CITY OF GOLETA
DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. PROJECT TITLE:
Case No. 18-031-DP-CUPRV-DRB
New Synagogue Buildings AND Site Improvements for Chabad of Santa Barbara

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

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:
Chris Noddings
Assistant Planner
(805) 961-7566
cnoddings@cityofgoleta.org

Mary Chang
Senior Supervising Planner
(805) 961-7567
mchang@cityofgoleta.org

4. APPLICANT: AGENT:
Chabad of Santa Barbara
6045 Stow Canyon Road
Goleta, CA 93117
(805) 683-1544
Attn: Rabbi Mendel Loschak

SEPPS
1625 State Street, Suite 1
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 966-2758 X101
Attn: Steve Fort

5. PROJECT LOCATION:
The project site is located at 6045 Stow Canyon Road, west of North Fairview Avenue in the City of Goleta (City). The property encompasses approximately 3.3 acres (see Figure 1). The Assessor Parcel Number (APN) is 077-170-044.
Chabad of Santa Barbara has been using the project site since the existing Conditional Use Permit (92-CP-018) was approved in 1992. Current uses on the site include a residence (used by the Rabbi) as well as a building that is used as a synagogue, a school, and a day care. The existing Conditional Use Permit outlined the maximum number of individuals that may be in attendance at the project site as 50 individuals at the synagogue, 25 at the school, and 15 at the daycare. In addition, three full-time and three part-time staff may also be at the site. However, the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000cc, et seq., signed into law on September 22, 2000, effectively made limitations such as the number of attendees allowed unenforceable.

6. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Chabad of Santa Barbara has requested approval of a Development Plan and a Revision to an Existing Conditional Use Permit (18-031-DP-CUPRV) that would add a new synagogue and storage building, remove an existing barn/storage garage, and make other site improvements. A request for one modification related to parking for the existing residence is also included.
The project consists of the following components as shown in the proposed site plan in Figure 2 and detailed in the project application:

1. A Development Plan (DP) to allow for the following:
   - Construction of a new, approximately 7,293 square foot (SF) one-story synagogue with a 815 SF roof terrace (8,108 SF total). The building will include a sanctuary, event hall, kitchen, offices, conference rooms, bathrooms, storage, and mechanical and electrical space. The tallest proposed roof line is 24 feet, 6.5 inches, although the building also includes an architectural projection that would have a maximum height of 34 feet, 7.25 inches. Solar panels will also be included on the roof.
   - Construction of a new, 841 SF, one-story storage building. The maximum height would be approximately 16 feet.
   - Removal of the existing 1,440 SF, approximately 80-year-old barn/storage garage.
   - Approval of the existing, 176-SF, open-sided, lean-to storage container.
   - Assistance in the removal of the existing residential driveway and the removal and relocation of the existing Synagogue driveway to approximately 35 feet west of its current location.
   - Replacement, reorientation, and expansion of the existing 24-space parking area (including 1 van-accessible space) with a 31-space parking area. The 31-space parking area would include 3 van-accessible spaces as well as 3 uncovered spaces designated for the residence.
   - Addition of landscape improvements to integrate the proposed synagogue and storage building with existing buildings and provide landscape buffers for neighboring properties and the Las Vegas Creek. Plants are intended to be generally native and drought tolerant; 24 trees to be planted include coast live oak (6), California sycamore (5), Catalina ironwood (1), and New Zealand Christmas tree (12). The removal of 8 fruit trees (various types), 2 myoporum trees, and one pepper tree (11 trees total) are proposed.
   - Addition of two new bioretention basins totaling approximately 3,462 SF (2.40% of the site).
   - Additional improvements on the site to accommodate the above proposed changes, including hardscape, new site lighting, and a trash enclosure.
   - No development is proposed within the General Plan required 100-foot Stream Protection Area setback from Las Vegas Creek.

As shown in Table 1 below, the total net additional building area after demolition and new construction as described above will be approximately 6,641 SF. The Goleta Water District and the Goleta Sanitary District would continue to provide water and sanitary sewer service to the proposed project. Currently, a portion of the on-site water usage (irrigation) is permitted to come from an on-site well (allowed as part of Conditional Use Permit 92-CP-018); no change is proposed.

2. A Modification request to eliminate the requirement of Section 35-256 (1) of the Inland Zoning Ordinance to provide a garage for the three required parking spaces for the residence. While the three parking spaces for the residence are proposed to be provided, they are proposed to be uncovered spaces located within the parking lot. The three residential parking spaces are proposed approximately 25 feet from the front property line (outside of the required 20-foot front yard setback), are approximately 2 feet below the elevation of Stow Canyon Road, and are screened from view from Stow Canyon Road by proposed landscaping.
Figure 2: Proposed Architectural Site Plan
### Table 1
Proposed Project and Existing Lot Coverage Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No: 18-031 DP and CUPRV APN: 077-170-044.</th>
<th>Existing SF</th>
<th>Existing % Cover</th>
<th>Proposed SF</th>
<th>Proposed % Cover</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot: 3.29 Acres (Gross)</td>
<td>143,996</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>143,996</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Single-family Dwelling)(^1)</td>
<td>4,855</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td>4,855</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes 762 SF Exterior Deck)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue/Pre-School(^1)</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>Convert religious service space to office use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa(^2)</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Shed(^3)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Building Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn/Storage Garage(^3)</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Building Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Synagogue(^3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,293</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
<td>New Building Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(815 SF roof terrace excluded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Storage Building(^3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>New Building Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Buildings</strong></td>
<td>9,145</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td>15,786</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
<td>+6,641 SF (+4.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessory/Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-sided storage(^3)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Trailer</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>To be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Enclosure(^3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Impermeable Surfaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/Drive Aisles (Impervious)</td>
<td>16,360</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>15,319</td>
<td>10.64%</td>
<td>-1,041 SF (-0.72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways/Other Hardscape</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>9,369</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
<td>+7,740 SF (+5.38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Basketball Court(^1)</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pervious Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape/Open Space</td>
<td>107,818</td>
<td>74.88%</td>
<td>81,798</td>
<td>56.81%</td>
<td>-26,020 SF (-18.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/Drive Aisles (Pervious)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,224</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>+9,244 SF (+6.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Range(^3)</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Area(^1)</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioretention Basins</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>+3,462 SF (+2.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lot</strong></td>
<td>143,996</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>143,996</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional, Offsite Demolition</strong>(^3)</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Demolish and replace both existing driveways with curb and gutter; demolish existing curb and gutter and replace with a new driveway approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SF = square feet; % = percent; N/A = Not Applicable

Notes:

- \(^1\)Feature was previously permitted.
- \(^2\)Feature does not require a permit.
- \(^3\)Feature is proposed to be permitted.

3. A Revision to the existing Conditional Use Permit (92-CP-018) to permit the expanded synagogue and pre-school/daycare activities as described below:

   - Synagogue:
     - Services and programs associated with the synagogue include activities typically associated with a religious institution, including worship, fellowship and
educational activities. Example services and programs include various weekly religious services, holiday services, weddings, funerals, coming-of-age events, after-school programs, adult education programs, teen events, and a seasonal summer camp.

- Activities would occur throughout the year on varying days of the week and times of the day.
- The number of people would fluctuate depending on the specific activity. The maximum number of attendees anticipated is 113 persons, including members, guests, and staff; such events are anticipated to occur on average once per week.
- The new synagogue has fixed seating for 81 people. Many members walk to services in observance of religious practice.
- Services and programs described above would occur within the new 7,293-SF Synagogue and support and ancillary activities may take place in a 1,980-SF portion of the existing 2,445-SF synagogue/pre-school building. Outdoor facilities (refer to the Development Plan description above) may also be utilized.
- Although synagogue services are open to the public, special events such as interfaith-gatherings, open houses, carnivals, and similar events that would attract a larger group of people (that would exceed more than 113 persons, including members, guests, and staff) would be regulated separately as provided for in City regulations.

- Pre-School/Daycare:
  - The pre-school/daycare would operate year-round, Monday through Friday, from 9AM through 3PM.
  - Attendees would be limited to no more than 20 students and 4 teachers.
  - Events may utilize a 465-SF portion of the existing 2,445-SF synagogue/pre-school building as well as outdoor facilities (refer to the Development Plan description above).

4. As shown in Table 2, a total of 29 parking spaces are required under the City of Goleta’s Inland Zoning Ordinance to simultaneously support all existing and proposed uses on the site: a residence (a single-family dwelling), a synagogue, and a pre-school/daycare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Existing, Required, and Proposed Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Parking Spaces</td>
<td>24 spaces, including 1 van-accessible space, provided in the existing lot as required by the existing Conditional Use Permit (92-CP-18). 2 spaces provided in the residential driveway; the permit for the garage conversion included the construction of a detached garage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Required for the Proposed Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Residence over 3,000 SF:</td>
<td>3 spaces (within a garage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue*:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One per four fixed seats</td>
<td>81 fixed seats/4 = 21 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*The synagogue includes office and storage space, an event hall, after-school and adult religious/educational programs, and a seasonal summer camp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Existing, Required, and Proposed Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Type</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School/Daycare:</td>
<td>One space per two employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 employees/2 = 2 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One space per ten students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 students/10 = 3 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Required Parking:</strong></td>
<td>3 + 21 + 2 + 3 = 29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Parking Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Type</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>3 Standard²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue and Pre-School/Daycare:</td>
<td>25 Standard and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Van-accessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Provided:</strong></td>
<td>31²</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Required:</strong></td>
<td>29, including 3 within a garage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Planning Commission to determine if there is a need to provide for bicycle parking; the applicant is proposing 3 spaces.

2The proposed residential parking is uncovered, not located within a garage, and subject to approval of a Modification.

7. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Historically, the proposed project site was used for cattle ranching starting in the mid-1800’s when it was purchased by Colonel W.W. Hollister from Nicholas A. Den, an Irish physician who had obtained rights to the 15,000-acre parcel in 1842. Subsequent owners continually raised the elevation of the farmland, re-routed Las Vegas Creek within the project boundary between 1929 and 1938, and planted avocado and citrus orchards (Stone 2018). However, there is no evidence that the site was still used for cultivation in the 1970s and 1980s, and it is known that commercial vehicles were stored on the site as part of a backhoe business without permits during a portion of this time (Booksan 2007). Today, only a few of the lemon and avocado trees remain on the western section of the property.

On October 28, 1992, the Santa Barbara County Planning Commission approved 92-LA-013 and 92-CP-018 for the “Loschak Synagogue, School, [and Lot] Line Adjustment” for APNs 077-170-031 and -032 for 6045 and 6051 Stow Canyon Road, respectively. Today, the APNs for these properties are 077-140-044 and 045, respectively, and the Synagogue is known as “Chabad of Santa Barbara.”

The Conditional Use Permit (92-CP-018) allowed for the construction and operation of an 873 SF synagogue, 2,235 SF office/meeting room, and a 2,235 SF daycare and school facility on the property. These improvements were in addition to the existing 2,002-SF residence (a single-family dwelling) and a 1,440-SF barn/storage garage on site. As part of the proposed project, the barn was to be removed to allow for the construction of a new driveway. Subsequently, the Deputy Director of Santa Barbara County’s Development Review Division approved two Substantial Conformity Determinations (SCDs) for the project. The first SCD, approved on May 26, 1994, increased the size of the proposed office/meeting room building and the proposed daycare and school facility buildings by 210 SF each to a new total of 2,445 SF each. The second SCD, approved on July 1, 1999, reoriented the proposed driveway 18 to 20 feet to the east, and extended the parking turnaround a maximum of 26 feet to the south, to retain existing mature fruit
trees and to retain the existing barn for storage; the total number of parking spaces proposed (24) would not change.

Ultimately, only the approved 2,445 SF daycare and school facility and revised parking lot were constructed. Since the 873 SF synagogue and the 2,445 SF office/meeting room were never constructed, the existing 2,445 SF daycare and school facility has been modified to serve all of these functions (daycare, school, office, meeting room, and synagogue worship space). Occasionally, a temporary tent is placed on the concrete slab that was constructed for the synagogue.

Concurrent with the Santa Barbara County Planning Commission’s approval of the aforementioned Lot Line Adjustment and Conditional Use Permit, the Santa Barbara County Planning Department approved a permit (93-LUS-028) for a residential remodel (including the conversion of the attached garage) and addition. Specifically, the project would increase the size of the 2,002-SF residence by 2,142 SF (to 4,144 SF total) and provide replacement parking in a new, detached, 630-SF garage. As part of this project, the driveway serving the former, attached garage was proposed to be removed and a new driveway on the eastern side of the property was proposed to be constructed to serve the new, detached garage. While the former, attached garage has since been converted, the former driveway has not been removed and neither the new driveway nor detached garage have been constructed.

On June 4, 1996, the Santa Barbara County Planning Department approved a permit for a 352 SF spa with bathroom (tub and shower) mechanical room and entry area. A second permit (99-LUS-024) was issued for an identical spa on February 17, 1999. It is presumed the second permit was issued because the original permit expired. In any event, the spa was ultimately constructed.

8. APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:

Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Barbara County Fire Department
Goleta Water District
Goleta Sanitary District

9. SITE INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing General Plan Land Use Designation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family (SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Ordinance, Zone District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Residential (DR)-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143,996 SF (3.3 Acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present Use and Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence, Synagogue, Education, School/Daycare Center, and Ancillary Uses (Spa/Bath House, Barn/Storage Garage, Parking, Half Basketball Court, Children’s Playground)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The environmental setting of the project site is urban. The project site is located at 6045 Stow Canyon Road, approximately 370 feet west of North Fairview Avenue and 900 feet south of Cathedral Oaks Road. The project is located on the existing Chabad of Santa Barbara property in a residential area of the City of Goleta. The project site is 3.3 acres in size on Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 077-140-044. Las Vegas Creek, a highly seasonal, unlined drainage channel, runs along the western boundary and The Meadows condominium complex is located west of Las Vegas Creek. The Montessori Center School of Santa Barbara and the Goleta Union School District Office (formerly Fairview Elementary School) are located to the south of the project site; Goleta Valley Church is located immediately to the east of the project site; and single-family residences are located to the north of the project site on the opposite side of Stow Canyon Road. Access to the project site is provided from Stow Canyon Road.

11. CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

The City made a request to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on December 20, 2018 for the Sacred Lands File related to the project per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and Native American Contacts list. The City received a response from the NAHC on December 27, 2018 that provided a Tribal Consultation List and also stated that the Sacred Lands File (SLF) check was negative.

On January 3, 2019, the City sent letters inviting consultation to the tribal representatives identified on the list provided by the NAHC as having a traditional and cultural association with the geographic area of the proposed project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. On February 8, 2019, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians indicated that they did not want to formally consult but would like the City to impose the requirement of a “discovery condition.” Such a condition requires that in the event resources are found, work halts or moves to another portion of the site until the find can be evaluated. Please refer to Section 15.E, Cultural Resources, for details on the Mitigation Measure.
12. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

13. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

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

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

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

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier environmental impact report or negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier environmental impact report or negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration document, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager  
Date: 10/31/19

14. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

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

(e) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)).

(f) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances).
(g) Supporting Information Sources: A source list, including individuals contacted, should be attached and cited in the discussion.

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

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

A. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Existing Setting

The proposed project site is located within a developed neighborhood with a mix of attached and detached residences, religious institutions, and schools, as described below. The site is graded and developed with structures and ancillary improvements as outlined in the project description.

The project site has a gentle slope from the northeast corner to the southwest corner (approximately 6% maximum). Most of the property boundary is lined with hedges and mature, skyline trees; some of this vegetation is located on neighboring property. Las Vegas Creek, a highly seasonal, unlined drainage channel, runs along the western boundary and The Meadows condominium complex is located west of Las Vegas Creek. The other, adjacent uses include the Montessori Center School of Santa Barbara and the Goleta Union School District Office to the south; Goleta Valley Church to the east; and single-family residences and Goleta Valley Jr. High School and Santa Barbara Charter School north of the project site on the north side of Stow Canyon Road.

The surrounding area does not have any scenic corridors or scenic view points as referenced on Figure 6-1 of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) Visual and Historical Resources Element. The nearest Local Scenic Corridors are Fairview Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road, respectively located approximately 390 feet east and 900 feet north of the nearest property boundary.
The project is required to comply with the City’s Outdoor Lighting Guidelines, which have been adopted to achieve a high standard of quality and efficiency in lighting and obtaining “Dark Sky” standards Citywide. The Dark Sky standards are intended to reduce light glare from impacting views of the night sky. The City’s Outdoor Lighting Guidelines and the Architectural and Design Standards for Commercial Projects require Design Review Board review of the proposed lighting to ensure that outdoor lighting used for project.

The City’s Design Review Board (DRB) is required to review the project and grant approval. Aspects of the DRB review relevant to this project include building height, bulk and scale; colors and types of building materials and application; physical relation to the immediately affected surrounding area; site layout, orientation and location of buildings, and relationship with open areas; architectural style; on-site lighting; and location and type of landscaping. Ordinance No. 15-04 includes 19 findings related to the aspects described above that must be made by the DRB during Design Review to grant project approval. On December 11, 2018, the DRB performed Conceptual review of the project and generally provided positive comments and support.

ii. Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist or the County of Santa Barbara’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (published May 1992 and revised January 1995, October 2001, and October 2002), adopted by the City of Goleta on August 19, 2008 (hereinafter referred to as the City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual). A discussion of the following thresholds occurs in the Project Specific Impacts analysis below. The Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual has not been updated since it was adopted by the City and may not reflect current CEQA, General Plan, and other regulations enacted in the ensuing years.

Threshold AES-1. Does the project site have significant visual resources by virtue of surface waters, vegetation, elevation, slope or other natural or man-made features which are publicly visible? If so, does the project have the potential to degrade or significantly interfere with the public’s enjoyment of the site’s existing visual resources?

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

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

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a-c, AES-1,-2,-3) Less Than Significant Impact. The City’s GP/CLUP Visual and Historical Resources Element Figure 6-1 does not identify any scenic corridors or scenic view points in the project site area. The project site is not visible from coastal and mountain areas, or the Fairview Avenue or Cathedral Oaks travel corridors due to surrounding development. Public views of the project site would generally be limited to those from Stow Canyon
Road, and any views of the project from Stow Canyon Road would largely be screened given existing site characteristics (e.g., topographical slope, existing vegetation) and the proposed project design (e.g., location of the synagogue behind the residence, proposed vegetation).

