of Goleta Municipal Code (the Inland Zoning Ordinance).

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 project would be constructed on the east side of the existing manufacturing/industrial building. It would not divide nor introduce an incompatible use within the already existing manufacturing/industrial development in the area. No such associated impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

b) The proposed addition would be contained within the required set backs. However, the existing building encroaches into the front-yard (west) setback and parking encroaches into the setbacks in the front-yard (west), sideyard (south) and rear yard (east). With the future Ekwill extension, additional setback encroachments into the newly created secondary front yard (north) along the Ekwill extension will occur. These future encroachments include: northwesterly
portions of the existing building and existing and proposed parking located on the north side of the parking lot. As such, a modification to the setback requirements for the existing building and proposed parking is proposed with this application.

Also, the future Ekwill extension would reduce the net parcel size, essentially increasing the site building coverage and reducing landscape coverage. The Zoning Ordinance requires landscape coverage of 30%. With the proposed Ekwill extension, a modification will be required to allow landscape coverage to be 16.5%. The City's Planning Commission (as a recommending body), and ultimately the City Council (as decision maker) would approve or deny these modification requests.

The proposed project is also subject to the regulations within the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance (GGMO), which in summary, is in place to ensure an appropriate balance between the rate of development of commercial-industrial space and the rate of housing growth in the City. The project as proposed includes a request amend Section 6.1 of the GGMO to grant an exemption to the Project, subject to a condition that the property owner(s) execute and deliver an Irrevocable Offer to Dedicate the right-of-way for the extension of Ekwill Street. The City's Planning Commission (as a recommending body), and ultimately the City Council (as decision maker) would approve or deny this request.

If the GGMO exemption request is approved, the project would not create any GGMO policy impacts as there are expired floor area exemptions/reservations in the GGMO that could account for the proposed square footage. The Floor area exemptions/reservations Items b – f in Section 6.1 and Item A in Section 7.1 of the GGMO expired leaving approximately 264,569 square feet that were intended to be allocated, unused. No other City projects have claimed use of this floor area for GGMO exemption purposes.

If the request is denied, again, the project would not create any GGMO policy impacts as the applicant would be subject to the competitive system for assigning allocations as set forth in the GGMO.

Also, the proposed project complies with applicable policies for land designated as “Business Park” under the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

As such, no impacts to consistency with applicable land use plans would occur as a result of project implementation.

c) There are no habitat or natural community conservation plans covering property in the vicinity of the project site nor would this proposal conflict with any other such plans in the City of Goleta. Therefore, project implementation has no conservation policy inconsistency impacts.
Cumulative Impacts

The project's contribution to cumulative land use and planning impacts would be considered less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

Residual project and cumulative impacts on land use and planning would be considered less than significant.
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

There are no known mineral resources onsite of any significance. The project site has been developed with the existing, main, industrial/manufacturing building on site, and prior to that, was land used for agricultural operations.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a,b) The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource or identified resource recovery site. No such impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

The proposed 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. Expose persons to or generate 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

A portion of the project site lies within the 60dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) railroad and airport 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 Pine Avenue and aircraft operations at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.
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 to 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 or CNEL. CNEL is a noise index that attempts to take into account differences in the intrusiveness of noise between daytime hours and nighttime hours. Specifically, CNEL weights average noise levels at different times of the day as follows:

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

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. Additional thresholds are contained in the City’s Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual. The City’s adopted thresholds assume that outdoor CNEL noise levels in excess of 64 dB are considered to pose significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors.

Project Specific Impacts

a) As noted above, the project site lies within the 60 dB CNEL noise contour of the City. Since the project site lies within an area of the City where the CNEL does not exceed 65 dB, the exposure of the employees and employees on the project site, and employees located at adjacent properties, to such noise levels would be considered an adverse but less than significant impact.

b,f) The proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. There are no private airports or airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. Such impacts are not anticipated as a result of this project.
The proposed addition to the existing manufacturing/industrial use would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. However, the project would increase the amount of mechanical equipment on site, which would increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Such an impact would be considered potentially significant.

d) The project site is adjacent to a mobile home park sensitive receptor, and therefore, noise associated with heavy equipment operation and construction activities, which can average as high as 95 dB or more measured 50 feet from the source would be considered to pose a potentially significant impact on sensitive receptors in the area. Also, the construction noise could affect employees of ATK and farm workers at the adjacent agricultural use to the east, and employees located at adjacent and nearby buildings. Hence, construction noise would be considered a potentially significant impact.

e) Although the project site does lie within the area of influence of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport as defined by the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan, it is outside of any airport noise contour of greater than 65 dB. As such, noise impacts from airport operations on the proposed project would be considered less than significant

Cumulative Impacts

Short term project construction noise would result in a less than significant cumulative noise impact on employees within the surrounding business park.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. Construction activity for site preparation and for future development shall be limited to the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. No construction shall occur on State holidays (e.g. Christmas, Thanksgiving, Memorial Day, 4th of July, Labor Day). Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (in the event of an emergency, for example) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Environmental Services. Plan Requirements: Two signs stating these restrictions shall be provided by the applicant and posted on site prior to commencement of construction. Timing: The signs shall be in place prior to beginning of and throughout all grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits.
Monitoring: City staff shall spot to verify compliance and/or respond to complaints.

2. The following measures shall be incorporated to reduce the impact of construction noise:
   a. All construction equipment shall have properly maintained sound-control devices, and no equipment shall have an unmuffled exhaust system.
   b. Contractors shall implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including but not limited to changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, and install acoustic barriers around significant sources of stationary construction noise.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The above measures shall be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications.

Monitoring: Planning and Environmental Services staff shall review the grading and building permits prior to issuance to verify compliance. The Planning and Environmental Services Building & Safety Division Inspector shall verify compliance on the construction site via periodic inspections.

3. New and existing HVAC equipment and other commercial/industrial equipment shall be adequately maintained in proper working order so that noise levels emitted by such equipment remain minimal. Noise shielding or insulation for such equipment will be required if such equipment results in objectionable noise levels at adjacent properties. To be considered effective, such shielding should provide a 5-dBA-CNEL noise reduction. Plan Requirements and Timing: The above measures shall be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications.

Monitoring: Planning and Environmental Services staff shall review the grading and building permits prior to issuance to verify compliance. The Planning and Environmental Services Building & Safety Division Inspector shall verify compliance on the construction site via periodic inspections.

Residual Impact

With implementation of the required mitigation measures, the residual project specific and project contribution to cumulative noise impacts would be less than significant.
POPPULATION 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

The project site lies within a predominantly manufacturing/industrial area centered on the east side of Pine Avenue in the Goleta Old Town district. The property is zoned Industrial Research Park M-RP, and designated as Business Park per the Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The project site has been approved for a manufacturing/industrial use since 1973.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Population & 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) The proposed additions would not create any new residential units, but the additions would contribute the GP/CLUP projected buildout of the City (GP/CLUP FEIR Population and Housing Element), and hence, the increase in employment opportunities as well. The anticipated increase in employees resulting from the proposed project would be so minimal that no measurable impact on population growth in the area would occur. No new roads or infrastructure that could support other new development would be required. As such, impacts resulting from potential inducement of population growth in the City would be considered less than significant.

b,c) The proposed project would not displace any existing housing units or require the displacement of any people thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no such impacts would occur.
Cumulative Impacts

The project’s contribution to cumulative population growth as well as adverse impacts on the area’s housing supply would be less than significant (population growth) or non-existent (housing supply).

Required/ Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

Residual impacts on population growth and the area’s housing supply, as well as the project’s contribution to such cumulative impacts would be less than significant (population) or non-existent (housing).
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>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>a. fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

Police and fire protection services would be provided by the City of Goleta Police Department and Santa Barbara County Fire Department. Employees of ATK Space Systems could avail themselves of a variety of parks and other public services such as the Goleta Branch of the County Library and a mix of City, County, and privately owned parks in the Goleta Valley.

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 & Guidelines Manual* includes thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools. Specifically, under these thresholds any project that would generate 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.²

² Current State standards for classroom size are as follows:
Grade K-2—20 students/classroom
Grade 3-8—29 students/classroom
Grades 9-12—28 students/classroom
Project Specific Impacts

a) Fire Department emergency vehicle access requirements for the project include a minimum width of 20 feet minimum width for all driveways and interior drive aisles, with the exception of a portion of the driveway fronting the utility equipment across from the loading area along the southern property line, which is approximately 16.5-feet in width. (Johnson, October 21, 2008). Therefore, all driveways and interior drive aisles comply with these requirements, and as such, adequate emergency and fire vehicle access is provided for the proposed project.

The minimal increase in the number of employees working at the project site would not generate the need for any additional fire fighting facilities and/or fire fighting personnel in the City. The primary responding County Fire Station for the proposed project would be Station 12 on Calle Real. Response times from this station are within County Fire Department guidelines (five minutes or less).