The proposed storage building will not obstruct scenic vistas as seen from locations in the project vicinity given its proposed height approximately (16 feet) and existing site characteristics (e.g., existing development and grade). The proposed Synagogue building would have a minimal impact, if any, on views in the project vicinity given it would largely be screened by the existing site features, including the residence, the building currently used for synagogue and educational services, and existing and proposed vegetation (hedges and trees) that line the majority of the property's boundary (existing vegetation and buildings are located adjacent to Stow Canyon Road and on neighboring property).

The proposed project does not lie within, or affect any views from, a Scenic Highway as designated by the State of California or the City of Goleta. As such, the project would not result in any impacts on scenic resources within a Scenic Highway viewshed. Removal of the barn/storage garage (believed to have been constructed by 1940 and is presumed to be over 80 years old [Bookspan 2007]) would result in a minor impact on the view of passing motorists and pedestrians on Stow Canyon Road, which is not a State Scenic Highway, given it is not prominently visible from the roadway and its lack of importance to the streetscape. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts to scenic views and scenic corridors.

d, AES-3) Less Than Significant Impact. The project will not create substantial light glare or result in a light related aesthetic incompatibility impact as discussed by checklist item d, and Threshold AES-3, given the characteristics of the lighting plan (minimal light fixtures, directed downward, dark sky compliant etc.). Further, the new improvements would be largely screened from view by the existing site conditions. As part of the design review for the project, the applicant is required to submit an outdoor lighting plan. As part of this process, the project will undergo Design Review Board review to ensure the project complies with the City’s exterior lighting dark sky standards, established lighting intensity maximums, as well as shielding and light angle requirements detailed in the City’s Outdoor Lighting Guidelines, Section VI, Exterior Lighting.

The outdoor lighting plans must include a site plan with the proposed locations of all proposed lighting fixtures and angles in relation to buildings and landscaping; photometric diagrams and data may also be required. Section VII of the Outdoor Lighting Guidelines details Parking Lot lighting requirements. Mandatory compliance with city lighting and design standards and completion of design review of the project will ensure the project’s new light sources for nighttime illumination of parking areas and/or loading areas, or for security, associated with the new Synagogue and storage buildings will meet City standards. With implementation of design review, no further mitigation would be required to address the potential lighting and glare impacts of the project and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Cumulative Impacts

Proposed development at the project site would not be prominently visible from viewpoints along Stow Canyon Road or other locations near the project site. Since construction of the original
project, the City of Goleta incorporated and adopted a General Plan with new aesthetics policies that are applicable to the proposed project site. The project is required to comply with the City's Outdoor Lighting Guidelines and the Architectural and Design Standards for Commercial Projects which require Design Review Board review of the proposed lighting plan and ensures the building lighting and design are compatible with the adjacent community. Given the purpose of the proposed lighting and with the implementation of a lighting plan that complies with City requirements, the project’s lighting-related impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project’s cumulative aesthetic impacts would be less than significant as it would not substantially contribute to changes in the visual character of the area.

v. Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are proposed or needed. However, the following condition of approval will be imposed on the project.

**Lighting Specifications.** The applicant must secure Design Review Board approval of all exterior lighting fixtures to be installed on the project site. The site lighting must be:

- controlled and directed away from the Stream Protection Area and its associated 100-foot buffer;
- low intensity;
- low glare design;
- hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels; and
- otherwise meet dark sky requirements.

Exterior lighting fixtures must be kept to the minimum lighting level and intensity needed to ensure public safety. These lights must be dimmed after 11 PM to the maximum extent practical without compromising public safety as determined by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. Lighting fixtures must be appropriate for the architectural style of the structure and surrounding area. The final lighting plan must include identification of all types, sizes, and intensities of wall mounted building lights and landscape accent lighting and a photometric map must be provided. “Moonlighting” type fixtures that illuminate entire tree canopies should also be avoided.

The Applicant/Permittee shall secure DRB approval of the lighting plan prior to issuance of the Land Use Permit for the project.

The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify plan compliance before issuance of the Land Use Permit and site installation at time of Final Building Inspection Clearance.

**Vegetation Screening.** Vegetation and/or fencing/walls shall be installed such that on-site parking areas and structures are partially screened and in substantial conformity with the approved plans. Vegetation shall be maintained in substantial conformity with the approved Landscape Plans. Substantial conformity must be determined by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee.
vi. Residual Impact

The project would result in a new source of light or glare that would create minimal impacts that would have a less than significant impact on light or glare with implementation of the existing standards.
B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

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

The proposed project site is located within an urbanized area and consists of developed land with a residence, a building used for synagogue and educational services that was approved in 1992 (92-CP-018) and other ancillary uses/structures as described in the project description. No agricultural use, forest lands, or timberlands occur on the project site or in the immediate vicinity.

Historically, the proposed project site was used for cattle ranching starting in the mid-1800’s when it was purchased by Colonel W.W. Hollister from Nicholas A. Den, an Irish physician who had obtained rights to the 15,000-acre parcel in 1842. Subsequent owners continually raised the elevation of the farmland, re-routed Las Vegas Creek within the project boundary between 1929 and 1938, and planted avocado and citrus orchards (Stone 2018). However, there is no evidence that the site was still used for cultivation in the 1970s and 1980s, and it is known that commercial vehicles were stored on the site as part of a backhoe business (operated without permits) during a portion of this time (Bookspan 2007).

Currently, the site includes ornamental fruit and avocado trees, some of which are likely remnants from the previous agricultural use of the site. The State of California Department of Conservation (CDC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) designated the project site and surrounding areas as Urban and Built-Up Lands (CDC 2018). The nearest Unique Farmland and Prime Farmland are respectively located approximately 450 feet and 1,100 feet east of the property’s eastern boundary, on the east side of Fairview Avenue.

ii. Thresholds of Significance

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

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a-e) **No Impact.** The site is designated as “Urban Built Up land” and is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as mapped by the California Department of Conservation. There are no agriculturally zoned properties or properties under a Williamson Act contract in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not result in any environmental changes that would involve the conversion of any farmland to non-agricultural uses. Additionally, the site has not been used for agriculture since before the existing Conditional Use Permit for the synagogue was approved in 1992, approximately 27 years ago. Further, there are no lands that contain or are zoned as forest lands or timberlands on the project site or in its immediate vicinity. Additionally, the proposed project would not result in any other environmental changes that would involve the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural or forest resources in the area.

iv. Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative impact on agriculture or forest resources within the City.
v. **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Based on the above analysis, no mitigation measures are necessary.

vi. **Residual Impact**

No residual impacts (either project specific or cumulative) on agriculture or forest resources would occur as a result of project implementation.
### C. AIR QUALITY

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

This section incorporates the results of air quality modeling prepared using CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 for construction and operations. The modeling results are included in this document as Appendix C.

i. **Existing Setting**

*Meteorological Setting*

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

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

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

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) establish health-based ambient air quality standards to identify outdoor pollutant levels that are considered safe for the public - including those individuals most sensitive to the effects of air pollution, such as children and the elderly. U.S. EPA has set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for six pollutants, including ozone (O₃), nitrogen oxides (NOₓ), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Sulfur Oxides (SOₓ) and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅). These are referred to as the “criteria” pollutants. CARB has set California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for the same six pollutants, as well as for four additional pollutants.

CARB also identifies other air pollutants as toxic air contaminants (TACs) - pollutants that may cause serious, long-term effects, such as cancer, even at low levels. Most air toxics have no known safe levels, and some may accumulate in the body from repeated exposures. CARB has identified about 200 pollutants as air toxics, and measures continue to be adopted to reduce emissions of air toxics. Both criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants are measured statewide to assess the adequacy of programs for cleaning the air. CARB works with local air pollution control districts to reduce air pollution from all sources.

ii. Regulatory Framework

Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS)

Federal and state law regulates Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) and emergency episode criteria for various pollutants. Generally, state regulations have stricter standards than those at the federal level. AAQS are set at concentrations that provide a sufficient margin of safety to protect public health and welfare. Federal standards are established by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and are termed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The State standards are established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and are called the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). The APCD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to assure that Federal and State air quality standards are being met. The significance of a pollutant concentration is determined by comparing the concentration to an appropriate federal and/or state ambient air quality standard. The region generally has good air quality, as it attains or is considered in maintenance status for most ambient air quality standards as described below.

Air Quality Planning

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

In 2001, the CARB developed an attainment plan that was designed to meet both federal and state planning requirements. The federal attainment plan was combined with those from other statewide non-attainment areas to become the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The 2001 Clean Air Plan (CAP) was adopted as the County portion of the SIP, designed to meet and maintain clean air standards. A 2013 CAP was adopted by the SBAPCD in March 2015.
The 2016 Ozone Plan (2016 Plan) was developed in 2016. The 2016 Plan is the eighth triennial update to the initial state Air Quality Attainment Plan that was originally adopted by the District Board in 1991 (other updates were done in 1994, 1998, 2001, 2004, 2007, 2010, and 2013). Based on the region’s nonattainment status for ozone, each of the Santa Barbara County plan updates have included an “every feasible measure” strategy to ensure continued progress toward attainment of the state ozone standards. The 2016 Plan addresses the state ozone standard only and does not address the federal ozone standard.

When the 2016 Plan was adopted, the District was designated as a nonattainment area for the state ozone standard. However, the District was aware that this designation might soon change to be nonattainment-transitional. A region is designated Nonattainment-transitional when the ozone standard has not been exceeded more than three times at any one location during the last year. The Board adoption included a commitment to review the 2016 Ozone Plan if the District’s designation were to change to nonattainment-transitional and determine whether the control measures scheduled for adoption or implementation within the next three years are needed (SBCAPCD August 2017).

The change to a nonattainment-transitional designation means that, prior to implementing new control measures, the District must review the plan and determine whether the stationary source control measures scheduled for adoption or implementation within the next three years are needed to accomplish expeditious attainment of the state ozone standard. The District may modify the control measure schedule if it determines that modifications will not slow progress toward achieving or maintaining the state ozone standard. Available data at the SBCAPCD website, shows that the ozone standards have not been exceeded thus far in 2019 (SBCAPCD 2019).

Santa Barbara County is designated as a federal ozone attainment area for the 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (the 1-hour federal standard was revoked for Santa Barbara County). “Attainment” means those areas of the country where air pollution levels are persistently below the national ambient air quality standards. A new California 8-hour ozone standard was implemented in May 2006, which the County has violated. At this time, the County is classified as “Nonattainment-transitional” for both the state 8-hour and 1-hour ozone standard.

The County also continues to violate the state standard for PM$_{10}$, therefore Santa Barbara County is a non-attainment area for the State standards for PM$_{10}$. The County is in attainment for the federal PM$_{2.5}$ standard and is designated “unclassified” for the State PM$_{2.5}$ standard, and is designated “attainment” or “unclassified” for other state standards and for all federal clean air standards. “Unclassified” means that there is currently no quantifiable data to measure ambient air quality standards in that area. Those jurisdictions that are designated both as “attainment” or “unclassified” are considered to be in attainment of ambient air quality standards even though there is currently no quantifiable data to measure its specific ambient air quality levels.

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

In addition, pursuant to the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, a significant adverse air quality impact may occur when a project, individually or cumulatively, triggers either of the following as summarized below:
Threshold AQ-1. Interfere with progress toward the attainment of the ozone standard by releasing emissions which equal or exceed the established long-term quantitative thresholds for NO\textsubscript{x} (nitrogen oxides) and ROC (reactive organic compounds; same as reactive organic gases [ROG]). Thresholds are 25 pounds/day of ozone precursors (NO\textsubscript{x} and ROC, combined).

Threshold AQ-2. Adds sufficient carbon monoxide (CO) to existing background levels to create a “hot-spot” where the one-hour standard of 20 parts per million carbon monoxide is exceeded. This typically occurs when adding 800 peak hour trips to a severely congested intersection.

Threshold AQ-3. Equals or exceeds the state or federal ambient air quality standards for any criteria pollutant (as determined by modeling).

Threshold AQ-4. Results in toxic or hazardous pollutants in amounts which may increase cancer risks for the affected population.

Threshold AQ-5. Causes an odor nuisance problem impacting a considerable number of people.

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

The following significance thresholds have been established by the APCD (Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents, SBCAPCD June 2017). While the City of Goleta has not yet adopted any new threshold criteria, these APCD thresholds are considered appropriate for use as a guideline for the impact analysis.

**APCD Operational Impacts Thresholds**

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

a) Emit 240 pounds per day or more of ROC and NO\textsubscript{x} from all sources;

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

c) Emit 25 pounds per day or more of unmitigated NO\textsubscript{x} from any motor vehicle trips only;

d) Emit 80 pounds per day or more of PM\textsubscript{10};

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

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

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

The cumulative contribution of project emissions to regional levels should be compared with existing programs and plans, including the most recent Ozone Plan (SBCAPCD 2016).

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

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

**APCD Construction Impacts Thresholds**

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

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

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

iv. **Project Specific Impacts**

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The criteria pollutant emission projections used to develop the SBCAPCD 2016 Ozone Plan are based on population, vehicle trends, and planned land use. As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by the City’s General Plan would be consistent with the Clean Air 2016 Ozone Plan.

The 2016 Ozone Plan uses the years 2025 and 2035 to estimate future emission inventories. The proposed project would result in the construction of a 7,293 SF synagogue and 841 SF storage building. The proposed project would not substantially change the existing uses conducted at the project site. Due to the relatively small size of the project, existing use of the site for religious services, and limited potential to substantially increase employment opportunities or the population of the City, it is not anticipated that the project would result in an increase in the City’s population that exceeds the forecasts used in the 2016 Ozone Plan. In addition, the project would be consistent with the project site’s existing General Plan land use designation (Single Family) and zoning classification (DR-4.6). Therefore, the proposed project’s emissions are accounted for in the 2016 Ozone Plan growth projections and the project would be consistent with the 2016 Ozone Plan.

b-d, AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, AQ-4, AQ-5) **Less than Significant Impact.**

**Construction Impacts:**

Construction of the proposed project would result in a temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed caused by three general categories: soil disturbance and subsequent
entrained dust emissions, equipment and vehicle exhaust emissions, and architectural coatings. Pollutant emissions associated with demolition and construction activity were quantified using CalEEMod (Version 2016.3.2) based on default project demolition and construction assumptions, except as noted on Page 1 of Appendix C (e.g., total disturbed area is 1.53 acres and the construction would be phased based on the applicant-provided construction schedule). Table AQ-1, below, shows the estimated maximum unmitigated annual construction emissions associated with the project for ROC, NOx, CO, SO2, PM10, and PM2.5.

### Table AQ-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fugitive and Exhaust Sources</th>
<th>ROC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Emissions</td>
<td>0.1561</td>
<td>1.1019</td>
<td>1.0039</td>
<td>1.7700e-003</td>
<td>0.0778</td>
<td>0.0576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CalEEMod v. 2016.3.2 model*

As previously mentioned, although the SBCAPCD does not currently have quantitative thresholds of significance in place for short-term or construction emissions, it uses 25 tons per year for ROC, NOx, SO2, as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts. For this analysis, the City has chosen to rely on the SBCAPCD’s guideline (25 tons/year for ROC, NOx, SO2, PM10, and PM2.5) as the threshold to determine the significance of project-related construction emissions. As shown in Table AQ-1, the construction emissions do not exceed these guidance thresholds. In addition, the project site is developed and does not involve a significant amount of grading. Moreover, the SBCAPCD provided suggested conditions for the project on April 17, 2018; these suggested conditions were confirmed on November 29, 2018 based upon review of project changes proposed by the applicant on November 13, 2018.

Therefore, project-related construction emissions would be substantially below the APCD’s short-term emission guideline of 25 tons per year for construction projects. As such, the project’s construction emissions would be less than significant and reduced to the extent feasible with the implementation of standard APCD conditions that have been included as conditions of approval for the project.

**Operational Impacts:**

The unmitigated operational mobile, area, and energy source emissions for the project were calculated using the CalEEMod computer model (version 2016.3.2). The model assumes that operation of the project would begin in 2022 and the results are shown below in Table AQ-2. The operational emissions provided in Table AQ-2 are the additional emissions associated with proposed project and would be in addition to the existing (baseline) emissions. Mobile emissions identified in Table AQ-2 are derived from CalEEMod’s default values based on the ITE Manual (9th edition [CAPCOA 2017]). As such, mobile emissions are over-estimated, given that many attendees at services and holiday events often do not drive but will walk to the site in keeping with religious practices and observances (Associated Transportation Engineers 2018) and because proposed to changes to ongoing activities are minor. Emissions resulting from the project would not
exceed the significance thresholds of 25 pounds per day for total ozone precursor emissions (ROC and NOX combined); 25 pounds per day of ROC and NOX for mobile emissions (individual); 240 pounds per day for total ozone precursor emissions (ROC and NOX combined); or 80 pounds per day for PM_{10} emissions. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant long-term air quality impact.

The proposed synagogue, storage building, and other project-related site improvements would not be a substantial long-term source of odors given the nature of the use. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant odor-related impacts.

Table AQ-2

| Project Operations – Unmitigated Area, Energy, and Mobile Source Emissions | Emissions (lbs./day) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ROC | NOX | CO | SO2 | PM_{10} | PM_{2.5} |
| Area Sources | 0.2722 | 4.0000e-005 | 4.3500e-003 | 0.0000 | 2.0000e-005 | 2.0000e-005 |
| Energy Sources | 5.6400e-003 | 0.0513 | 0.0431 | 3.1000e-004 | 3.9000e-003 | 3.9000e-003 |
| Mobile Sources | 0.5237 | 1.7021 | 4.4518 | 0.0113 | 1.0253 | 0.2823 |
| Total | 0.8016 | 1.7534 | 4.4992 | 0.0116 | 1.0293 | 0.2863 |
| City Threshold | 25 (ROC and NOX combined) | “Hotspot” created? | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| SBCAPCD Thresholds | 25/240 | 25/240 | N/A | N/A | 80 | N/A |
| Exceed Threshold? | No | No | No | N/A | No | N/A |

a) 25 lbs per day for mobile emissions only and 240 lbs per day for all project sources (area, energy, and mobile)
Totals may vary due to rounding.
Source: CalEEMod v.2016.3.2 Model

Pursuant to checklist items b, c, and d, and Thresholds AQ-1 through AQ-5 (inclusive), project operation would not exceed CEQA thresholds, SBCAPCD operational thresholds of significance, and City of Goleta Thresholds. The project, therefore, would have a less than significant impact due to the project operational mobile and area source emissions.

v. Cumulative Impacts

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

For projects that do not have significant ozone precursor emissions or localized pollutant impacts, if emissions have been taken into account in the most recent Ozone Plan growth projections, regional cumulative impacts may be considered to be insignificant. When a project’s emissions exceed the thresholds and are clearly not accounted for in the most recent Ozone Plan growth
projections, then the project is considered to have significant cumulative impacts. As described in response “a” above, the proposed project’s emissions are accounted for in the 2016 Ozone Plan growth projections and the project would be consistent with the Ozone Plan. Therefore, the project’s contribution to regional cumulative air quality impacts is considered less than significant.

vi. **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No air quality impacts are identified; therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

vii. **Residual Impact**

The project would result in less than significant impacts, inclusive of residual air quality impacts.
### D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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>X</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>X</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>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Existing Setting

The project site is located within an urbanized area and consists of developed open space/landscaping and play areas (approximately 80.2% of the site) as well as impervious development, including buildings, parking, and walkways (approximately 19.8% of the site). Existing structures include a residence, a building used for synagogue and educational services.
that was approved in 1992 (92-CP-018), and other ancillary uses/structures as described in the project description. The majority of the property boundary is lined with hedges and mature, skyline trees; some of this vegetation is located on neighboring property. The site also includes ornamental fruit trees, some of which are likely remnants from the previous agricultural use of the site that likely ended by the 1970s.