The existing fire hydrant infrastructure in the area is substandard and does not meet the 300-foot spacing requirement for commercial areas. Five new fire hydrants at the project site would be required to ensure adequate fire protection for the proposed project (Bryan Hayden, September 10, 2008 Preliminary Condition Letter). If the fire hydrants are not installed per Fire Department requirements, the project would pose a potentially significant impact to fire services.

b-e) The minimal increase in the number of employees working in the area would have no impact on the County Sheriff Department’s ability to adequately serve the citizens of the City. As no residential units are proposed as a part of this application, there would be no adverse impact on enrollment in either the Goleta Union or Santa Barbara School & High School Districts. Any potential demand generated by the project for parks and other public facilities/services would be so minimal as to be immeasurable. No such impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would make no measurable contribution to cumulative impacts on fire or police protective services or the demand for parks and other public facilities and services.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The composite utility plan to be prepared by the applicant shall include the installation of five fire hydrants to serve the proposed project meeting all applicable Santa Barbara County Fire Department requirements. Plan Requirements &
**Timing:** The composite utility plan identifying the location and specifications of the required fire hydrant shall be submitted for review and approval by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department as well as City staff and the DRB prior to LUP issuance. The required fire hydrants shall be installed and approved in the field by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department prior to any occupancy clearance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance with the requirement to prepare a Fire Department approved composite utility plan prior to DRB preliminary/final review of the project. City staff shall verify Fire Department approval of the installed fire hydrant prior to any occupancy clearance.

**Residual Impact**

Upon implementation of this mitigation measure, residual project specific impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant. All other residual project specific and project contributions to cumulative impacts on public services would be less than significant.
RECREATION

<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. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting
According to the General Plan inventory of existing parks and open space, as of 2005, the City contains approximately 526 acres of parkland and open space areas available for recreational purposes. The 526 acres equates to approximately 17 acres of recreational area per 1,000 residents.

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) There are no park facilities proposed as a part of this project. As provided in Figure 3.10-3 of the GP/CLUP FEIR, there are several existing neighborhood open space areas, neighborhood parks, and community parks within the vicinity (i.e. one mile) of the project that could accommodate local recreational demands of the project employees. Given the available supply of recreational facilities and the small number of employees added to the area as a result of the proposed project, the project’s recreation impacts are considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project in combination with other proposed manufacturing/industrial uses within the City could increase the City's population which would result in a cumulative increase in impacts to the City's recreational capacity. Given the small number of employees added to the area as a result of the proposed project, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.
Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

The proposed project's contribution to cumulative demand for parks and recreational facilities would be addressed through the payment of park and recreation development impact fees. Therefore, no other recreational impact mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

The proposed project's residual recreation impacts would be less than significant.
### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard 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. Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Setting

The site is bound on the north by Old San Jose Creek and then the University Mobile Home Park and an existing industrial use, to the south by a commercial/industrial facility, to the east by a vacant field currently used for agricultural purposes (designated and zoned for visitor serving development), and to the west by Pine Avenue and then other manufacturing/industrial facilities. Access to the site is proposed via two existing one-way driveways off of Pine Avenue. The driveway on the northwestern side of the
site is an exit only driveway (26’11” wide), and the one-way driveway on the southwestern side of the site is an enter only driveway (28.5-feet wide).

As noted in the project description, a request to amend the GGMO to exempt the project from its provisions would require the property owner to execute and deliver an Irrevocable Offer to Dedicate the right-of-way (approximately the northern 100’ of the property) for the extension of Ekwill Street. Access to the site would be provided via the two existing driveways. The northwestern driveway would serve the main entrance and main parking area and the southwestern enter-only driveway would provide access to the rear of the building and the existing and new loading dock area.

Also, upon construction of the proposed Ekwill Street extension by the City, access to this site will change. The Ekwill Street project is currently projected to encroach onto the subject property, which would thereby necessitate the removal of the northwestern driveway. This driveway will need to be replaced with a two-way driveway along the Ekwill Street right-of-way (precise location to be determined by the City’s Community Services Department and the property owner during the processing of the Ekwill project).

There is no sidewalk along the Pine Avenue project frontage, and the installation of any sidewalk in this location will be determined during the Ekwill Street extension project by the City’s Community Services Department. Parking for the proposed project would be provided on site in a total of 226 surface parking spaces, including 43 compact stalls (19.7%) and seven (7) accessible spaces. Eight (8) parking stalls will be demolished once the Ekwill Street extension is installed. The percentage of compact stalls (19.7%) is based on the final 218 permanent parking spaces.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant project generated traffic impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds of significance are set forth in the City's Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines 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.

<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

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

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

3) Project adds traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g. narrow width, road side ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or receives use which would be incompatible with a substantial increase in traffic (e.g. rural roads with use by farm equipment, livestock, horseback riding, or residential roads with heavy pedestrian or recreational use, etc.) that will 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) To facilitate assessment of potential traffic impacts resulting from project implementation, Associated Transportation Engineers prepared and submitted a traffic study dated October 21, 2008. That study was (ATE) reviewed and approved by the City. Per this traffic study, project trip generation was developed by considering estimation techniques contained in Trip Generation (7th Edition) prepared by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Roadway segments expected to be affected by the proposed project include Fairview Avenue north of Hollister Avenue, Hollister Avenue east of Fairview Avenue and Pine Avenue south of Hollister Avenue. Project trip generation is shown in Table 2; trip generation is shown in Table 3, and existing roadway plus project roadway volumes for each of these road segments are shown in Table 3.
Table 2
Project Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Average Daily</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>12,513 SF</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>12,513 SF</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Project Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin/Destination</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distribution %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Hwy 101(a)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 217</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Trips to/from east via SR 217 interchange. Trips to/from west via Fairview Avenue interchange.

Table 4
Existing Plus Project Roadway Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Acceptable Capacity</th>
<th>Existing ADT</th>
<th>Project Added ADT</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Avenue n/o Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue e/o Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Avenue s/o Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 2 through 4 indicate that all of the roadway segments likely to be affected by the proposed project would operate at acceptable levels of service upon project implementation and traffic volumes that would not exceed design capacity or degrade existing levels of service significantly. As such, project specific impacts on roadway operations within the project travelshed would be considered less than significant.

Tables 5 and 6 compare the existing and existing plus project levels of service.
Table 5
Existing Plus Project A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Existing + Project</th>
<th>Project-Added Trips</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Pine Avenue</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Kellogg Avenue</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 217 SB Ramps/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 217 NB Ramps/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Existing Plus Project P.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Existing + Project</th>
<th>Project-Added Trips</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Pine Avenue</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Kellogg Avenue</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 217 SB Ramps/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 217 NB Ramps/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Tables 5 and 6 indicate that the study-area intersections would continue to operate at LOS C or better with the addition of project traffic. As such, intersection impacts are considered less than significant.

b) The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) has developed a set of traffic impact thresholds to assess the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on regional transportation facilities located within the Congestion Management Program (CMP) roadway system. The
following guidelines were developed by SBCAG to determine the significance of project-generated traffic impacts on the regional CMP system.

1. For any roadway or intersection operating at "Level of Service" (LOS) A or B, a decrease of two levels of service resulting from the addition of project-generated traffic.
2. For any roadway or intersection operating at LOS C, project-added traffic that results in LOS D or worse.
3. For intersections within the CMP system with existing congestion, Table 7 (below) defines significant impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Project-Added Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS F</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. For freeway or highway segments with existing congestion, Table 8 (below) defines significant impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Project-Added Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS F</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fairview Avenue/U.S. 101 northbound (NB) ramps, Fairview Avenue/U.S. 101 southbound (SB) ramps, Fairview Avenue/Hollister Avenue, Hollister Avenue/SR 217 NB Ramps, and the Hollister Avenue/SR 217 SB Ramps intersections are located within the CMP network. As shown on Tables 5 and 6, the CMP intersections are forecast to operate at LOS C or better under Existing plus Project traffic conditions. The project would not generate a significant project impact to the CMP network based on CMP impact criteria.

Tables 9 and 10 (below) indicate that the Fairview Avenue/U.S. 101 NB Ramps are forecast to operate at LOS F during the A.M. peak hour and at LOS D during the P.M. peak hour. The project is forecast to generate less than 10 peak hour trips (3 A.M./6 P.M.) to this intersection. The project would not generate a significant impact to this intersection based on CMP impact criteria.
Table 9
Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Cumulative + Project</th>
<th>Change in V/C</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Pine Avenue</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Kellogg Avenue</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 217 SB Ramps/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>LOS E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 217 NB Ramps/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project P.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Cumulative + Project</th>
<th>Change in V/C</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Pine Avenue</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue/Kellogg Avenue</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 217 SB Ramps/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>LOS E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 217 NB Ramps/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A CMP criteria states the minimum impact threshold for freeway segments is 50 peak hour trips. The project's traffic study (ATE, 10/21/08) indicates that the project would add less than 50 peak hour trips to any freeway segment within the study-area. The project would therefore not generate a significant freeway impact based on CMP criteria.