Pursuant to the City's adopted General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, Conservation Element Map (June 2016) (Figure 4-1) for Special-Status Species and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA), the closest identified ESHA is Las Vegas Creek (a highly seasonal, unlined drainage channel) and the associated riparian habitat (a mixture of ornamental and native species that have colonized the creek’s eastern bank) located on and immediately west of the property’s western boundary. The portion of Las Vegas Creek adjacent to the project site is channelized, approximately 18-20 feet wide, and has a relatively flat bed gradient. The banks have been graded to about 45-degrees and pipe-and-revetment runs along the toe of both banks. The eastern bank of the creek is a mixture of ornamental and native species that have colonized this area, including Monterey cypress (Cupressus macrocarpa), willow rhus (Rhus lancea), black cottonwood (Populus balsamifera subsp. trichocarpa), fan palm (Washingtonia sp.), waxleaf Texas privet (Ligustrum japonicum), California blackberry (Rubus ursinus), and coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) saplings and seedlings. Eastward of this line of riparian vegetation is a mowed grass path, chain-link fence, and oleander (Nerium oleander) hedge (Hunt & Associates 2017).

GP/CLUP Policy CE 2.2 establishes a 100-foot stream protection area (SPA) on both sides of creeks, including Las Vegas Creek, measured from the top of the bank or the outer limit of wetlands and/or riparian vegetation, whichever is greater. The City may consider increasing or decreasing the width of the SPA upland buffer on a case-by-case basis at the time of environmental review. The City may allow portions of a SPA upland buffer to be less than 100 feet wide, but not less than 25 feet wide, based on a site specific assessment if (1) there is no feasible alternative siting for development that will avoid the SPA upland buffer; and (2) the project’s impacts will not have significant adverse effects on streamside vegetation or the biotic quality of the stream.

GP/CLUP Policy CE 1.2.k designates “nesting and roosting sites and related habitat areas for various species of raptors” as ESHA. No special status species have been identified on the project site or project vicinity (GP/CLUP 2016), and it is unlikely that any of the 11 ornamental and fruit trees proposed for removal (refer to plan set Sheet L-1) would be used as a nesting or roosting site for raptors. However, it is possible that these 11 ornamental and fruit trees could be used by nesting migratory birds. Furthermore, given the number and variety of skyline trees on and immediately adjacent to the site, it is assumed that raptor nesting or roosting sites (ESHA) are also located on or immediately adjacent to the project site. The overall wildlife habitat values of the project area are relatively low due to the historic agricultural use of the site, and existing urban development on and in the vicinity of the site. It is expected that Las Vegas Creek supports habitat for resident and migratory wildlife that are common to the project area.

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

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

a. Substantially reduce or eliminate species diversity or abundance.

b. Substantially reduce or eliminate quantity or quality of nesting areas.

c. Substantially limit reproductive capacity through loss of individuals or habitat.

b. Substantially fragment, eliminate, or otherwise disrupt foraging areas and/or access to food resources.

e. Substantially limit or fragment range and movement (geographic distribution of animals and/or seed dispersal routes).

f. Substantially interfere with natural processes, such as fire or flooding, upon which the habitat depends.

2. **Less Than Significant Impacts**

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

a. Small acreages of non-native grassland if wildlife values are low.

b. Individuals or stands of non-native trees if not used by important animal species such as raptors or monarch butterflies.

b. Areas of historical disturbance such as intensive agriculture.

c. Small pocket of habitats already significantly fragmented or isolated, and disturbed or degraded.

b. Areas of primarily ruderal species resulting from pre-existing man-made disturbance.

iii. **Project Specific Impacts**

**a) Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction would result in the direct removal of approximately 26,000 SF (18% of the site) of a developed, open field and ornamental landscaping, including 11 ornamental and fruit trees (1 apple, 1 apricot, 3 avocado, 2 citrus, 1 pomegranate shrub, 2 myoporum, and 1 pepper) that are not used by important animal species and have a low value for wildlife. No specimen or native trees would be removed. Such habitat modification would have little to no direct, long-term impact on any special status species.

Further, the California Invasive Plant Council classifies the invasiveness of the pepper tree as “limited” and “moderate” for the myoporum tree. These trees are not skyline trees and are unlikely to be used by raptors for nesting or roosting, especially when considering the many skyline trees available for nesting or roosting within or adjacent to the project site. As such, the removal of the three existing, limited- or moderately-invasive trees would eliminate the potential for them to spread into the adjacent riparian ESHA and is therefore considered a small but beneficial long-term impact to biological resources.

Wildlife present near construction activities, however, would be temporarily exposed to auditory and visual disturbance from human presence and construction equipment, as well as vibration, dust, and noise, during construction activities. In response, mobile species such as birds and mammals may temporarily leave the site until construction activities cease.
GP/CLUP Policy CE 1.9 (h) requires that the timing of grading and construction activities be controlled to minimize potential disruption of wildlife during critical time periods such as nesting or breeding seasons, and GP/CLUP Policy CE 8.4 requires a buffer area for raptor species. Specifically, development shall be designed to provide a 100-foot buffer around active and historical nest sites for protected species of raptors when feasible. Furthermore, whenever feasible, no development activity (e.g., grading, construction) shall be allowed within a 300-foot radius of the nest site during the nesting and fledgling season. GP/CLUP Policies CE 1.2(k) and 8.1(e) designate raptor roosts as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas, and CE Policy 8.2 requires that all development be located, designed, constructed, and managed to avoid disturbance of adverse impacts to special status species and their habitats, including raptors roosts. Additionally, all raptors are specifically protected under California Department of Fish and Wildlife Code and all migratory birds are protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act; these laws include the protection of raptor and migratory bird nests, respectfully, during the active nesting season (Fish and Game Code, § 1 et seq.; 16 Unites States Code, § 703 et seq.).

There are no known roosts/nests on the property or adjacent to the property. However, the potential exists for hawks and migratory birds to use the existing trees on or adjacent to the property site. If there are nesting birds within 300 feet of site, project construction has the potential to temporarily disturb/impact nesting birds (e.g., on the skyline trees within and around the project site). Therefore, in an abundance of caution, a Condition of Approval (Nesting Birds) is proposed to avoid the potential impacts resulting from construction of the proposed project. Specifically, preconstruction surveys for nesting birds will be performed and buffer areas will be implemented if an active nest is detected. The Nesting Birds Condition of Approval was proposed by the City and agreed to by the applicant. Implementation of the Nesting Birds Condition of Approval will be verified by the City through a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). Therefore, with the implementation of the Nesting Birds Condition of Approval and the MMRP, the City has a mechanism to verify that any impacts to migrating and nesting birds would be reduced.

The project complies with GP/CLUP Policy CE 2.2 by providing a 100-foot SPA buffer between the proposed new development (including the bioretention basin, storage building, and patio) and the top of the bank or the outer limit of wetlands and/or riparian vegetation (whichever is greater). The synagogue would be located approximately 180 feet from the buffer. Therefore, project would not result in any direct impacts to Las Vegas Creek or its SPA buffer. Potential indirect impacts to Las Vegas Creek or its 100-foot SPA buffer would be minimal. The project would comply with short- and long-term water quality requirements, in part by including several stormwater control measures would be implemented to reduce the peak and volume of runoff while also providing treatment of runoff before it is discharged off-site; see Section 15.J, Hydrology and Water Quality, for additional details. Additionally, Condition of Approval Lighting Specifications (refer to Section 15.A.v) would minimize potential lighting impacts. Finally, the number of people on the project site that could result in indirect impacts would not be substantially increased.

b-e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** As stated above, (Section “a”), Las Vegas Creek is located adjacent to the project site and it is assumed that the creek serves as a wildlife migration corridor. The proposed improvements are located at least 100’ feet away from the top of Las Vegas Creek bank in accordance with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 2.2.
Given the project’s location (a minimum of 100 feet from riparian vegetation), previous development located on and adjacent to the project site, and the implementation of conditions of approval to minimize new lighting on the project site, the project would not significantly impede short- or long-term wildlife access to foraging habitat, breeding habitat, water resources, or other areas necessary for reproduction. Consistent with existing City standards, new exterior building, landscaping, and parking lot lighting would be pointed downward, dark-sky compliant, primarily support the safety of users of the site, and would have a minimal impact on riparian habitat located over 100 feet from any new lighting. Therefore, impacts to wildlife movement and nursery sites would be less than significant.

The construction and on-going use of the and site improvements for synagogue and educational services will not entail the removal, filling, hydrological interruption of any wetland, marsh, or vernal pool given the project’s location and lack of wetlands in the vicinity as well as the existing condition of the site and the low-impact design of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no impact to federally or state-protected wetlands.

f) **No Impact.** While adjacent to Las Vegas Creek, the project site does not contain habitat elements protected under City of Goleta’s GP/CLUP Conservation Element plans and policies and development as designed would not conflict with local policies protecting biological resources. The project site is not within the coverage area of any approved federal, state, or local Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan as described in checklist item f. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts related to consistency with these types of plans. The proposed buildings and site improvements will not conflict with any local policies or adopted conservation plans regarding biological resources as there are none applicable to the site or the area in which the project is located. As such, no impact will occur.

iv. **Cumulative Impacts**

The project’s potential impacts to potential raptor or migratory bird nesting sites during construction would be less than significant and would be further reduced by implementation of the *Nesting Birds and Lighting Specifications* Conditions of Approval. Because construction would pose only a short-term impact to potential raptor nesting sites during the 16-20-month construction period, the project’s short-term contributions to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No other component of the project would result in long-term impacts to biological resources that would be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project’s contributions to cumulative impacts to biological resources would not be considerable or significant.

v. **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are proposed or needed. However, the following condition of approval will be imposed on the project.

**Nesting Birds.** At the Permittee’s expense, the Applicant/Permittee must retain a City-approved biologist to conduct a survey to determine if nesting birds exist on or adjacent to the project site within 300 feet. The survey must be conducted prior to commencement of any demolition, grading, and/or construction activities. The survey must establish the breeding and roosting status of any nesting birds found on the site or within 300’ of the site and designate a 300-foot
buffer from any nest if found. The survey must include recommendations to minimize impacts to nesting birds during construction, to including but not limited to, imposing setbacks, installing fence protection, and restricting the construction schedule. The survey must take into account expected increases and decreases in nesting birds over the construction period and must include a map showing known roosting and nesting sites.

Construction within the 300-foot buffer must be avoided during the nesting season (e.g. February 1st through July 31st, but is variable based on seasonal climatic conditions). In addition, construction must not occur until the City-approved biologist has notified the City that all young birds have successfully fledged, and the nests are no longer active.

The 300-foot buffer(s) must be shown on all grading and construction plans where applicable. The survey must be conducted no more than 14 days and no less than 7 days prior to commencement of any demolition, grading and/or construction activities. Survey conclusions must be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of Grading/Building permits.

The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before issuance of the Grading/Building Permit.

**Stream Protection Area.** Grading, construction activities, and structural development shall occur outside of a 100-foot SPA/riparian buffer measured from the top-of-bank or edge of riparian vegetation, whichever is greater, of Las Vegas Creek. Under no circumstances shall any construction equipment or construction worker vehicles be allowed inside the buffer; mechanized equipment for the purpose of mowing the existing grass field is allowed.

The 100-foot SPA buffer, the location of construction fencing, and fencing materials shall be shown on the project plans submitted for approval of any LUP or the issuance of any building or grading permit for the project and approved by the PER Director. The fence and fencing material must be installed in accordance with the approved plans prior to commencement of grading/ground disturbing activities.

City staff shall review plans, confirm fence installation prior to the commencement of construction activities (including grading), and perform site inspections throughout the construction phase.

**Invasive Species.** Non-native, invasive plant species cannot be included in any erosion control seed mixes and/or landscaping plant palette. The California Invasive Plant Council maintains an Inventory database of non-native, invasive plants.

The Applicant/Permittee shall secure DRB approval of the planting plan prior to issuance of the Land Use Permit for the project. The prohibition of the use of non-native invasive plant species must be printed on all Landscape plans.

The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before issuance of the Land Use Permit and that the requirement has been satisfied at the time of Final Building Inspection Clearance.
vi. Residual Impact

With implementation of the mitigation measure above, residual project impacts on biological resources during construction would be less than significant because construction would not occur within 300 of bird nesting activities. Once construction is complete, no significant contribution to cumulative biological resource impacts will occur with day-to-day operations of the project as it would result in only a small expansion of ongoing synagogue and educational services.
E. 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 pursuant to in §15064.5?</td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section incorporates the analysis, findings, and recommendations in the Phase I Archaeological Investigation for 6045 Stow Canyon Road, APN 077-170-044, Goleta, California (Stone 2018) as well as a supplemental memorandum (Stone 2019) in response to the City of Goleta’s request for additional information. These documents are referenced herein as Appendix D and contain confidential information that is kept on file with the City of Goleta and may be reviewed with prior authorization by the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Department in accordance with applicable law. The historic significance of the barn/storage garage to be demolished was assessed in the Historic Resources Evaluation for Out-Building at 6045 Stow Canyon Road, City of Goleta, California, Assessor’s Parcel Number 007-717-044 (Shelley Bookspan, January 26, 2007), which is included herein as Appendix E. Tribal Cultural Resources are also addressed in Section R below.

i. **Existing Setting**

**Prehistoric Setting**

Evidence exists for the presence of humans in the Santa Barbara coastal area for thousands of years. While some researchers have proposed that the Santa Barbara Channel area may have been settled as early as 40,000 years ago, only limited evidence for occupation much earlier than 9,500 years has been discovered. Even so, human prehistory along the Santa Barbara channel area coast may extend back as much as 12,000 years. Beginning approximately 7,500 years ago, prehistoric human settlement in the local area apparently increased rapidly with a number of sites dating to approximately this time, and many more dating subsequent to it (General Plan Final EIR [GP FEIR]).

**Ethnographic and Historic Setting**

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

As provided in the City’s General Plan Final EIR (Section 3.5, Cultural Resources), the City contains prehistoric, ethnographic, historical, and paleontological resources. GP/CLUP Figure 6-2 (November 2009) shows areas that contain sensitive historic/cultural resources and identifies 46 historic resource locations.

A Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation was completed in June 2018 for the proposed project that included an archaeological site records and literature search as well as an intensive surface survey of the property (Stone 2018). The literature and records search identified (1) two previously recorded archaeological sites are within a 0.25-mile radius, (2) two previous investigations conducted within the project area (a ground surface survey and subsequent Extended Phase 1 backhoe testing program), and (3) thirteen other investigations conducted within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. Past and present on-site surveys identified low densities of estuarine shellfish fragments and fire altered rock within the southeastern portions of the project site and three estuarine shellfish fragments within the western portion of the project site. The report concluded that:

“The presence of surface shellfish fragments is a function of placement of fill when Las Vegas Creek was realigned from within the site to outside its western boundary between 1929 and 1938, and/or slough fill soils that were imported to the property when existing avocado trees were planted. The shell fragments on the ground surface are therefore not associated with a prehistoric or historic archaeological site.”

Additionally, a supplemental memorandum (Stone 2019) concluded that “soils below 2 feet from the surface were formed prior to Native American occupation in this area” and that disturbance of soils below 2 feet from the surface “would not have the potential to disturb unknown buried archaeological resources.”

Existing structures include a residence in the northeastern portion of the property, a building used for synagogue and educational services that was approved in 1992 (92-CP-018), and other ancillary uses/structures as described in the project description. The small storage shed and the storage garage are proposed to be removed. Of these, only the storage garage has potential to be a historically significant. The storage garage appears to be in poor to fair condition (portions of the foundation are crumbling, window frames are broken, window panes are missing, some of the metal cladding and roofing is misshapen, limited water damage can be seen in the interior, and newer crossbeams have been added to provide support). Bookspan (2007) rated the potential for the structure to be historically significant as a 7 out of a possible 40 based on the City of Goleta’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. The Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual does not provide a threshold value to define the significance of a potential historic resource.

As mentioned in Section 11 above, the City of Goleta provided an opportunity for consultation with the designated Tribes as required by law. On February 8, 2019, the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians responded to the request and asked that a “discovery clause” be made a part of the project requirements (email from F. Romero).
ii. Thresholds of Significance

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

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Construction would result in the removal of a structure (the barn/storage garage) that is at least 80 years old and is associated with the prior agrarian activities that occurred on the site; and is somewhat associated with the Sexton family, which has historical importance in the community. The historical report prepared by Bookspan (2007) found that the barn is not an exceptional example and is in disrepair. Further, the report finds that the barn is not particularly historic given its simple utilitarian design, and its context and setting have been lost. What is notable about the barn is that it is an older structure in a modern neighborhood. The report concluded that removal of the barn would result in possible impact and recommends relocation or documentation as mitigations to reduce the impact to less than significant. The implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-1 and -2, Historic Building Relocation and Historic Building Documentation, are proposed to avoid the potential impacts resulting from construction of the proposed project. These mitigation measures are proposed by the City and agreed to by the applicant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and -2 will be verified by the City through a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). Therefore, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and -2, any impacts to the historic barn would be reduced to less than significant. While the successful relocation of the building is preferable, relocation is not required to reduce the impact to less than significant given the documentation that would be achieved through implementation of MM-CUL-2.

b,c) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. A Phase I archaeological survey was prepared for the proposed project (Stone 2018). This survey included an intensive inspection of the project site on December 27, 2017 in accordance with the City of Goleta Cultural Resource Guidelines requirements, as adopted by the County of Santa Barbara Regulations Governing Archaeological and Historical Projects Undertaken in Conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Related Laws: Cultural Resource Guidelines (revised January 1993). Earlier on-site investigations include a Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation (Santoro and Hazeltine 1992, as cited in Stone 2018) as well as Extended Phase 1 Testing (Santoro 1992, as cited in Stone 2018). As noted above, these surveys identified low densities of estuarine shellfish fragments and fire altered rock within the southeastern portions of the project site and estuarine three shellfish fragments within the western portion of the project site. However, the presence of these materials is a result of the import of fill during earlier agricultural use of the site and is not associated with a prehistoric or historic archaeological site occurring on this property.