The SR 217 NB Ramps/Hollister Avenue intersection is forecast to LOS E during the A.M. and P.M. peak hour periods. The project is forecast to generate more than 10 peak hour trips (29 A.M./30 P.M.) to this location which would be
considered a significant impact based on CMP criteria. The SR 217 NB Ramps/Hollister Avenue intersection is forecast to operate at LOS D during the P.M. peak hour period. The project is forecast to generate more than 20 peak hour trips (24 P.M. peak hour trips) at this intersection which would be considered a potentially significant impact based on CMP criteria.

c) The proposed project lies outside of any airport approach or clear zone and would have no impact on air traffic patterns.

d) The traffic study for the proposed project concludes that the existing and proposed site access and circulation would not interfere with traffic on Pine Avenue as it is anticipated that vehicles entering and exiting the site’s driveways would experience delays of less than 10 seconds (LOS A). Any potential impacts to site access and circulation changes as a result of the Ekwil Street extension will be analyzed in the Ekwil Street extension project. As such, project specific impacts related to circulation design features are less than significant.

e) As noted in the discussion of fire protection services under the section on Public Services of this document, Fire Department emergency vehicle access requirements for the project include a minimum width of 20 feet for all driveways and interior drive aisles, with the exception of a portion of the driveway fronting the utility equipment across from the loading area along the southern property line, which is approximately 16.5-feet in width. (Johnson, October 21, 2008). Therefore, all driveways and interior drive aisles comply with these requirements, and as such, adequate emergency and fire vehicle access is provided for the proposed project. However, if the project is not built to the aforementioned driveway and drive aisle width specifications, the project would present a potentially significant impact to fire protection services.

f) Long Term Parking
The proposed project would provide a total of 226 surface parking spaces, including 43 compact stalls (19.7%) and seven (7) accessible spaces. 8 parking stalls will be demolished once the Ekwil extension is installed. The percentage of compact stalls (19.7%) is based on the final 218 permanent parking spaces. The property would retain the existing 3 loading zones and 20 indoor bicycle parking spaces. The proposed amount of parking exceeds the City’s minimum parking requirements for the project (170 spaces) and meets the City’s minimum requirement for off-street loading facilities for commercial uses.

The traffic study for this project (ATE, 10/21/08) prepared a parking analysis for two scenarios. The first scenario assumes a 50/50 split between the future office and R & D space as requested by City staff (12,513-square foot office plus 12,513-square foot research & development = 25,026 SF total). It is noted that this scenario is consistent with the methodology used to determine the project trip generation forecasts. The second scenario assumes the actual programmed
square footage for the future office and R & D space (4,682-square foot office+20,344-square foot research & development=25,026-square foot total). Scenario 1 would require 216 spaces and Scenario 2 would require 206 spaces. The proposed project exceeds the required parking calculated for both scenarios.

In addition, the City's Inland Zoning Ordinance requires minimum drive aisle widths on site to ensure adequate vehicle backing space to safely enter and exit parking spaces with a minimum of turning movements. The minimum width of the drive aisles are as shown below in Table 11 (reference Figure 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drive Aisle</th>
<th>Minimum Width</th>
<th>Proposed Width</th>
<th>Consistent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>35'5&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60'6&quot;</td>
<td>83'</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>43'6&quot;</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>39'</td>
<td>39'6&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>60'6&quot;</td>
<td>60'6&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>60'6&quot;</td>
<td>60'6&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>60'6&quot;</td>
<td>60'6&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>43'6&quot;</td>
<td>44'</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>43'6&quot;</td>
<td>43'6&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2
Drive Aisles
As shown in Table 11, the project as proposed is in conformance with the City’s minimum drive aisle widths which ensure that the interior vehicular circulation and parking plan is fully functional. However, the current plans are conceptual and if the project is not built as currently proposed, the project could pose a potentially significant impact on parking.