The potential for unknown, intact, buried prehistoric deposits is unlikely, as the project site is heavily disturbed by previous agricultural uses and is substantially filled. Therefore, it is
improbable that intact prehistoric resources exist or are likely to exist within the project site and within the proposed impacted areas extending an estimated 8 feet below the existing project ground surface at the uphill side of the proposed synagogue building. However, given the proximity to Las Vegas Creek and that the imported fill contains shellfish fragments and fire-altered rock, there is limited potential for archaeological resources, including isolated human remains, to have been redistributed throughout the project site during previous grading activities, including within areas that the Phase 1 Study has determined to be no longer intact. Therefore, the project may have the potential to significantly impact an archaeological resource or disturb human remains. As indicated above, the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians commented that the potential for impacts to significant resources would be low and requested that a mitigation measure regarding the discovery of resources be included. The potential for the project to impact significant cultural resources is considered to be unlikely, however, the project’s potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-3, Discovery of Cultural Resources. This mitigation measure is proposed by the City and agreed to by the applicant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 will be verified by the City through a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). Therefore, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 and the MMRP, the City has a mechanism to verify that any potentially significant impacts to the historic barn would be reduced to less than significant.

iv. Cumulative Impacts

Construction of the proposed project would not impact any known archaeological sites. The project would have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to archaeological resources if it were to disturb previously undetected and intact resources, however, the potential for such an impact to occur at the project site is considered to be low. In the unlikely event that intact resources are encountered during the construction of the project, potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of the proposed project-specific mitigation measure CUL-3. Therefore, the project’s cumulative impacts to archaeological resources are not cumulatively considerable and not significant.

The project would result in the removal of a small (1,440 sq ft) barn/storage garage that is considered to be historical primarily because of its connection to Goleta’s agrarian past. The historical agricultural context of the project area, however, no longer exists. The structure is in poor condition and does not exhibit other important historical characteristics such as a design of historical interest, association with a significant architectural style, it does not embody unique construction methods or technology, is not culturally important, and it is not likely to yield important information about the community (Bookspan, 2007). The removal of the barn/storage garage would result in the loss of a utilitarian structure associated with Goleta’s past, however, proposed mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level, and the removal of the structure would not facilitate or encourage the removal of other historical structures in the City.

Impacts to historic resources tend to be site-specific and are generally assessed on a case-by-case basis. However, if a project were to result in development features or changes to existing environmental conditions that are incompatible with historical resources that exist in the vicinity of the project site, a potentially significant cumulative impact to historical resources could result. There are no other historical resources located on or adjacent to the project site that could be directly or indirectly affected by the proposed project. Therefore, the project’s cumulative impacts to historical resources are not cumulatively considerable and not significant.
v. Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Portions of the project may have the potential to affect intact cultural resources. Project Environmental Conditions of Approval/Mitigation Measures for these potential affects will be included in the project approval and have been agreed to by the applicant as follows:

**MM-CUL-1: Historic Building Relocation.** The Applicant/Permittee, at its sole expense, shall make a good faith effort to relocate the barn/storage building not less than 90 days. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, the Applicant shall offer the building to be moved, at the expense of the recipient, to another site including working with a Realtor to advertise the building. The order of preference for relocation is 1) in Goleta; 2) in the South Coast area of Santa Barbara County; 3) in Santa Barbara County; and 4) outside of the County. This offer will be made through an advertisement placed in a paper general circulation twice within a 60-day time period, and a direct offer to local preservation groups including the Goleta Valley Historical Society.

**Plan Requirements & Timing:** Prior to publishing the notice, the notice shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, the applicant must provide evidence of the good faith outreach effort to relocate the building including seeking the services of a Realtor to assist in finding a receiver for the building to the satisfaction of the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee.

**Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify compliance before issuance of the demolition permit.

**MM-CUL 2: Historic Building Documentation.** The Permittee/Applicant shall have a City-approved architectural historian provide written and photographic documentation of the barn/storage garage’s historical features and former setting using historic photographs, measured drawings, and archival quality photography. The City shall review and approve the documentation prior to issuance of demolition permit. One copy of the historical documentation shall be kept with the City of Goleta and copies shall be deposited with the Goleta Valley Historical Society and in the Special Collections Department of the Davison Library of the University of California, Santa Barbara.

**Plan Requirements & Timing:** The applicant shall secure approval of the architectural historian by the City of Goleta prior to the documentation phase. Further, the review of the written and photographic history of the site must be completed, approved, and submitted to the designated repositories prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.

**Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify compliance before issuance of the demolition permit.

**MM-CUL-3: Discovery of Cultural Resources.** If archaeological resources are encountered during grading, work must be stopped immediately or redirected until a City-approved archaeologist and local Chumash Native American consultant can evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to the Phase 2 investigation standards set forth in the City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 2 study must be funded by the Applicant/Permittee at his sole expense. If resources are found to be significant, they must be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 3 mitigation program must be funded by the Applicant/Permittee.
Timing: If archaeological resources are encountered during grading, the identification of the City-qualified archaeologist and Chumash Native American consultant shall be approved by the City prior to additional grading in the vicinity of the find. The monitors must be onsite during all project excavation, grading or other soil disturbance required to conduct the Phase 2, and if necessary, Phase 3 investigations.

Monitoring/Reporting Party(ies): The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before grading/construction in the vicinity of the find may be resumed.

vi. Residual Impact

Implementation of the Mitigation Measures would reduce the proposed project’s impacts to less than significant.
### F. ENERGY

<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 potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**i. Existing Setting**

The project site is currently developed with residential, office, religious service, educational service, storage, parking, and landscaping uses. The current uses at the site were developed with approval of 92-CP-18 and subsequent permits (refer to Section 7, Background Information) by the County and prior to incorporation of the City. Baseline energy use at the site was estimated as part of the air quality modeling using CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2; refer to Appendix C.

Energy is provided by the Southern California Gas Company and by Southern California Edison (SCE). In addition to electrical distribution lines, several SCE substations are located within the city, including the Hollister Avenue and Glen Annie substations. The only electrical generating station in the city is GenOn’s Energy Inc’s “peaking station” on Las Armas between Hollister Avenue and the railroad tracks, which generates electrical power only during emergencies and peak-use periods.


**ii. Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for energy use have not been established in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. The project would be expected to have a significant impact on energy use if it demonstrably resulted in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation or conflict or obstruct a plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency as discussed in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Checklist above.
iii. **Project Specific Impacts**

*a,b) Less Than Significant Impact.* The project is expected to utilize electricity, natural gas, and diesel and gasoline fuels as energy during the primary construction and operational phases. CalEEMod V. 2016.3.2 was used to estimate the baseline, construction, and annual operational energy use of all project phases and components (including transportation-related energy) during construction and operations to assess the annual air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and energy used for the project. The results of the modeling are provided in Appendix C. Construction energy use would be temporary and less than significant. Based on the default assumptions and project-specific land use data in the CalEEMod model, operations would entail the use of 191,005 kBTU/year of natural gas and 85,856 kW-hours/year of electricity. Moreover, the new development shall be required by the California Building Code to be constructed to current energy standards and the project would be consistent with the CPUC’s Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (CPUC 2008, 2011). As such, the project's energy use would not be substantial, the project would use energy in an inefficient or wasteful manner, and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. **Cumulative Impacts**

The proposed project would incrementally increase energy use onsite. However, it would have a less than significant cumulative impact as it would meet required energy efficiency standards. The project would also be consistent with the CPUC Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan as implemented in the California Building Code, resulting in a less than significant impact.

v. **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No energy efficiency impacts are identified; therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

vi. **Residual Impact**

The project would result in less than significant impacts, inclusive of residual energy impacts.
### G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potentially Significant Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Than Significant Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See Prior Document</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### i. Existing Setting

The underlying geologic structure of the proposed project site is predominately Recent Quaternary Age Younger Alluvium, although Pleistocene Age Older Alluvium occupies a small portion of the northeastern corner of the property (GP/CLUP FEIR Figure 3.6-1, September 2006). Soils within the northeastern two-thirds of the Project site are characterized Milpitas Positas fine sandy loam (Stone 2018). They are found on alluvial fans and low terraces. The representative
profile is an A Horizon of brown to dark brown fine sandy loam to 25 inches. The B Horizon is yellow brown to brown clay and clay loams to 54 inches. The C Horizon is alluvial gravelly sandy loam. The balance of the soils along the western, southwestern, and southeastern project areas is Goleta loam, associated with broad flood plains. The surface A Horizon is a dark grayish brown fine sandy loam that extends to 20 inches. The subsequent C Horizon is brown fine sandy loam that extends to 72 inches below surface, including loamy sand, sandy loam, loam, and clay loam (Stone 2018). The project site has a gentle slope from the northeast corner to the southwest corner (approximately 6% maximum). Over the entire site there is an elevation range of approximately 15 feet (see Appendix B, Civil Sheet 2 of 4).

The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California that has experienced ground motion in response to earthquakes in the past. All of the City of Goleta is located within Seismic Zone D as designated by the California Uniform Building Code. The potential for liquefaction on the project site has a moderate problem rating as identified in Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan (SBCCP) Seismic Safety and Safety Element Liquefaction Map (2015).

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

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

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

In addition, impacts related to geology have the potential to be significant if the project involves any of the following characteristics:

Threshold GEO-2. The project site or any part of the project is located on land having substantial geologic constraints, as determined by the City of Goleta. Areas constrained by geology include parcels located near active or potentially active faults and property underlain by rock types associated with compressible/collapsible soils or susceptible to landslides or severe erosion.

Threshold GEO-3. The project results in potentially hazardous geologic conditions such as the construction of cut slopes exceeding a grade of 1.5 horizontal to 1 vertical.

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

Threshold GEO-5. The project is located on slopes exceeding 20% grade.
iii. **Project Specific Impacts**

*a,c, GEO-1, GEO-2* **Less Than Significant Impact.** There are no Alquist-Priolo mapped earthquake faults or zones identified on the project site or in the immediate project area. Pursuant to checklist items a and c, and Threshold GEO-2, the closest faults include a segment of the Carneros Fault approximately 1,400 feet north of the site, an unnamed fault approximately 0.6 mile north of the site, the More Ranch Fault approximately 1.8 miles south of the project site, the Glen Annie Fault located approximately 0.7 mile west of the project site, and the Pedro Fault approximately 0.9 miles northeast of the project site (USGS 2009).

Strong ground shaking during seismic activity is a potential hazard common to the entire City and most of California. Project construction would be subject to compliance with the seismic safety standards of the California Building Code (CBC), which is adopted and incorporated into the Goleta Municipal Code. The CBC includes excavation and re-compaction measures to ensure structural stability in the event of a seismic event.

The topography of the inland site and surrounding developed parcels is gently sloped and the site is not mapped in an area of moderate or high landslide potential, as cited by checklist item c and Thresholds GEO-1 and GEO-2 above (GP/CLUP Figure 5-1, Geologic Hazards Map dated Nov. 2009). The absence of mountains or cliffs adjacent to the project site results in a less than significant landslide hazard.

The potential for liquefaction on the project site has a moderate problem rating as identified in Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan (SBCCP) Seismic Safety and Safety Element Liquefaction Map (2015). As part of the City’s standard conditions of approval, the applicant is required to submit a soils and geotechnical report to the City that details compliance with City standards for grading and construction of the new synagogue and storage building. Conditions of approval are memorialized in the resolutions of approval for a project and are binding on the project. The soils and geotechnical report are required to be prepared by a licensed certified geotechnical engineer and reviewed by the City Building and Safety Department to minimize risks associated with soil stability prior to project approval and construction. Compliance with City standards for preparation of soils and geotechnical reports will ensure the report includes the appropriate structural-design parameters for the synagogue and storage building, including soils compaction ratios and for construction of the foundation and building structural components to address potential hazards from liquefaction and/or seismic-related settlement during implementation of the project. Therefore, implementation of City standard conditions of approval for soils and geotechnical reports will ensure proper soils and geotechnical engineering design in accordance with the current City and California Building Code and that the potential impacts associated with liquefaction, seismic activity or unstable slopes and soils would be less than significant.

*b, GEO-1, GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-5* **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would be located on a developed site with gently sloped topography consisting of open fields, existing structures, ornamental landscaping, and asphalt parking. Grading/excavation to accomplish the project would be limited, with an estimated earthwork quantity that includes 660 cubic yards of cut and 575 cubic yards of fill for a net export of 85 cubic yards. All areas disturbed by project-related construction that are not covered by structures, impermeable surface or permeable parking areas would be
landscaled. Based on the existing topography of the site and the design of the project, the proposed development would not result in substantial soil erosion, result in cut slopes exceeding 1.5 horizontal to 1 vertical, or 15 feet in height, result in slopes exceeding 20% grade, or cause a loss of topsoil that would result in a potentially significant geologic impact. As such, the potential impacts considered under checklist item “b” and Thresholds GEO-1, GEO-3, GEO-4, and GEO-5 would be less than significant.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Goleta loam and Milpitas-Positas fine sandy loam soils found on the site are typically not expansive in nature. In any event, all new construction is required to adhere to local and state mandated grading and construction requirements, including but not limited to the California Building Code and City ordinances and engineering standards. Additionally, the City GP/CLUP EIR Figure 3.6-4, Topography and Landslides, identifies the project site as having a low landslide potential (GP/CLUP EIR 2006). Structural engineering and foundation reports are required to be provided by a licensed certified geotechnical engineer and reviewed by the City Building and Safety Department to minimize risks associated with soil stability prior to project approval and construction. Therefore, through existing regulatory processes, standard conditions, and City policies, potential impacts related to unstable or expansive soils that might be located on the project site would be less than significant.

e) **No Impact.** The project site contains existing connections to the Goleta Sanitary District sewer system which will continue to be used. Pursuant to above checklist item e above, septic systems and drywells are not used on the property and are not planned to be used as the site is connected to the sanitary sewer system. The synagogue will include restrooms and a new sewer line lateral would be connected to the existing Goleta Sanitary District sewer system installed to California Building Code and Goleta Sanitary District standards. Therefore, no impact associated with geologic hazards related to the use of alternative waste water would exist.

f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is underlain by Recent Quaternary Age Younger Alluvium. As such, the potential for significant paleontological resources is low. The presence of surface shellfish fragments is a function of placement of fill when Las Vegas Creek was realigned from within the site to outside its western boundary between 1929 and 1938, and/or slough fill soils that were imported to the property when existing avocado trees were planted (Stone 2018). Moreover, such shellfish fragments are not potentially significant paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts to significant paleontological resources would be less than significant.

iv. **Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative development in the City would expose new residents and property to geologic and soil-related hazards in the area. However, such impacts would be addressed on a project-by-project basis through preparation of required soils and geotechnical engineering studies and adherence to the recommendations therein, as well as adherence to existing City and state regulations including the California Building Code. Because the potential impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant and impacts from future projects would be addressed on a case-by-case basis, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
v. Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are proposed or needed. However, the following standard condition of approval will be imposed on the project.

**Geotechnical and Soils Engineering Report.** The owner/applicant shall submit a Geotechnical and Soils Engineering Report related to soil engineering associated with the demolition, grading, and construction of the new synagogue and storage buildings. The recommendation of the Geotechnical and Soils Engineering Report must be incorporated into the Project’s grading and building plans. The Geotechnical and Soils Engineering Report must meet the City of Goleta standards for engineering documents and address potential for liquefaction and/or seismic-related settlement and identify appropriate structural-design parameters and soils compaction ratios to address potential hazards.

Grading and building plans must be submitted for review and approval by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, the Building Official, or designee, and the Public Works Director, or designee, before the City issues grading and building permits.

The Project soils engineer must observe all excavations before soil modification (including placement of compacted soil), gravel backfill, or rebar and concrete and report observations to the City. Building Inspectors and/or Public Works Inspectors will conduct field inspections as needed.

vi. Residual Impact

Based on the above analysis and implementation of standard conditions of approval, potentially significant project-specific impacts on Geology and Soils would be avoided. The project would not result in significant residual soils and geology impacts.
H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

i. Existing Setting

As described in greater detail in Section 7, Background, and Section 10, Environmental Setting, the project site was previously developed for cattle ranching, agriculture, and a backhoe business before the existing synagogue, daycare, and school facility was permitted in 1992.

Climate Change Background

Parts of the Earth’s atmosphere act as an insulating “blanket” for the planet. This “blanket” of various gases traps solar energy, which keeps the global average temperature in a range suitable for life. The collection of atmospheric gases that comprise this blanket are called “greenhouse gases” (GHGs) based on the idea that these gases trap heat like the glass walls of a greenhouse. These gases, mainly water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), ozone (O₃), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), all act as effective global insulators as they do not absorb visible light from the sun but do absorb heat (e.g., infrared light) radiated from the earth’s surface. The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) defines a GHG as any gas that absorbs infrared radiation in the atmosphere. California law defines GHG to include the following: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) (Health and Safety Code, § 38505(g)). Most scientists agree that human activities, such as habitat conversion (including deforestation) and combustion of fossil fuels (e.g., for electricity production, driving internal combustion vehicles), have contributed to the elevated concentration of these gases in the atmosphere that is slowly raising global temperatures.

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

Climate change could impact the natural environment in California by triggering, among other things:
- Rising sea levels along the California coastline;
- Extreme-heat conditions, such as heat waves and very high temperatures, which could last longer and become more frequent;
Global climate change issues are addressed through the efforts of various federal, state, regional, and local government agencies as well as national and international scientific and governmental conventions and programs. These agencies work jointly and individually to understand and regulate the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and resulting climate change through legislation, regulations, planning, policy-making, education, and a variety of programs. Some of the significant agencies, conventions, and programs focused on global climate change are listed below, and list of climate change legislation in California is available online at https://www.climatechange.ca.gov/state/legislation.html.

- Federal U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- California Air Resources Board
- California Executive Order S-3-05
- California Executive Order S-13-08
- California Global Warming Solutions Action of 2006 (AB 32)
- Senate Bill (SB) 97 (enacted in 2007), SB 375 (enacted in 2008), SB 350 (enacted in 2015), and SB 32 (enacted in 2016).
- State of California Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan
- Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
- 2006 City of Goleta General Plan Conservation Element
- 2012 City of Goleta Energy Efficiency Action Plan
- 2014 City of Goleta Climate Action Plan
- City of Goleta Resolution 17-52 (Adoption of Renewable Energy Goals)
- City of Goleta Energy Efficiency Standards (reach code)

The City’s General Plan Conservation Element Implementation Action 5 (CE-IA-5), 2014 Climate Action Plan (CAP), and 2012 Energy Efficiency Action Plan identify measures to effectively meet State of California established greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets and energy efficiency goals, as articulated in Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) and the California Public Utilities Commission’s (CPUC) Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan and as implemented in the California Building Code Titles 20 and 24.

According to the CAP, energy consumption by the City’s built environment will represent 43 percent community emissions in 2020. Implementation of measures reducing electricity usage and improving energy performance, therefore, are vital to the City’s CAP. The CAP identifies 13
building energy measures (eight energy efficiency measures) with the goal of reducing GHG emissions through lower electricity and natural gas use. The measures include implementing the City’s “reach code” (adopted November 2010) which required new residential and commercial buildings to exceed the then-existing California Title 24 standards by 15 percent, financing programs for both residential and commercial energy retrofits, urban forest management, programs for residential and commercial solar, and Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) to encourage use of renewable energy use and the resultant realization of a reduction in GHG. The “reach code” sunset in July 2014 when the more stringent Title 24 standards took effect.

Additionally, on December 5, 2017, the City of Goleta committed to moving the City’s municipal facilities and community-wide electricity supply to 100% renewable power by 2030 (Resolution 17-52). More information about the City of Goleta’s Sustainability and Climate Adaptation programs can be found online at https://www.cityofgoleta.org/projects-programs/sustainability-climate-adaptation.

ii. Thresholds of Significance

Consistent with recent case law, CEQA Guidelines section 15126.2(a) amendments clarify that an EIR shall focus analysis on the significant effects of a proposed project on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines section 15064.4 requires a lead agency to make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. They give discretion to the lead agency to determine whether to:

1. Quantify GHG emissions resulting from a project, and/or
2. Rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards.

The State Natural Resources Agency adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for GHG emissions that became effective on December 28, 2019. These CEQA Guidelines amendments provide regulatory guidance on the analysis of GHG emissions in CEQA documents.

The revisions to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.4(2)(b) clarify that in determining the significance of a project’s greenhouse gas emissions, the lead agency should focus its analysis on the reasonably foreseeable incremental contribution of the project’s emissions to the effects of climate change.

A project’s incremental contribution may be cumulatively considerable even if it appears relatively small compared to statewide, national or global emissions. The agency’s analysis should consider a timeframe that is appropriate for the project. The agency’s analysis also must reasonably reflect evolving scientific knowledge and state regulatory schemes. In addition, section 15064.4(2) (b) and (c), in summary, state that a lead agency should consider the following factors, among others, when assessing the significance of impacts from GHG emissions on the environment:

1. The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;
2. Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project; and
3. The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.
In determining the significance of impacts, the lead agency may consider a project's consistency with the State's long-term climate goals or strategies, provided that substantial evidence supports the agency's analysis of how those goals or strategies address the project's incremental contribution to climate change and its conclusion that the project's incremental contribution is not cumulatively considerable.

A lead agency may use a model or methodology to estimate greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project. The lead agency has discretion to select the model or methodology it considers most appropriate to enable decision makers to intelligently take into account the project's incremental contribution to climate change. The lead agency must support its selection of a model or methodology with substantial evidence. The lead agency should explain the limitations of the particular model or methodology selected for use.

CEQA Guidelines section 15064.7(b) call on Lead Agencies to establish significance thresholds for their respective jurisdictions. Lead agencies may also use thresholds on a case-by-case basis as provided in Section 15064(b)(2).

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

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

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

On June 10, 2010, the Santa Barbara County Planning & Development Department produced a memorandum “Support for Use of Bay Area Air Quality Management District Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards,”2 which states, “While Santa Barbara County land use patterns differ from those in the Bay Area as a whole, Santa Barbara County is similar to certain Bay Area counties (in particular, Sonoma, Solano, and Marin) in terms of population growth, land use patterns, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies, and average commute patterns and times. Because of these similarities, the methodology used by BAAQMD to develop its GHG emission

---

1 On December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court reversed the Trial Court ruling on California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2015) 62 Cal.4th 369 and remanded the substantive question of whether the BAAQMD’s 2010 Air Quality CEQA Guidelines were valid back to the Court of Appeals for a decision. The BAAQMD published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court’s opinion. The GHG thresholds remained unchanged from the previous version.

significance thresholds, as well as the thresholds themselves, have applicability to Santa Barbara County and represent the best available interim standards for Santa Barbara County.” In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §§15064.4(b)(2), and 15064.7(c), the City has consistently relied upon Santa Barbara County’s “Support for Use of Bay Area Air Quality Management District Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards,” as the expert recommended threshold for establishing greenhouse gas impacts of a project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table GHG-1</th>
<th>Bay Area Air Quality Management District GHG Thresholds of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GHG Emission Source Category</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operational Emissions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Development Projects&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,100 Metric Ton (MT) CO₂&lt;sub&gt;e&lt;/sub&gt;/yr. or 4.6 MT CO₂&lt;sub&gt;e&lt;/sub&gt;/SP/yr.&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Sources&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10,000 MT CO₂&lt;sub&gt;e&lt;/sub&gt;/yr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Santa Barbara County Planning & Development Department,
<sup>a</sup> Land use development projects include residential, commercial, industrial, and public land uses and facilities.
<sup>b</sup> SP = Service Population (residents + employees).
<sup>c</sup> Stationary Sources include land uses that would accommodate processes and equipment that emit GHG emissions and would require an Air District permit to operate.

The City of Goleta is located in Santa Barbara County and shares meteorological attributes as well as similar land use patterns and policies. As such, thresholds deemed applicable in Santa Barbara County would also reasonably apply to projects within the City Goleta. Therefore, this analysis uses the BAAQMD/Santa Barbara County Interim Thresholds of Significance to determine the significance of GHG emissions related to this project, based on the 1,100 MT CO₂<sub>e</sub>/year or 4.6 MT CO₂<sub>e</sub> per service population per year threshold for commercial and residential land uses. There is no BAAQMD threshold of significance for construction emissions.

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

A. Generates operational emissions in an amount more than 1,100 MT CO₂<sub>e</sub>/yr., and/or results in significant construction or operational GHG emissions based on a qualitative analysis.

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

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

### Project Specific Impacts

**a,b) Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section F. Energy, above, the energy analysis for this project is based on an analysis of energy use for all project phases and components, including transportation-related energy, during construction and operation as modelled using the CaEEEMod V. 2016.3.2. The project is expected to utilize electricity, natural gas, and diesel and gasoline fuels as energy during the primary construction and operational phases. CaEEEMod V. 2016.3.2 estimates the baseline, construction, and
annual operational energy use of the project’s components to assess the air quality and greenhouse gas emissions of the project. The results of the modeling are provided in Appendix C.

Given the global nature of climate change resulting from GHG emissions, GHG emission impacts are inherently cumulative in nature. Accordingly, the determination of whether a project’s GHG emissions impacts are significant depends on whether those emissions would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. This is assessed in the Cumulative Impacts section below.

iv. Cumulative Impacts

The project’s “unmitigated GHG emissions” have been calculated for the project (see below and Appendix C). These emissions include operation of the project and forecast trip generation, as well as the GHG emissions from project construction. The CalEEMod v.2016.3.2 computer model was used to calculate direct and indirect project-related emissions. Table GHG-2 presents the estimated carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄ emissions) of the project.

Construction. Project construction activities would generate approximately 279.5 MT CO₂e. Construction GHG emissions are typically summed and amortized over the lifetime of the project (assumed to be 30 years), then added to the operational emissions. Construction GHG emissions have been amortized, and would result in 139.3 MT CO₂e/yr.

Area. Based on the default assumptions and project-specific land use data in the CalEEMod model, annual emissions associated with architectural coatings, consumer products, and landscaping would be 0.00081 MT CO₂e/yr.

Energy Consumption. Energy Consumption emissions were calculated using the CalEEMod model and project-specific land use data. Electricity would be provided to the project site via Southern California Edison, and natural gas would be provided by Southern California Gas. The project would result in 37.7 MT CO₂e/yr due to energy consumption.

Mobile Source. The CalEEMod model relies upon project-specific land use data to calculate mobile source emissions. The proposed project would directly result in 66.9 MT CO₂e/yr of mobile source-generated GHG emissions. This analysis is considered to be conservatively high, however, as many attendees at services and holiday events often do not drive but will walk to the site in keeping with religious practices and observances (Associated Transportation Engineers 2018) and because proposed to changes to ongoing activities are minor.

Solid Waste. The project is anticipated to generate approximately 52.1 tons of tons of solid waste per year, based on CalEEMod’s default assumptions and assuming no waste is recycled or composted, thereby resulting in 24.2 MT CO₂e/yr. This estimate is considered conservatively high, however, as the analysis provided in Section 15.S, Utilities and Services, identifies 6.75 tons/year as a conservatively-high estimate of waste generated annually, and at least half of this waste would be diverted (recycled or composted).

Water Demand. The project’s water supply would be groundwater and imported sources provided by the Goleta Water District. The estimated annual water required for the project, based on CalEEMod’s default assumptions, is 2.25 acre-feet, and emissions from indirect energy impacts due to water use would be 1.2 MT CO₂e/yr. This estimate is conservatively high, however, as the
Goleta Water District has determined that the new synagogue building (with proposed property development, activities [e.g., religious and educational services], and retrofits of existing structures) would require 0.95 acre-feet of water annually (Goleta Water District: July 11, 2019 email from Jim Heaton).

### Table GHG-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total Metric Tons of CO₂e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction (amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td>139.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.00081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Source²</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste²</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Demand²</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Emissions</strong>²,³</td>
<td><strong>269.3 MT CO₂e/yr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GHG Significance Threshold</strong>⁴</td>
<td><strong>1,100.00 MT CO₂e/yr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG Significance Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Emissions calculated using CalEEMod v.2016.3.2 computer model.
2. Emissions estimates are expected to be conservatively high for reasons provided in text.
3. Total may appear to be slightly off due to rounding.
4. If annual emissions of operational-related GHGs exceed these levels, the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution of GHG emissions and a cumulative significant impact to global climate change.

**Total Project-Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases.** As shown in Table GHG-2, the total amount of project-related “business as usual/unmitigated” GHG emissions from all sources combined would total 269.3 MT CO₂e/year. For reasons provided above, however, these emissions are expected to be conservatively high. In any case, the total project-related unmitigated operational GHG emissions would not exceed the 1,100 MT CO₂e/year threshold utilized by the City of Goleta, resulting in a greenhouse gas emissions impact to global climate change that would be less than significant.

**Compliance with other regulations or requirements.** All of the new construction (i.e., the proposed synagogue and storage building) will be required to incorporate existing energy efficient fixtures and equipment required by the California Building Code. Additionally, the City CAP programs are available to the applicant to help reduce the cost of installing solar and energy efficient fixtures onsite. The project would also be required to be consistent with the CPUC Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan as implemented in the California Building Code (CBC). All project construction components must comply with the CBC prior to issuance of building permits by the City. Therefore, the project will be consistent with, and result in a less than significant impact to, the local CAP and the CPUC Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan.

**v. Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No impacts are identified. Therefore, mitigation is not necessary.
vi. Residual Impact

No impacts are identified. Therefore, residual cumulatively considerable impacts to global climate change would not occur.
### I. 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>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Setting

The City contains various sources of hazardous wastes/materials, such as industrial facilities, laboratories, and gas stations. Predominant land use in the site vicinity is residential, school, and religious institution. The existing facilities on the project site include a residence, a building used for synagogue and educational services that was approved in 1992 (92-CP-018), a spa/bath house, a small storage shed, and a barn/storage garage that is proposed to be removed on the northern portion of the property.
A records search through the State of California’s GeoTracker tool for sites contaminated or Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) sites within a 0.5-mile radius of the project was conducted. Thirteen (13) sites were located within the 0.5-mile radius of the project site, but none have an effect on the project and none are located within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site.

The project site lies approximately 1.0 mile north of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBMA), outside of the Clear Zone and Approach Zone for the SBMA (GP/CLUP Figure 5-3, November 2009). There are no other airports or airstrips within two miles of the project site. The nearest schools from the project site are the Montessori Center School of Santa Barbara (formerly Fairview School) located immediately to the south of the project site and the Goleta Valley Junior High School and Santa Barbara Charter School located northwest of the project site on the opposite side of Stow Canyon Road.

ii. Thresholds of Significance

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

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a,b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous substances, other than minor amounts typically used for maintenance (including landscaping) and cleaning products. Existing and proposed uses onsite will remain as residential, religious services, and educational services. There are adequate state regulations in place to protect public safety. At the local level, the County Fire Department and Health Department screens inventories and inspects sites permitted to use or store hazardous materials regularly. The SBCAPCD also regulates projects with possible toxic emissions.

Given the age of the existing barn/storage garage and trailer to be removed or demolished, there is the potential for hazardous materials that were previously common in building materials to be present. These materials may include asbestos, which could become airborne if disturbed and requires special handling procedures including the use of protective clothing and respirators during removal, transport, and disposal. Removal of asbestos containing materials is governed by Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District regulations; review and approval by the City of Goleta Building and Safety Department are also required. Standard conditions of project approval require (1) testing for asbestos prior to issuing a demolition permit for the barn/storage garage and (2) proper disposal of the trailer at a licensed or certified wrecking yard if it is not legally transferred to a third party and removed from the property.

Therefore, based on the above analysis, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts from the proposed project on the risk of
upset involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located within 0.25 mile of three existing schools: the Montessori Center School of Santa Barbara, the Goleta Valley Junior High School, and the Santa Barbara Charter School.

Since the proposed project would not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous substances, other than minor amounts typically used for maintenance (including landscaping) and cleaning products, the greatest potential for impacts to these schools would be during demolition and construction activities. Given the age of the existing storage garage to be removed or demolished, there is the potential for asbestos to be present. This could be hazardous if not removed and disposed of properly. Satisfying the requirements of the standard conditions of project approval (discussed in response to CEQA items “a,b”, above) would ensure that the potential impacts to nearby schools associated with construction (including the demolition or removal of the storage garage and trailer) would be less than significant.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** A hazardous waste site records search was completed in March 2019, using Geotracker, an online database of hazardous site records maintained by the California State Water Resources Control Board. No open or closed cases occur on the project site or within 1,000 feet of the project site. Additionally, considering the nature of the project proposal (construction of a new synagogue and a new storage building, with landscaping and parking redesign), the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment. Any future proposals to use potentially hazardous materials on the site would be subject to review and approval by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department and City of Goleta Building and Safety Department prior to project clearance and would undergo a separate review process on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, project impacts associated with hazardous materials sites would be less than significant.

e) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site lies approximately 1.0 mile north of the SBMA and is located outside of the Clear Zone and Approach Zone. Although the project site is located within two miles of the SBMA, the project would not result in a safety or excessive noise hazard for people residing or working in the project area. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

f,g) **No Impact.** The project would not result in the construction of any new facilities or establishment of new uses that could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is located well outside of the City’s Wildland Fire Hazard Area (GP/CLUP Figure 5-2, June 2016); therefore, no impact from exposure to wildlife fires would occur. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

iv. **Cumulative Impacts**

With the implementation of the City’s standard conditions of approval regarding the abatement of potential asbestos hazards within the existing building, and the proper disposal of the trailer at a licensed or certified wrecking yard if it is not legally transferred to a third party and removed from the property, the project would not have any impacts related to hazardous materials. As such,
the proposed project, combined with other similar projects, would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts related to hazardous materials.

v. Required Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are proposed or needed. However, the following conditions of approval will be imposed on the project due to the date that the existing building was constructed and use of potentially hazardous building materials commonly in use on those dates.

Asbestos Abatement. Before the City issues a demolition permit for the existing barn/storage garage (if the barn is not relocated to another site), the Applicant/Permittee must notify the Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District and test for asbestos. If asbestos is found, then the Applicant/Permittee must abate and dispose of the materials in a manner consistent with the California Building Code, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District requirements, and any other regulatory requirements.

Prior the issuance of the demolition permit, the Building Official or designee must receive the appropriate paperwork confirming the abatement. The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before issuance of the Land Use Permit.

Trailer Disposal/Removal. Before the City issues a demolition permit for the existing parking lot, the Applicant/Permittee must provide proof that the trailer has been either (1) properly recycled or disposed at a licensed or certified wrecking yard or disposal site (2) legally transferred to a third party and removed from the property.

Prior the issuance of the demolition permit, the Building Official or designee must receive the appropriate paperwork confirming the proper disposal or legal transfer and removal of the trailer. The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before issuance of the Land Use Permit.

vi. Residual Impact

With implementation of the conditions of approval, the project would have a less than significant residual impact related to potential hazards and hazardous materials. This standard condition provides the mechanism for verification and additional certainty that any asbestos in the existing building will be handled in a safe manner consistent with all state and local rules, as is required by the City for all demolition of buildings from this time period, and that the trailer will be properly disposed or legally transferred and removed.
### J. 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 or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 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>iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Existing Setting

The federal Clean Water Act and the California Water Code mandate controls on discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s). The California State Water Board issues National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits that require cities, towns, and counties to regulate activities which can result in pollutants entering their storm drains and/or surface and sub-surface drainage features. Municipalities implement comprehensive stormwater pollution-prevention programs. Municipal staff use Best Management Practices (BMPs) when maintaining their own streets, storm drains, and municipal buildings. In addition, Chapter 13.04 of the Goleta Municipal Code contains the City’s storm water requirements that are applicable to the development of the site.