Short Term Construction Parking
Vehicular access to the project site for construction activities and workers is available from Pine Avenue (classified as a collector street/road in the GP/CLUP Figure 7-2). However, because construction activities often conflict with onsite construction vehicle parking, such vehicles may have to be parked offsite for significant amounts of time. While offsite parking in the near vicinity is available, it is not on land owned by the applicant. As such, demand for construction related vehicle parking either on or offsite is considered to pose a potentially significant, short term parking impact.

g) The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project would not adversely affect any existing or planned bus stops in the area, lies in close proximity to bus service making public transportation access to the project substantially more feasible for employees, and would retain the existing, indoor bicycle parking spaces (20 in total) for people wishing to use bicycles for transportation purposes to and from the site. Therefore, the project does not conflict with the City’s General Plan policies supporting alternative transportation, and hence, the project poses no impact in this regard.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative Traffic Volumes
The ATE Traffic Study for the project (10/21/08) forecasted cumulative traffic volumes using the Goleta Traffic Model. The traffic model includes traffic generated by approved and pending projects proposed within the Goleta area (approved and pending projects list is contained in the Technical Appendix of the ATK traffic report – ATE, 10/21/08) and assumes future programmed roadway improvements to be fully constructed. The planned improvements that will have the greatest affect on traffic patterns within the study-area are the Ekwil Street and Fowler Street extensions. The extensions would create two new connections from Fairview Avenue to Kellogg Avenue which would result in new east-west travel paths that will relieve traffic loading within the Hollister Avenue corridor.

Cumulative Roadway Operations
The data in Table 12 shows the addition of project traffic would not significantly impact any of the study-area roadway segments under the Cumulative plus Project scenario based on the City’s impact criteria.
Table 12
Cumulative Roadway Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Acceptable Capacity</th>
<th>Cumulative ADT</th>
<th>Project Added ADT</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Avenue n/o Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue e/o Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Avenue s/o Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Intersection Operations
As discussed in project specific impact “b,” and as shown in Tables 9 and 10, the project would generate a potentially significant cumulative impact at the SR 217 SB Ramps/Hollister Avenue during h.t P.M. peak hour period.

Required Mitigation Measure

1. Construction vehicle parking and/or staging of construction equipment or materials, including vehicles of construction personnel, is prohibited along Pine Avenue. Plan Requirements & Timing: The applicant shall prepare a construction vehicle parking plan, including provisions for construction personnel parking and construction equipment/materials staging, for both on and offsite locations in the vicinity of the project site the precludes the need for any construction related parking or equipment/materials staging on Pine Avenue. Said plan shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure compliance with this requirement prior to Planning Commission consideration of the project. City staff shall periodically monitor in the field to verify compliance throughout all construction activities.

Residual Impact

The City has programmed improvements to construct roundabouts at the SR 217/Hollister Avenue interchange as part of the Ekwill-Fowler Extension Project. The traffic study completed for the Ekwill-Fowler Project indicates that the installation of roundabouts would provide for LOS C operations under the Year 2030 analysis scenario. The addition of project traffic at the roundabout controlled intersections would not generate a significant impact. The installation of the roundabout would therefore mitigate the project’s cumulative impact at the SR 217 SB Ramps/Hollister Avenue intersection. The project would be required to contribute to the funding of these improvements through the payment of traffic mitigation fees established by the Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan (GTIP). Therefore, with implementation of the
mitigation measure listed above and through payment to GTIP, residual project specific and cumulative traffic impacts 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

**Sewage Disposal**

The Goleta Sanitary District (GSD) provides sewer service to the Old Town neighborhood via a system of gravity flow and pressurized lines (where required due to the area’s topography). The District’s wastewater treatment plant has a current capacity of 9.7 million gallons per day (MGPD) with a Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) permitted treatment capacity of 7.64 MGPD and a current throughput of 5.5 MGPD (Comstock Homes Development & Ellwood Mesa Open Space Plan EIR, 04-EIR-001; 2004). The plant currently operates under a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency with concurrence by the RWQCB. Although the NPDES permit calls for all wastewater to undergo at least secondary treatment, the GSD has been successful in obtaining a waiver from full secondary treatment under Section 301(h) of the Federal Clean Water Act. The GSD’s continued use of a waiver is subject to ongoing approval
by the State Water Resources Control Board and the California Coastal Commission. Major GSD customers include the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD), University of California Santa Barbara (UCSB), and the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBA). GSD has an agreement with the GWSD, UCSB, SBA and Santa Barbara County for flow capacity ownerships as follows: GSD retains 47.87 percent; GWSD is allocated 40.78 percent; UCSB is allocated 7.09 percent of the treatment plant flow capacity (GP/CLUP FEIR).