Approximately 19.8% of the project site is covered with impervious surfaces (refer to Table 1), including buildings, paved parking areas, walkways, and the half basketball court. Most of these impervious surfaces (all but the existing barn/storage garage and a portion of the residence) were constructed after the synagogue was approved in 1992. The total impermeable surface paving and concrete onsite is 19,277 SF, or 13.35% of the site. Permeable landscaping (including the archery range) onsite currently accounts for 110,298 SF, or 76.60% of the site and is comprised of ornamental trees, shrubs, grasses. The permeable play area accounts for 5,030 SF, or 3.49% of the site.

The project site’s elevation ranges from approximately 45 feet in the southwestern portion of the site to 60 feet in the northeastern portion of the site (see Appendix B, Civil Sheet 2 of 4). Although stormwater runoff, as well as tailwater from landscape irrigation onsite, can flow off the property in three different directions (west, south, or southeast), depending on the specific location of origination, all water eventually flows to Las Vegas Creek before flowing to San Pedro Creek and ultimately to the confluence of San Jose Creek and Atascadero Creek located east of the Goleta Slough. Runoff from all roofs would discharge directly or indirectly to onsite pervious areas. Small portions of the project site (i.e., the entrance to the existing and proposed synagogue parking lot, as well as the westernmost corners of the property [north and south]) are located within the 100-year flood zone (FEMA 2012).

ii. Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Hydrology & 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 assumes that a significant impact on hydrology and water resources would occur if a project would:

Threshold HYD-1: Result in a substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns.
Threshold HYD-2: Alter the course of a stream or river.
Threshold HYD-3: Increase the rate of surface runoff to the extent that flooding, including increased erosion or sedimentation, occurs.
Threshold HYD-4: Create or contribute to runoff volumes exceed existing or planned stormwater runoff facilities, or substantially degrade water quality.

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a-c, e, HYD-1, HYD-2, HYD-3, HYD-4) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project will demolish or remove the existing small (53 SF) storage shed, a 1,440 SF
barn/storage garage, and 120 SF trailer; construct a new synagogue and storage building; and redesign the existing parking lot and landscaping. The existing areas of impervious surfaces on the project site will now be reconfigured to consist of the following, totaling approximately 42,002 SF (a net increase of 13,454 SF – refer to Table 1):

- existing residence (a single-family dwelling),
- existing educational services building,
- existing spa building,
- existing open-sided storage structure
- existing half basketball court
- new synagogue building,
- new storage building,
- new trash enclosure
- new patio & walkways, and
- new drive aisles & parking areas.

To offset additional storm water runoff from the new impervious areas listed above, several stormwater control measures will be implemented to reduce peak and volume of runoff and provide treatment of runoff before it is discharged off-site:

- vegetation swales,
- bioretention basins,
- minimization of impervious areas (partially through use of permeable pavers set on a gravel base),
- dispersal of runoff to pervious areas (all roof and hardscape areas will drain to landscaped areas before being discharged offsite), and
- large vegetated buffers (all proposed development will be set back a minimum of 100 feet from the riparian habitat along Las Vegas Creek).

Las Vegas Creek is located on the property’s western boundary. Expected pollutants of concern for a development of this type, including parking lots, are suspended solids/sediments, nutrients, oil and grease/hydrocarbons (from motor vehicles), pesticides and herbicides from landscaped areas, and trash and debris from social activities and refuse areas.

The Santa Barbara County Stormwater Technical Guide for Low Impact Development (2nd Edition, dated February 3, 2017), identifies four tiers of Post Construction Requirements (PCRs) for projects. Since the Project proposes to replace more than 22,500 square feet of impervious surface, it must evaluate Tier 4 requirements, which also include Tiers 1 through 3, consistent with City Threshold HYD-1 and checklist item a.

To comply with the requisite PCRs, post construction runoff from impervious areas (including existing and proposed buildings, the proposed parking lot, and proposed hardscape) will be directed to landscaped areas, permeable pavers, or the proposed bioretention basins. The project will also include vegetated swales and large vegetated buffers (all proposed development will be set back a minimum of 100 feet from the riparian habitat along Las Vegas Creek). The standard Conditions of Approval include a requirement to develop a stormwater facility operations and maintenance agreement and stormwater control plan that will address the operation and maintenance of these features.
Preliminary calculations indicate that project implementation would reduce the amount of runoff water from the site due to the proposed stormwater control measures. As such, the preliminary drainage analysis for all storm events (2-, 5-, 10-, 25-, and 100-year) indicates the project will result in reduced flows leaving the site than currently occur during peak flow events (Appendix F, Section III.C).

Prior to occupancy, the applicant will be required to execute a stormwater facility operations and maintenance agreement and secure approval of a Storm Water Control Plan from the City, consistent with City Threshold HYD 3 and checklist item “e” above. In addition, temporary construction-related water quality impacts could result if associated pollutants enter Las Vegas Creek or the storm water system that ultimately drains to the confluence of San Jose Creek and Atascadero Creek located east of the Goleta Slough. However, the project will be required to comply with adopted standards that include protective requirements such as an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) or Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), as appropriate based on the amount of disturbed area. The stormwater quality measures shall be prepared and submitted in conformance with the City Municipal Code, consistent with City Threshold HYD-4 and City Threshold “c.” The project will also be subject to conditions of approval that require construction washing areas to be located outside of the Las Vegas Creek riparian setback and at least 100 feet from any storm drain, waterbody, or sensitive biological resources.

Pursuant to checklist item “b,” the Applicant has also agreed to relinquish existing rights to use up to 2.4 acre-feet of water per year from the onsite well to supplement irrigation water, thereby increasing groundwater available for municipal use. Under the proposed project, all water would be supplied by the Goleta Water District.

Implementation of standard conditions of approval will ensure that the project complies with federal and state water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, and protect surface and ground water quality. Therefore, with implementation of the standard conditions of project approval will ensure that the project would not contribute incremental water runoff or pollutant discharge that would result in having cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts in the receiving flood control system (including Las Vegas Creek) that drains to the confluence of San Jose Creek and Atascadero Creek located east of the Goleta Slough. In addition, similar short-term and post-construction requirements would be applied to cumulative development located in the City, which would reduce the potential for

**d.) Less than Significant.** All proposed structures lie outside of the 100-year Flood Zone and the Tsunami Inundation Zone (FEMA 2012, 2017; GP/CLUP Figure 5-2, June 2016). Therefore, risk of release of pollutants due to inundation associated with a mapped flood hazard, or because of a tsunami, would be less than significant.

**iv. Cumulative Impacts**

As discussed above, implementation of the stormwater control measures (bioretention basins, vegetated swales, permeable pavers set on a gravel base) would result in reduced peak flows and for all storm events (2-, 5-, 10-, 25-, and 100-year) will not exceed pre-project flows. Implementation of the conditions of project approval will ensure that the project would not contribute incremental water runoff or pollutant discharge that would result in having cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts in the receiving flood control system (including Las Vegas Creek) that drains to the confluence of San Jose Creek and Atascadero Creek located east of the Goleta Slough. In addition, similar short-term and post-construction requirements would be applied to cumulative development located in the City, which would reduce the potential for
cumulative stormwater runoff and quality impacts. Therefore, the project’s cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts are not cumulatively considerable and potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

v. Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are proposed or needed. However, the following standard conditions of approval will be imposed.

**Storm Water Control Plan.** The Applicant/Permittee shall submit to, and receive approval from, the Public Works Director, or designee, of a Storm Water Control Plan/Erosion Sediment Control Plan (SWCP/ESCP) to treat and control off-site discharge of stormwater during and following construction of the project. The SWCP/ESCP shall be prepared in compliance with the Central Coast Regional Water Board's Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements for Development Projects in the Central Coast Region, Resolution No. R3-2013-0032, and shall use the *Stormwater Technical Guide for Low Impact Development: Compliance with Stormwater Post-Construction Requirements in Santa Barbara County*.

The SWCP/ESCP must receive approval from the Public Works Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of the Land Use Permit. The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance prior to issuance of the Land Use Permit. City Planning and Environmental Review as well as Public Works staff will verify compliance with the provisions of the SCWP periodically and respond to instances of non-compliance with the SWCP/ESCP during and after project construction.

**Stormwater Facility Operations and Maintenance Agreement.** The Applicant shall enter into and record a Stormwater Facility Maintenance Agreement with the City's Public Works Director, or designee. The City's Public Works Director, or designee, shall develop and provide to the applicant a draft Stormwater Facility Operations and Maintenance Agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney. The Stormwater Facility Operations and Maintenance Agreement, shall, require in perpetuity that project owners, and their successors in interest, to regularly inspect, maintain, and when necessary repair or replace stormwater treatment, retention and detention Stormwater Control Measures and Best Management Practices that are incorporated into the project. The Stormwater Facility Operations and Maintenance Agreement shall include a legal description of the project's location, a vicinity map, and the project's approved Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Plan. All costs associated with the preparation and recordation of said Agreement shall be borne by the Applicant. Applicant shall also post a Bond in a form acceptable to the City's Public Works Director, or designee, and in an amount of 110% of the estimated costs of maintaining Stormwater Control Measures and Best Management Practices incorporated into the Project for an initial period of two (2) years.

The Stormwater Facility Operations and Maintenance Agreement must receive approval from the Public Works Director, or designee, and be recorded prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

**Washing and Fueling of Construction Equipment and Materials.** During construction, washing and fueling of construction equipment and materials (including concrete and paint) can occur only in areas where polluted water and materials can be contained for subsequent removal from the site on a regular basis. The washing and fueling areas shall be located at least 100 feet
from any storm drain, waterbody or sensitive biological resources unless permitted by PER Director, or designee, due to site constraints. Areas designated for washing and/or fueling functions must be identified on all plans submitted for issuance of any grading and/or building permit(s).

Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits, designated fueling and wash off area(s) must be specified on the all grading and building plans. The fueling and wash-off area(s) must be in place throughout all applicable phases of construction.

The Public Works Director, or designee, and the Building Official, or designee, must verify compliance before issuance of the Grading and Building Permits. Subsequently, the Public Works Director, or designee, and the Building Official, or designee, must conduct site inspections during construction to verify compliance.

vi. Residual Impact

The project would not result in a residual significant hydrology or water quality impact with implementation of standard conditions of approval in accordance with the applicable stormwater requirements and Goleta Municipal Code Section 13.04.
K. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
a. Physically divide an established community? | | | | X | |
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | X | | | |

i. Existing Setting

GP/CLUP Land Use Element Figure 2-1 designates the project site as Single-family (R-SF). The R-SF land use designation is intended to identify and protect appropriately located land areas for family living in low-density residential environments. Uses in the R-SF designation include single-family attached and detached dwellings, second (accessory) residential units, religious institutions, small-scale residential care facilities, small-scale day care centers, public and quasi-public uses, and home occupations.

The project site is zoned Design Residential (DR) pursuant to the Article III, Chapter 35, Goleta Municipal Code (Inland Zoning Ordinance) Zoning Map. The purpose of the DR zone is to provide standards for traditional multiple residences as well as allowing flexibility and encouraging innovation and diversity in the design of residential developments by allowing a wide range of densities and housing types while requiring the provisions of a substantial amount of open space within new residential developments.

Table LUP-1 provides the land use and zoning designations of the adjacent properties, all of which are developed consistent with the General Plan Land Use and Inland Zoning Ordinance designations.

No changes to the Land Use Designation or Zoning are proposed with the project.

### Table LUP-1
Adjacent Land Use and Zoning Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction from Project Site</th>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
<th>Existing Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North &amp; Northeast</td>
<td>Residential – Single-family</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Residential – Single-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Residential – Single-family</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South &amp; Southeast</td>
<td>Public / Quasi-Public</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>School/Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West &amp; Southwest</td>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Residential – Single-family Planned Unit Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Public / Quasi-Public</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii. 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.

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a) **No Impact.** The proposed development would not result in the physical division of any established community or neighborhood. The proposal represents an infill project within the urban area of the City and existing parcel boundaries. The project site is surrounded by a mix of residential, religious, and educational uses. In addition, the project does not involve modifications to the existing circulation network. Therefore, there would be no impact related to dividing an established community.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project seeks approval of a Development Plan (18-031-DP) for the existing and proposed site improvements as well as a Conditional Use Permit Revision (18-031-CUPRV) to the existing Conditional Use Permit (92-CP-018). Pursuant to GP/CLUP Land Use Element Table 2-1, Allowable Uses and Standards for Residential Use Categories (Land Use Table), religious institutions, small-scale day care centers, and one single-family detached dwelling per lot are allowed in the R-SF land use designation. Pursuant to Inland Zoning Ordinance Sections 35-315.4 (Minor Conditional Use Permits), 35-315.5 (Major Conditional Use Permits), and 35-222.4 (Permitted Uses), the proposed child care facility, church, and single-family dwelling are allowed, respectively, with a Minor Conditional Use Permit, with a Major Conditional Use Permit, and by right.

Although the existing Conditional Use Permit (92-CP-018) allows up to 2.4 acre-feet of water to supplement onsite irrigation every year, the proposed project would be required to obtain all water from the Goleta Water District, consistent with General Plan Policy PF 4.1(l). The well would not be abandoned and closed, however, as an adjacent property has an easement for access to the well.

The project does not involve any General Plan amendment or Specific Plan amendment and would not conflict with any adopted land use plan. The project site is not located within the local coastal zone and does not require a rezone that would conflict with the City’s zoning ordinance. All development would be located outside of the 100-foot streamside protection area required by GP/CLUP Policy CE 2.2. Land use regulations related to biological, cultural, and tribal cultural resources are discussed in their respective sections. Therefore, the project does not have the potential to adversely impact applicable regulations and policies and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Cumulative Impacts

Due to the project’s consistency with the applicable use standards and policies described above, it can be found that the proposed project was anticipated in the GP/CLUP build-out scenario and would therefore not pose any cumulative land use impacts.
v. Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

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

vi. Residual Impact

Based on the above analysis, no residual impacts to Land Use and Planning would occur.
L. 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>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. **Existing Setting**

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

ii. **Thresholds of Significance**

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

iii. **Project Specific Impacts**

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

iv. **Cumulative Impacts**

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

v. **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

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

vi. **Residual Impact**

Based on the above analysis, no residual impacts to Mineral Resources would occur.
### M. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a 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>
</tbody>
</table>

#### i. Existing Setting

Since the project site lies outside the approach zone of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBMA), is well removed from the railroad, and is not located on a major thoroughfare, the primary sources of noise in the area are vehicular traffic on Stow Canyon Road and operations at the adjacent schools. As such, and as shown on GP/CLUP Noise Element Figures 9-1 through 9-4, noise levels at the project site are predicted not to exceed the 60 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour for the existing and future (2030) airport, railroad, or roadway noise.

Noise is defined as unwanted or objectionable sound. The measurement of sound takes into account three variables: 1) magnitude, 2) frequency, 3) duration, and 4) time of day.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Weighting Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daytime—7 am to 7 pm</td>
<td>+0 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening—7 pm to 10 pm</td>
<td>+5 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nighttime—10 pm to 7 am</td>
<td>+10 dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

**Threshold NOI-4.** Noise from grading and construction activity proposed within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors, including schools, residential development, commercial lodging facilities, hospitals or care facilities, would generally result in a potentially significant impact. According to the US EPA guidelines, the average construction noise is 95 dBA at a 50-foot distance from the source. A 6 dB drop occurs with a doubling of the distance from the source. Therefore, locations within 1,600 feet of the construction site would be affected by noise levels over 65 dBA. Construction within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors on weekdays outside of the hours of 8:00AM to 5:00PM and on weekends would generally be presumed to have a significant effect. Noise attenuation barriers and muffling of grading equipment may also be required. Construction equipment generating noise levels above 95 dBA [at 50 feet] may require additional mitigation.
Thresholds 1 and 3 are generally applied to long-term, operational noise that would be generated by a proposed project; short-term noise is specifically addressed in Threshold 4. “Outdoor living areas” referenced in Threshold 2 typically refer to patios, decks, yards, and similar locations.

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

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a, NOI-1 through NOI-4) Less Than Significant. As noted above, the project site is not located within the 60 dB CNEL noise contour for the existing and future (2030) airport, railroad, or roadway noise (GP/CLUP Figures 9-1 through 9-4). The GP/CLUP Noise Element Table 9-2 Noise and Land Use Compatibility Criteria sets a normally acceptable threshold of 60 dBA CNEL, and a conditionally acceptable threshold of 65 dBA CNEL, for residential (both low density and multiple family), school, library, church, hospital, and nursing home uses. The project’s existing and proposed uses will remain as residential, religious services, and educational services, and will primarily occur indoors. The proposed synagogue and storage buildings would not result in a substantial increase in existing noise conditions at the project site given the intended use. The existing activities (inclusive of large events) and the proposed project’s activities operational impacts will not exceed established noise levels or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity and impacts would be less than significant.

Further, it is presumed that both ongoing and large events may utilize the proposed courtyard located south of the synagogue building. Use of this site, however, would be secondary to use of the synagogue and any noise generated at this location would be substantially reduced by both the distance to nearby sensitive receptors and the shielding that would be provided by existing and proposed buildings and vegetation. Furthermore, the frequency of large events would not change, most large events would occur indoors, and the activities would be subject to existing City noise requirements like any other organization/institutions in Goleta. As such, the proposed project would have a less than significant effect on the existing noise environment.

As described in the Transportation section below, the project would not add a substantial amount of traffic onto streets in the vicinity of the project site, including Fairview Avenue and Stow Canyon Road. Similarly, the project would not result in a substantial increase in the number of cars parking on-site, and parking areas would be more than 100 feet from adjacent uses. Moreover, parking lot-related noise would not be substantially different from existing conditions. As designed and based on the activity levels anticipated, the project would not result in change that would create significant traffic-related or parking lot-related noise impacts.
Consistent with Threshold NOI-4 above, construction noise associated with the proposed project would generally result in a potentially significant impact on sensitive receptors, including the adjacent residences, church, and schools (refer to Section 9, Site Information; Section 10, Environmental Setting; and Table LUP-1), within 1,600 feet of the construction site. The average noise associated with heavy equipment operation and construction activities is 95 dBA measured 50 feet from the source. The construction activities anticipated to generate the greatest noise include grading activities, beeping associated with backup/reverse signals on trucks, and nail guns during structure framing. With the implementation of conditions of approval implemented during construction as required by the City, however, short term construction impacts would be less than significant. These standard conditions are outlined below.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during operation of the synagogue. There may be some increase in vibration and noise generated by construction; however, construction would be short-term, temporary, and cease upon project completion. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) **No Impact.** Although the project site lies 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. In addition, there are no private airports or airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. As such, no noise impacts from airport operations on the proposed project would occur.

iv. **Cumulative Impacts**

Because project related construction noise would pose only a short-term noise impact and there is no other project related noise impact as addressed above, the project contributions to cumulative noise impacts would be less than significant.

v. **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are proposed or needed. However, the following standard conditions of approval will be imposed.