**Water Supply**
The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water purveyor for the City of Goleta. The GWD currently has four sources of water: surface water from the Lake Cachuma Project; surface water from the State Water Project; ground water from the Goleta basin; and recycled water. These sources are expected to be able to provide approximately 19,172 Acre Feet per Year (AFY) to the GWD through the year 2030. The Lake Cachuma Project provides approximately 9,322 AFY, the State Water Project provides approximately 4,500 AFY, ground water sources provide approximately 2,350 AFY, and recycled water facilities provide up to 3,000 AFY (Goleta General Plan Water Supply Assessment, 05/23/08). The GWD rights to ground water were adjudicated in a lawsuit that was filed in 1973 Wright v. Goleta Water District and finally settled in 1989. "The Wright Judgment" stipulated a safe ground water yield from the ground water basin of 3,410 AFY and gave the GWD rights to 2,350 of that amount based on a ten-year average. (Citrus Village Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, August 15, 2008).

**Stormwater Control Facilities**
Stormwater runoff from the property is currently flows into two different areas. The improved area north of the building flows into an existing storm drain system and outlets into Old San Jose Creek. The southern portion of the site is collected by inlets and transported into an underground sump pump. The project proposes to construct two basins to detain the difference between the pre-project and the post-project storm runoff rate (Preliminary Drainage Analysis for ATK Space Systems, Penfield & Smith, August 2008).

**Solid Waste**
Solid waste generated in the City is collected by Marborg (south of Hollister Avenue) and Allied Waste (north of Hollister Avenue) and transported to the Tajiguas Landfill 20 miles to the west of Goleta on the Gaviota Coast. The County has received approval for, and is in the process of expanding the landfill to provide for an additional 15 years of solid waste disposal capacity. The landfill now has sufficient capacity to provide solid waste disposal services to the South Coast until 2020.
Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on utilities and service systems would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, under the City’s *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual*, a project that would generate 196 tonnes of solid waste/year, after receiving a 50% credit for source reduction, recycling, and composting would result in a project specific, significant impact on the City’s solid waste stream. Any project generating 40 tonnes/year, after receiving a 50% credit for source reduction, recycling, and composting would be considered to make an adverse contribution to cumulative impacts to the City’s solid waste stream.

Project Specific Impacts

a,e) In 2006, Dudek completed an updated land use survey and future wastewater projections analysis for both the GSD and GWSD. The County of Santa Barbara, the airport, and UCSB did not participate. The study identified generation factors for use in developing projected wastewater demand. Commercial uses are evaluated at 100 gallons per day per 1,000-square feet of habitable building space (GP/CLUP FEIR). Based on the application of these wastewater generation rates, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate approximately 2,502 GPD of wastewater. This represents approximately 0.1% of the remaining available treatment capacity under the GSD’s operating permit from the RWQCB. While this level of estimated demand would have no potential to increase wastewater volumes conveyed to the GSD’s sewage treatment plant in excess of the Districts current operating permit from the RWQCB, the applicant has yet to provide an Intent to Serve letter from the District. Until such a commitment is given by the GSD, a final determination as to the availability of central sewer service by the GSD to serve the proposed project cannot be made. As such, the proposed project poses a potentially significant impact on the availability and adequacy of central sewage disposal service.

b) The proposed project would not necessitate any new construction or expansion of existing wastewater or domestic water treatment facilities. Corresponding environmental impacts normally associated with such facility construction and/or expansion would not occur as a result of this project.

c) The proposed detention basins will handle all of the stormwater runoff from the post-project condition per the City of Goleta Stormwater Management Plan. A less than 2-foot depth of water ponding will occur in the larger or smaller basin before it overtops the basin and escapes overland through the parking lot and into the storm drain system. The proposed storm drain system would need to be sized to transport a 25-year storm event to Old San Jose Creek, and as such, presents a less than significant environmental impact associated with such facility expansion.
d) The project also would not contribute to groundwater overdraft as no wells are proposed onsite. Projects served by the GWD would not cause or contribute to groundwater basin overdraft pursuant to the requirements of the Wright vs. Goleta Water District judgment.