**Noise Attenuation – Construction Noise.** The following measures must be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise:

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

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

c) Whenever possible, construction activities must be scheduled to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously, which causes high noise levels.

d) During construction, stationary construction equipment must be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers;
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- During construction, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas must be located as far as practicable from noise sensitive receptors;
- Earthmoving equipment operating on the construction site must be as far away from vibration-sensitive sites as possible; and
- Construction hours, allowable workdays, the telephone number of the job superintendent must be clearly posted at all construction entrances to enable surrounding owners and residents to contact the job superintendent directly. If the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent must notify the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, and investigate, take appropriate corrective action and report the action taken to the reporting party and the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee.

All signs must be in place before the start of site preparation and grading activities and maintained through to occupancy clearance or Final Building Inspection Clearance. Requirements a-f must be incorporated as text into all plans sets and must be incorporated graphically into all plan submitted for approval of any Land Use Permit, Grading Permit or Building Permit.

The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before issuance of the Land Use Permit, and before commencement of construction activities, and during construction.

**Construction Timing.** Construction activity and equipment maintenance is limited to the hours between 8 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made for onsite work for good cause at the sole discretion of the Planning and Environmental Review Director. Exceptions to these restrictions for work in the City Right-of-Way may be made for good cause at the sole discretion of the Public Works Director or designee. Any subsequent amendment to the General Plan noise standard upon which these construction hours are based shall supersede the hours stated herein. No construction can occur on State holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day). Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior plumbing, electrical, drywall and painting (depending on compressor noise levels), are not subject to these restrictions.

At least one sign near each Project site entrance stating these restrictions must be posted on the site. Signs must be a minimum size of 24” x 48.” Signs must be in place before the beginning of and throughout grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits.

The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must monitor compliance with restrictions on construction hours and must promptly investigate and respond to all complaints.

**Construction Noise Compliant Line.** The Applicant/Permittee must provide a non-automated telephone number for local residents and employees to call to submit complaints associated with construction noise.

The telephone number must be posted on the site and must be readily visible from adjacent public areas. At least one sign near each Project site entrance along Stow Canyon Road with the phone number must be posted at all times. The Applicant/Permittee must inform the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, of any complaints within one week of receipt of the complaint. Signs must be in place before beginning of and throughout construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits.
Building Inspectors and/or Code Compliance staff may periodically inspect and respond to complaints.

**Distancing of Vehicles and Equipment.** Noise and ground-borne vibration construction activities whose specific location on the Project site may be flexible (e.g. operation of compressors and generators, cement mixing, general truck idling) must be conducted as far as possible from the nearest noise and vibration sensitive land use.

The location of vehicles and equipment must be designated on building and grading plans. Equipment and vehicles must remain in the designated location throughout construction activities.

The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance.

**Construction Notice.** The Applicant/Permittee shall provide all adjacent property owners and residents within 300 feet of the construction site with a construction activity schedule and construction routes 30 days in advance of construction activities in both English and Spanish. Any alterations or additions shall require PER Director, or designee, approval and 30-days prior notification to affected property owners and residents.

The Applicant/Permittee shall submit a copy of the schedule and mailing list to PER Director, or designee. Schedule and mailing list shall be submitted 30 days prior to initiation of any earth movement. PER compliance monitoring staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance with activity schedules.

vi. **Residual Impact**

With implementation of these mitigation measures, the short-term construction noise impacts would be less than significant and no significant long-term noise impacts will occur with project build out.
N. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document
---|---|---|---|---|---
a. Induce substantial unplanned 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)? |  |  | X |  | 
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? |  |  |  | X | 

i. **Existing Setting**

As of January 2019, California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates that City has a population of 32,759 people, has approximately 12,381 housing units, and has an average household size of 2.76 people per household (DOF 2019). Upon build out of the GP/CLUP (anticipated to occur by the year 2030), the City’s population is expected to reach 38,100 (City of Goleta, GP/CLUP Final EIR, 2006: 3.8-15).

ii. **Thresholds of Significance**

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

iii. **Project Specific Impacts**

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project includes the development of a 7,293 S.F. synagogue and 841 S.F. storage building. Considering the small scale and the uses (religious services, storage) of the proposed buildings, the project would not substantially induce unplanned population growth as no new homes or businesses are proposed and the new buildings would be used for existing religious services. Additionally, the project would not indirectly induce population as there will be no extension of roads or other infrastructure. As such, project impacts related to population growth would be less than significant.

b) **No Impact.** The project involves the construction of a 7,293 S.F. synagogue and a 841 S.F. storage building on property that is already being used for religious purposes that would not displace existing people or housing. As such, there would be no impact associated with displacing substantial numbers of existing people or necessitating the construction of replacing housing elsewhere.
iv. **Cumulative Impacts**

As the proposed project would not have any population and housing impacts, the proposed project combined with other similar projects would not result in any cumulatively considerable population and housing impacts.

v. **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are warranted.

vi. **Residual Impact**

The project would not result in any residual impacts to population and housing.
O. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

i. **Existing Setting**

**Fire Protection**

The project site is located within the urban area, in a central portion of the City of Goleta. Fire services would be provided by Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD) under contract to the City. The closest fire station to the project site is Station #14, located at 320 N. Los Carneros Road (approximately 1.2 miles away).

The GP/CLUP identifies three standards under Public Facilities Element Policy PF 3.1 with respect to the provision of fire protection services, which are derived from guidelines by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District. These standards include:

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

The mandated California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) requirement for firefighter safety, known as the “two-in-two-out rule”, is also applicable. This rule requires a minimum of two personnel to be available outside a structure prior to entry by firefighters to provide an immediate rescue for trapped or fallen firefighters, as well as immediate assistance in rescue operations.
The SBCFD has implemented a dynamic deployment system for its fire engines, in addition to the traditional static deployment system from fire stations, when the station’s engine is “in house”. Dynamic deployment allows for the dispatching of engines already on the road for emergency calls by employing a Global Positioning System (GPS) to monitor the exact location of each engine in real time, rather than dispatching by a station’s “first in area”, as has been the previous practice. Previously, when an engine was out on routine (non-emergency) activities, such as inspections or training, the engine company was considered “in-service” and its exact location at any given moment in time was not known to County Dispatch. However, with dynamic deployment using the County’s GPS, County dispatch has real time information on the exact location of each engine at all times and can dispatch the closest, un-engaged engine to an emergency incident, regardless of which fire station’s service area the call originates from. This precludes the need for an in-service engine to have extended run times when another fire engine would be closer. The Fire Department has also added a battalion chief as the fourth fire fighter on scene, in order to meet the “two-in-two-out rule.”

Station 14 has an engine company with a staff of three personnel, consisting of an engine company captain, engineer, and firefighter. Fire Station 14 meets the NFPA and SBCFD guidelines, as follows (City of Goleta, GP/CLUP Final EIR, Table 3.12-1; 2006):

1) The ratio of firefighters to population at Fire Station 14 is 1: 1,987.
2) Fire Station 14 currently serves a population of 5,960 (2000 Census), which is below the ratio of one engine company (three-person solely Station 14’s first-in district crew) per 12,000 population by approximately 6,040 people.
3) Response time from Fire Station 14 is typically within 5 minutes, although the western edge of the City and some northern neighborhoods may experience a longer response time. Fire Station 14 is approximately 1.8 miles by road to the southwest of the project site and well within a five-minute response time.

**Police Protection**

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

**Schools**

Public education services are provided by the Goleta Union School District (GUSD) and the Santa Barbara Unified School District (SBUSD). In general, enrollments in the area school system have been not been increasing and area schools serving the project vicinity are operating below capacity (Goleta Union School District 2017). These schools include La Patera Elementary School at 555 N La Patera Lane, Kellogg Elementary School at 475 Cambridge Drive, Goleta Valley Junior High and Santa Barbara Charter School co-located at 6100 Stow Canyon Road, Dos Pueblos High School at 7266 Alameda Ave., and San Marcos High School at 4750 Hollister Avenue.

**Parks**

A more detailed discussion of parks is provided below under Recreation. The City currently contains 19 parks (including 3 that are privately-owned but publicly accessible), 21 open spaces (including 3 that are privately-owned but publicly accessible), and 1 community center (the Goleta
Valley Community Center). City parks are considered in combination with open space to provide recreational opportunities and encompass approximately 554 acres for a ratio of approximately 17.8 acres per 1,000 residents.

**Libraries**

Services at the Goleta Public Library are provided by the City of Goleta at 500 North Fairview Avenue. The 2-acre library site includes a 15,437 square foot (SF) building and parking areas. The facility provides services to the City and nearby unincorporated areas including Isla Vista, Hope Ranch, and the Gaviota Coast with a population of approximately 95,202. In the FY 2017/2018, the library had approximately 264,242 visitors and circulated 688,581 items, not counting the items that were downloaded electronically. Services were provided by 6 full-time and 15 part-time employees (Personal Communication from Allison Gray, Goleta Valley Library Director, July 15, 2019).

ii. **Thresholds of Significance**

A significant impact on public services would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual include thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools. Specifically, under these thresholds, any project that would result in enough students to generate the need for an additional classroom using current State standards would be considered to result in a significant impact on area schools. The City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual notes State standards were: Grades K – 2, 20 students per classroom; Grades 3 – 8, 29 students per classroom; and Grades 9 – 12, 28 students per classroom. However, today the State standards are based on average class sizes of 31 (not to exceed 33) for kindergarten, 30 (not to exceed 32) for Grades 1 – 3, and 29.9 (or the district’s average number of students per teacher in 1964, whichever is greater) for Grades 4 – 8 (California Department of Education 2018).

iii. **Project Specific Impacts**

a) **Less Than Significant Impact**

i. **Fire Protection**

The project would result in an increase of religious service, office, event hall/kitchen, and storage square footage on the property. Fire protection requirements for the project would include, but would not be limited to, structural fires, emergency medical services, public assistance, and other requests. Once on the scene following any emergency call, the Fire Department would need adequate onsite fire protection facilities. The Fire Department has reviewed the project and determined that the plans prepared by the applicant are acceptable (SBCFD Memorandum, June 14, 2019). Access for the project must be maintained with a minimum 20-foot wide all-weather travel way that is serviceable and maintained for the life of the project. The project would require compliance with Fire Department standard conditions such as fire sprinklers, proper addressing, gated access, and payment of Fire Department development impact fees. Compliance with these standards in addition to implementation of the dynamic deployment system discussed above would reduce impacts to fire protection services to less than significant.

On December 6, 2018, the City approved the addition of a new Fire Station #10 to serve the western portion of the City. The addition of Fire Station #10 will improve the City wide firefighter to population ratio to 1:3,681 and will bring the service ratio into compliance with the City’s minimum service standard upon commencement of normal operations. The
The proposed project will not increase the intensity of use at the project location that would increase the existing demand for fire services, exacerbate the current firefighter to population ratios deficiency, or change the existing Station #14 response times. As such, the project would have a less than significant impact to fire protection service.

**ii. Police Services**

As stated above, the Santa Barbara County Sheriff Department provides 24-hour police protection services to the area under contract to the City of Goleta. Demand for police services resulting from the project, would not change measurably from baseline levels in the foreseeable future. Additionally, the project includes adequate patrol car access. Therefore, project related impacts on police services in the City would be less than significant.

**a) No Impact**

**iii.-v. Schools, Parks, Other Facilities**

Given the non-residential nature of the project and that existing operations would remain largely unchanged, the proposed project would not result in additional enrollment of school aged children in either the Goleta Union or Santa Barbara High School Districts. Similarly, the project would not generate any extra demand for parks and other public facilities/services. Therefore, the project would have no impact to schools, parks, or other public facilities.

**iv. Cumulative Impacts**

There are no project-specific significant impacts to public services as described above, as there would be less than appreciable change in intensity to existing onsite use from this project. When the recently approved Fire Station 10 on the west side of the City is constructed, a reduction in the existing deficiency in Citywide firefighter to population ratio will be resolved. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for public services and would result in less than significant cumulative impacts.

**v. Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Based on the above analysis, no mitigation measures are required.

**vi. Residual Impact**

Based on the above analysis, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts to Public Services would be considered less than significant.
P. RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Existing Setting

The City of Goleta has 19 parks (including 3 that are privately-owned but publicly accessible), 21 open spaces (including 3 that are privately-owned but publicly accessible), and 1 community center (the Goleta Valley Community Center), comprising a total of approximately 554 acres. This is approximately 17.8 acres per one thousand residents. The City has adopted a goal of providing 4.7 acres of parkland (open space lands whose primary purpose is recreation) per thousand residents.

ii. 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.

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a-b) No Impact. Given the scope and nature of the proposed site improvements (a 7,380 S.F. synagogue and 841 S.F. storage building), the project would not create a demand for, nor increase the use of, existing park/recreational facilities within the community. Further, no recreational facilities are proposed with this project, nor given the nature of the proposal would the project require the construction of additional recreation space. Therefore, no impacts associated with the construction of recreational facilities would occur.

iv. Cumulative Impacts

Because project would have no impact to recreation, the project contributions to cumulative recreation impacts would be less than significant.

v. Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Based on the above analysis, no mitigation measures are required.
vi. Residual Impact

Based on the above analysis, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts to Recreation would be considered less than significant.
Q. TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section incorporates the analysis, findings, and recommendations in the *Phase I Traffic Analysis for the 6045 Stow Canyon Road Project – City of Goleta* (Associated Transportation Engineers 2018) as well as the *Updated Traffic Study for the 6045 Stow Canyon Road Synagogue Project – City of Goleta* (Associated Transportation Engineers 2019). These documents are respectively provided in Appendices G and H of this document.

i. **Existing Setting**

The project site is served by a network of City streets and U.S. Highway 101. Access to the project site is provided from Stow Canyon Road west of North Fairview Avenue. Stow Canyon Road is a two-lane, undivided, major collector roadway that parallels Cathedral Oaks Road and serves the surrounding neighborhood as well as the Goleta Valley Junior High School and the Santa Barbara Charter School. There are no existing or planned bikeways on Stow Canyon Road; the nearest bikeway is the existing Class II path on Fairview Avenue (GP/CLUP Figure 7-6, November 2009). Sidewalks exist along the project frontage on both sides of Stow Canyon Road. The closest MTD bus stops are approximately 390 feet east and 940 feet west of the project site, respectively located on Fairview Avenue (at Stow Canyon Road) and on Stow Canyon Road (at the Goleta Valley Junior High School).

As described in the General Plan and the associated General Plan Final EIR (GP FEIR), the intersection of Stow Canyon Road and Fairview Avenue had a Level of Service (LOS) rated as “F” as of 2005 (see General Plan Table 7-1). This was anticipated to remain the same under full build-out by 2030. Planned transportation improvements (i.e., installing a signal at the intersection or other traffic flow regulating improvement), however, would improve the LOS rating at the intersection to a “B.” The time schedule for this improvement is presently unknown. Since 2005,
a new signal has been installed at the intersection of Berkeley Road and Fairview Avenue; Fairview Avenue, north of Stow Canyon Road, has been expanded from one lane to two lanes; and sidewalk and bike lane improvements have been made as well in this area. While the intersection of Stow Canyon Road remains unsignalized, the aforementioned improvements on Fairview Avenue have improved the LOS at the intersection of Stow Canyon Road and Fairview Avenue to a rating of “C”. The primary cause of the existing, poor level of service is traffic associated with the start and end of the school day at the Goleta Valley Junior High School and the co-located Santa Barbara Charter School (Table TRA-1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Goleta Valley Junior High School</th>
<th>Santa Barbara Charter School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Day of School</td>
<td>August 20</td>
<td>August 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day of School</td>
<td>June 3</td>
<td>June 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades Served</td>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>K – 6³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Class Start</td>
<td>0 Period: 7:30AM¹</td>
<td>8:15 AM (all grades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Period: 8:30AM²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Class End</td>
<td>6th Period: 2:34 PM¹</td>
<td>K: 1:30PM⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th Period: 3:24 PM</td>
<td>1 – 6: 2:50 PM⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled Students (Approximate)</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>Kindergarten: 35³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – 6: 200³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Approximately 50 students at the Goleta Valley Junior High School attend 0 period; these students are released at the end of 6th period.
2. 1st Period at the Goleta Valley Junior High School begins at 9:15AM on Thursdays.
3. Additional students are enrolled in the Santa Barbara Charter School K-8th grade “HomeBased Partnership” program located offsite, on Cathedral Oaks Road.
4. Santa Barbara Charter School ends classes at 1:00 PM on Fridays (all grades).

U.S. Highway 101 is a four-lane, north-south interstate highway that connects the City of Goleta to the Cities of Santa Barbara, Carpinteria, and Ventura to the south and Cities of Buellton, Lompoc, and Santa Maria to the north. Calle Real and Cathedral Oaks Road are the primary east/west arterials on the north side of U.S. Highway 101 and vary from two to four lanes between Los Carneros Road and Fairview Avenue.

On major collector roadways such as Stow Canyon Road, City of Goleta Engineering Standard 4-050 requires a separation of 150 feet between driveway access points. Additionally, the Engineering Design Standards adopted by the City of Goleta require the fewest number of access points onto a City road (i.e., one access point or driveway) (Santa Barbara County Department of Public Works Transportation Division’s Engineering Design Standards, Section 5.1[G], September 2011).

The project property has two existing driveway access points on Stow Canyon Road. The western driveway access point is for the synagogue’s parking lot; its centerline is located approximately 91 feet east of the centerline for the nearest driveway on the adjacent property to the west, and was constructed as permitted under an SCD to the original CUP (92-CP-018) that was approved by the Santa Barbara County’s Development Review Division on July 1, 1999. The eastern driveway access point is for the residence’s former garage (converted to habitable residential space under 93-LUS-028); its centerline is located approximately 50 feet east of the centerline for the synagogue’s parking lot access, and approximately 175 feet west of the centerline for the
nearest driveway on the adjacent property to the east. In addition to allowing the conversion of
the former garage to habitable residential space, 93-LUS-028 also involved the removal of the
existing former-garage driveway access point and the construction of a new driveway access
point; its centerline was to be located near the eastern property boundary, approximately 103 feet
east of the centerline for the existing driveway to the former garage.