Based on the Water Duty Factors as noted in the City’s *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual*, project water consumption would be as follows:

Research Park MRP—0.14 AFY/1,000 ft² * 25,026 ft² = 3.50 AFY

Applying these water duty factors, it is estimated that the proposed project would consume 3.50 AFY of GWD water. This represents approximately 0.023 percent of the water received by GWD in 2005 (the GWD estimated that they received 15,300 AFY in 2005), and approximately 0.018 percent of the water available to the GWD in the near future and between 2030 (The GWD estimated that they will be able to receive 19,172 AFY for the next 25 years). Given these projections, the GWD has sufficient supply to service this project. However, the applicant has yet to provide a Can & Will Serve letter from the GWD. Until such a commitment is given by the GWD, a final determination as to the availability of central water service by the GWD to serve the proposed project cannot be made. As such, the proposed project poses a potentially significant impact on the availability and adequacy of central water service.

f) *City Solid Waste Generation Rates*
Projects that are estimated to generate 196 tons/year or more of solid waste, after receiving a 50% credit for source reduction, recycling, and composting, are considered to pose a significant, project specific impact. Based on the solid waste generation factors noted in the City’s *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual*, solid waste generation for the proposed project would be as follows:

Manufacturing Space—0.0026 tons/year/ft² * 25,026 ft² = 65.07 tons/year

Based on the application of City solid waste generation rates, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate a total of 65.07 tons/year before being given a 50% source reduction, recycling, and composting credit. After being given the 50% credit, the estimated yearly solid waste volume generated by the project would be 32.54 tons. As such, project specific impacts on the solid waste flow into the Tajiguas Landfill would be considered adverse, but less than significant.

*State Solid Waste Generation Rates*
The California Integrated Waste Management Board has provided Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates for Industrial Establishments, which includes an
estimated rate of 0.0108 tons/ft²/year for manufacturing uses. Accordingly, solid waste generation for the proposed project based on this standard would be as follows:

Manufacturing Space – 0.0108 tons/ft²/year * 25,026 ft² = 281.08 tons/year

Based on the application of State solid waste generation rates, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate a total of 281.08 tons/year before being given a 50% source reduction, recycling, and composting credit. After being given the 50% credit, the estimated yearly solid waste volume generated by the project would be 140.54 tons. As such, project specific impacts on the solid waste flow into the Tajiguas Landfill would be still be considered adverse, but less than significant.

g) The proposed project would not result in the generation of any solid waste in violation of any Federal, State, or local solid waste regulations or statutes.

Cumulative Impacts

Project contributions to cumulative impacts on public utilities or service systems such as wastewater collection and treatment, potable water supplies, stormdrain and runoff control infrastructure, or the Tajiguas Landfill would be less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The applicant shall obtain a Can & Will Serve letter from the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD). **Plan Requirements & Timing:** The Can & Will Serve letter shall be submitted to the City prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

   **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

2. The applicant shall obtain a Can & Will Serve letter from the Goleta Water District (GWD). **Plan Requirements & Timing:** The Can & Will Serve letter shall be submitted to the City prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

   **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

Recommended Mitigation Measure

3. A Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan (WRRP) shall be submitted to the Community Services Department for review and approval. Said plan shall indicate how a 50% diversion goal shall be met during construction including but not limited to the following:
a. Demolition and/or excess construction materials shall be separated onsite for reuse/recycling or proper disposal (e.g., concrete asphalt).

b. During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials and brush shall be provided onsite.

c. The applicant/property owner shall contract with a City approved hauler to facilitate the recycling of all construction recoverable/recyclable material. The copy of the contract is to be provided to the City. Recoverable construction material shall include but not be limited to asphalt, lumber, concrete, glass, metals, and drywall.

**Plan Requirement and Timing:** This requirement shall be printed on the grading and construction plans. Materials shall be recycled as necessary throughout construction. All materials shall be recycled prior to occupancy clearance.

**Monitoring:** At the end of the project, applicant shall submit a Post-Construction Waste Reduction & Recycling Summary Report documenting the types and amounts of materials that were generated during the project and how much was reused, recycled, composted, salvaged, or landfilled.

4. Demolition and/or excess construction materials shall be separated onsite for reuse/recycling or proper disposal (e.g., concrete asphalt). During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials and brush shall be provided onsite. **Plan Requirements:** This requirement shall be printed on the grading and construction plans, and the applicant shall submit a post-construction waste reduction and recycling summary to the Community Services Department. **Timing:** Materials shall be recycled as necessary throughout construction. All materials shall be recycled prior to occupancy clearance. The post-construction waste reduction and recycling summary shall be submitted within ten (10) days of waste disposal and recycling activities.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to occupancy clearance.

**Residual Impact**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems would be considered less than significant.
### MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a endangered, rare, or threatened species, 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 the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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