The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) coordinates with regional
agencies, including the City of Goleta, to prepare and implement the SBCAG 2016 Congestion
Management Program (CMP). The CMP coordinates regional and multi-jurisdictional issues
related to congestion, land development, and air quality, and efficient use of limited transportation
funds. The CMP defines the roadway facilities (intersections and road segments), appropriate
roadways level of service (LOS) standards, performance measures including vehicle miles
travelled (VMT), alternative transportation methods, land use impacts, and a capital improvement
program. The City of Goleta General Plan Transportation Element establishes the Citywide LOS
in coordination with SBCAG and is consistent with the CMP.

ii. Thresholds of Significance
A significant traffic impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts
noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds of significance are set forth in the City’s
Thresholds Manual and include the following:

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

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

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

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

Threshold TRA-4. Project traffic would utilize a substantial portion of at least one
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 a lower level of service (i.e., a V/C ratio exceeding 0.90)].

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a,b, TRA-1, TRA-2, TRA-4) Less Than Significant Impact. Many of the uses planned within the new, 7,293-SF synagogue building are already occurring within the existing 2,445-sf synagogue/pre-school building. Further, many attendees at services and holiday events often do not drive but will walk to the site in keeping with religious practices and observances (Associated Transportation Engineers 2018). The project’s location does not conflict with a transit plan or transit activities.

The project is not located within 1/4 mile of any of the intersections identified in the SBCAG 2016 CMP Table 4.3 CMP Intersections Located Within Transit Priority Area. As described above, the closest MTD bus stops are approximately 390 feet east and 940 feet west of the project site, respectively at the intersection of Fairview Avenue and Stow Canyon Road and on Stow Canyon Road at the Goleta Valley Junior High School.

The City Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identifies implementation priorities for the City’s vision for an integrated bicycle and pedestrian network; the nearest planned improvements are located on Fairview Avenue, approximately 390 feet east of the project site (City of Goleta 2018: Figure 4-3). The project’s continued use of the property for residential, religious services, and educational services at incrementally increased intensities does not change the intensity of use of the existing transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities that would result in a significant impact to a City plan, concept plan or implementing ordinance for the circulation system or with transit activities.

Project-related construction traffic would result primarily from construction personnel commuting to and from the project site. Given the small scale of the construction activities, it is expected that project construction would not require a substantial number of construction workers and would not generate a significant amount of construction-related traffic. While the applicant has not chosen a construction contractor, the CalEEMod v. 2016.3.2 estimation of the number of worker trips and vendor trips is minimal (see Summary Report Table Trips and VMT in Appendix C). Given this, and (1) the generally good existing traffic conditions on Stow Canyon Road and at the intersection of Stow Canyon Road and Fairview Avenue (outside of school start and end times); (2) existing school start and end times (see Table TRA-1, above); (3) the Construction Timing Condition of Approval (see Section 15.M, Noise) that limits construction activity and equipment maintenance to the hours between 8 AM and 5 PM; and (4) the Construction Deliveries Condition of Approval (discussed below in Section “v,” Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures) that limits the delivery of construction materials to non-peak traffic periods when schools are in session; short-term traffic generation impacts would be less than significant as the arrival and departure of construction workers and materials deliveries would have little to no overlap with traffic associated with school start and end times.

Adequate area exists on the project site to provide parking for construction workers and to accommodate material and equipment staging outside of the 100-foot Stream
Protection Area, consistent with the Stream Protection Area Condition of Approval (see Section 15.D, Biological Resources).

In regard to long-term use of the site, the Updated Traffic Study (see Appendix H) applied composite rates developed from Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) sources, as each source has limited data available. The composite rate is applied to the net increase in synagogue size (7,293 SF) as shown in Table TRA-2 below. The Traffic and Parking analysis concludes that the project would result in a net increase of 72 average daily trips (ADT), 7 AM peak hour trips, and 13 PM peak hour trips (Table TRA-2). Tables 5 and 8 of the Updated Traffic Study (see Appendix H) show that these additional trips would have a minimal impact on Fairview Avenue’s roadway operations and that the LOS “A” rating would remain as-is under both the current (Table 5) and cumulative (Table 8) scenarios. Impacts to nearby intersections are discussed below.

Table TRA-2
Project Trip Generation Estimates (Net Increase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>ADT Rate</th>
<th>ADT Trips</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Rate</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Trips (In/Out)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Rate</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Trips (In/Out)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue¹</td>
<td>7,293 SF</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>7 (3/4)</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>13 (6/7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Trip generation rates per 1,000 SF of building area using average of ITE and SANDAG rates.

Existing levels of service for nearby key intersections, and the number of trips that the proposed project would add to each intersection, are provided in Table TRA-3 (AM peak) and Table TRA-4 (PM peak). These tables also identify whether the impact would be significant based on the City’s Thresholds Manual. The analysis considered the improvements on Fairview Avenue that have been made since 2005. As shown, the key intersections studied currently operate in the LOS A-C range under existing conditions and the project would add between 3 and 13 peak hour trips at these locations. This analysis is considered to be conservatively high, as many attendees at services and holiday events often do not drive but will walk to the site in keeping with religious practices and observances (Associated Transportation Engineers 2018) and because proposed changes to ongoing activities are minor. It should also be noted that the Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road intersection operates at LOS C with the improvements that have been completed since 2005.

Table TRA-3
Existing LOS and Project-added Traffic (AM Peak Hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing V/C</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>Project-Added Trips</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road</td>
<td>19.1 Sec¹</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/Calle Real</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/US101 Northbound</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/US 101 Southbound</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. This intersection is not signalized; LOS is based on average weighted delay per vehicle, in seconds.
Given the above analysis, the additional trips resulting from the project would not significantly impact traffic conditions at these intersections. Moreover, the LOS at the intersection of Fairview Avenue and Stow Canyon Road will further improve when the future planned improvements at the intersection (i.e., signalization) and Condition of Approval are implemented.

Lastly, the proposed project was estimated by the CalEEMod v. 2016.3.2 to generate 171,830 vehicle miles travelled (VMT) annually (see Summary Report Table 4.2, Trip Summary Information, in Appendix C). This analysis is considered to be conservatively high, however, as many attendees at services and holiday events often do not drive but will walk to the site in keeping with religious practices and observances (Associated Transportation Engineers 2018) and because proposed to changes to ongoing activities are minor. As such, these project changes would not lead to a significant change in the VMT. The project is also located 2.1 miles from the Goleta Amtrak station. As noted above, the closest MTD bus stops are approximately 390 feet east and 940 feet west of the project site, respectively located on Fairview Avenue (at Stow Canyon Road) and on Stow Canyon Road (at the Goleta Valley Junior High School). Therefore, based on the nature of the project and its location, less than significant impacts are expected to occur.

Based on the above analysis, the proposed project will not have a significant effect to CEQA Checklist items a and b or City Threshold TRA-1, TRA-2, and TRA-4; additional discussion of City Threshold TRA-2 is also provided below.

**c, TRA-2, TRA-3) Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project, per the City’s standards, would reduce the number of driveways on the property from two to one. The proposed driveway is located approximately 35 feet to the west of the existing synagogue (western) driveway. This would reduce the separation distance between the new, single driveway’s centerline and that of the nearest access point to the neighboring property to the west from approximately 91 feet to approximately 56 feet. While the proposed separation distance is less than the 150 feet required by City of Goleta Engineering Standard 4-050, the line of sight on Stow Canyon Road is sufficient to minimize any potential safety concerns. Additionally, the single driveway proposed would reduce the number of points of conflict between pedestrians and vehicles and would provide the fewest number of access points onto a City road possible (i.e., one access point or driveway), consistent with the Santa Barbara County Department of Public Works Transportation Division's Engineering Design Standards, Section 5.1[G] (September 2011). Further, there is good line-of-sight available on Stow Canyon Road at the proposed location and there are no other design features (e.g. narrow width, road side ditches, sharp
curves, inadequate pavement structure) that would create an additional safety risk. The requirement to reduce the number of driveways onto Stow Canyon Road will reduce existing potential safety impacts and result in a less than significant impact.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The continued use of the site is compatible with the uses along Stow Canyon Road. There are no roadway geometric concerns (i.e., sharp curves, blind curves etc.) associated with the design of Stow Canyon Road that would impede emergency access to the site. The project would not generate traffic volumes as noted above that would impede Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD) access to the site. Further, SBCFD has reviewed the project’s access and circulation plan and has found it acceptable subject to conditions which compliance will be required prior to issuance of occupancy permits (County of Santa Barbara Fire Department 2019). Based on nature and intensity of the use and the design of Stow Canyon Road, the project would not have the potential to significantly impact emergency access.

iv. **Cumulative Impacts**

Tables TRA-5 and TRA-6 provide the cumulative LOS and the number of trips that would be added to each intersection by the project for the AM and PM peak hour, respectively, for the key intersections analyzed above. As shown, the Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road intersection is forecast to operate at LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hour periods with cumulative traffic volumes. The project would add 7 AM and 13 PM peak hour trips to the intersection, which represent an increase in volumes of 0.7%. This level of traffic would not generate significant cumulative impacts based on the City’s Thresholds Manual, which states the significance threshold at intersections operating at LOS F is a 1.0% increase. As shown in the tables, other intersections studied operate at a LOS of B-D, and the increase in traffic volumes resulting from the project would be less than significant. It should also be noted that the future planned improvements at the Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road intersection (i.e., signalization) would improve the LOS at this intersection to an “A” rating with cumulative volumes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>Project-Added Traffic (AM Peak Hour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road</td>
<td>&gt;50 Sec¹</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/Calle Real</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/US101 Northbound</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/US 101 Southbound</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. This intersection is not signalized; LOS is based on average weighted delay per vehicle, in seconds.
Table TRA-6
Existing LOS and Project-added Traffic (PM Peak Hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Project-Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road</td>
<td>&gt;50 Sec1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/Calle Real</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/US101 Northbound</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/US 101 Southbound</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. This intersection is not signalized; LOS is based on average weighted delay per vehicle, in seconds.

Based on the above analysis and the Updated Traffic Study (Appendix H), the project will not increase the employment intensity or change land uses at the site that would contribute incrementally to cumulative traffic that would exceed the LOS or V/C ratio that would result in a conflict with the General Plan or SBCAG 2016 CMP that would result in a cumulative impact to the regional road system. Moreover, under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Since the project would not result in a significant increase in VMT and is located near public bus service and in proximity to train service it is expected to not have a significant impact due to a conflict or inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(b).

v. **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are proposed or needed. However, the following conditions of approval will be imposed. In addition, condition of approval Construction Timing (see Section 15.M, Noise) limits construction activity and equipment maintenance to the hours between 8 AM and 5 PM.

**Construction Materials and Equipment Delivery.** Delivery of materials and equipment for construction must be limited to non-school peak traffic periods when either the Goleta Valley Junior High or the Santa Barbara Charter School is in session unless a specific need arises and appropriate measures are developed to the satisfaction of the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee.

**Unimpeded Right Turn for Eastbound Stow Canyon Road.** Improvements shall be installed prior to the request for Certificate of Occupancy to allow for an unimpeded right-turn at all times for eastbound traffic on Stow Canyon Road at the Fairview Avenue intersection. Improvements may include, but are not limited to, a no parking zone, red curb painting, and restriping. Improvements shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director, and at the Applicant’s cost.

vi. **Residual Impact**

Based on the above analysis, residual impacts to traffic and transportation systems would be less than significant.
### R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section incorporates the analysis, findings, and recommendations in the *Phase I Archaeological Investigation for 6045 Stow Canyon Road, APN 077-170-044, Goleta, California* (Stone 2018) as well as a supplemental memorandum (Stone 2019) in response to the City of Goleta’s request for additional information. These documents are referenced herein as Appendix D and contain confidential information that is kept on file with the City of Goleta and may be reviewed with prior authorization by the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Department in accordance with applicable law. Cultural Resources are also addressed in Section E, above.

i. **Existing Setting**

   **Prehistoric Setting**

   Evidence exists for the presence of humans in the Santa Barbara coastal area for thousands of years. While some researchers have proposed that the Santa Barbara Channel area may have been settled as early as 40,000 years ago, only limited evidence for occupation much earlier than
9,500 years has been discovered. Even so, human prehistory along the Santa Barbara channel area coast may extend back as much as 12,000 years. Beginning approximately 7,500 years ago, prehistoric human settlement in the local area apparently increased rapidly with a number of sites dating to approximately this time, and many more dating subsequent to it (General Plan Final EIR [GP FEIR]).

### Ethnographic and Historic Setting

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

As provided in the City’s General Plan Final EIR (Section 3.5, Cultural Resources), the City contains prehistoric, ethnographic, historical, and paleontological resources. GP/CLUP Figure 6-2 (November 2009) shows areas that contain sensitive historic/cultural resources and identifies 46 historic resource locations.

A Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation was completed in June 2018 for the proposed project that included an archaeological site records and literature search as well as an intensive surface survey of the property (Stone 2018). The literature and records search identified (1) two previously recorded archaeological sites are within a 0.25-mile radius, (2) two previous investigations conducted within the project area (a ground surface survey and subsequent Extended Phase 1 backhoe testing program), and (3) thirteen other investigations conducted within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. Past and present on-site surveys identified low densities of estuarine shellfish fragments and fire altered rock within the southeastern portions of the project site and estuarine three shellfish fragments within the western portion of the project site. The report concluded that:

“The presence of surface shellfish fragments is a function of placement of fill when Las Vegas Creek was realigned from within the site to outside its western boundary between 1929 and 1938, and/or slough fill soils that were imported to the property when existing avocado trees were planted. The shell fragments on the ground surface are therefore not associated with a prehistoric or historic archaeological site.”

Additionally, a supplemental memorandum (Stone 2019) concluded that “soils below 2 feet from the surface were formed prior to Native American occupation in this area” and that disturbance of soils below 2 feet from the surface “would not have the potential to disturb unknown buried archaeological resources.”

California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with this area have been notified of the project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. Eight tribes were sent consultation requests in accordance with Assembly Bill 52; one tribe, the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians responded. On February 8, 2019, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians
indicated that they did not want to formally consult and that they would accept the standard Conditions of Approval requiring disclosure in the advent of an inadvertent discovery. No other responses were received.

ii. Thresholds of Significance

The project would be considered to have a significant impact on tribal cultural resources if it were to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in the checklist above.

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a.i, ii) Less Than Significant. An archaeological site records and literature search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Central Coast Information Center (CCIC), University of California, Santa Barbara, was conducted on December 7, 2017 (Stone 2018, 2019). The records search identified all recorded archaeological sites and investigations within the proposed Project area and a 0.25-mile buffer distance. The records search determined that (a) no previously recorded archaeological sites are within the project site; (b) two previously recorded archaeological sites are within a 0.25-mile radius; (c) two investigations, a ground surface survey and subsequent Extended Phase 1 backhoe testing program, were conducted within the project area; and (d) 13 other investigations have been conducted within a 0.25-mile radius.

The project site is not listed or described in a Sacred Lands File, is not listed among the sites identified on General Plan Figure 3.5-1 (Historic Resources), and is not officially designated or recognized as a historically significant site in the CHRIS system by a local government pursuant to a local ordinance or resolution.

As described above, the Phase I Archaeological report and supplemental memorandum concluded that shell fragments on the ground surface are not associated with a prehistoric or historic archaeological site and that soils below 2 feet from the surface were formed prior to Native American occupation in this area and that disturbing these soils would not have the potential to disturb unknown buried archaeological resources. Based on these factors, and the input received through consultation, the project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 and impacts would be less than significant with implementation of MM-CUL-3.

iv. Cumulative Impacts

In general, cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources would occur when a series of actions leads to the loss of a substantial type of site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe. Consistent with the City General Plan, potential project related contributions to cumulative impacts to currently undiscovered tribal cultural resources in the incorporated City of Goleta are reduced to less than significant by implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3.
v. **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation Measure CUL-3 (See Section E, *Cultural Resources*, above) will ensure that if, in the unlikely event of discovering a Native American/cultural resource, the work would stop and the appropriate measures would be taken. This mitigation measure is proposed by the City and agreed to by the applicant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 will be verified by the City through a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). Therefore, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 and the MMRP, the City has a mechanism to verify that any potentially significant impacts to the historic barn would be reduced to less than significant.

vi. **Residual Impact**

With Mitigation Measure CUL-3 implemented, less than significant CEQA-defined residual impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources would occur due to the project.
S. 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. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Existing Setting

Wastewater Treatment

Wastewater in the project area is collected and treated by the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD) at the Goleta Wastewater Treatment Plant (GWWTP). The GWWTP has a design capacity of 9.7 million gallons per day (mgd), based on an average daily flow rate. However, the discharge is restricted under the facility’s National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (Permit No. CA0048160) (a Clean Water Act Requirement by the U.S. EPA), to a daily dry weather discharge of 7.64 mgd (RWQCB, 2010). GSD owns 59.22 percent of the capacity rights at the GWWTP, which gives GSD an allotment of 4.52 mgd of treatment capacity. GSD currently contributes 2.54 mgd in flow to the GWWTP, leaving GSD 1.98 mgd of remaining capacity.

The plant’s treatment system consists of primary settling, biofiltration, aeration, secondary clarification, chlorine disinfection, and de-chlorination. Wastewater flows greater than 4.38 mgd receive primary treatment only and are blended with treated secondary wastewater prior to disinfection and discharge to the ocean. Treated wastewater is discharged to the Pacific Ocean...
through a diffuser 5,912 feet offshore at a depth of approximately 87 feet. In May 2013, the GSD treatment facilities were upgraded from the partial secondary blended process. With the plant upgrades completed, the plant is able to discharge effluent that has been treated to full secondary standards as well treat some wastewater to the tertiary standards required for recycled water use (Goleta Sanitary District 2018: 3).

**Water Sources, Supply, and Demand**

The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water purveyor for the City of Goleta and surrounding areas. The GWD service area is located in the southern portion of Santa Barbara County with its western border adjacent to the El Capitán State Park, its northern border along the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains and the Los Padres National Forest, its eastern border along the City of Santa Barbara, and its southern border along the Pacific Ocean. The service area encompasses approximately 29,000 acres and includes the City of Goleta, University of California, and Santa Barbara Airport (City of Santa Barbara property); the remainder of the service area is located in the unincorporated County of Santa Barbara. GWD provides water service to approximately 87,000 people through a distribution system that includes over 270 miles of pipeline, as well as nine ground water wells and nine reservoirs (Goleta Water District 2019).

### Drainage Facilities

All stormwater runoff, as well as tailwater from landscape irrigation onsite, flows southwest to Las Vegas Creek and ultimately to the confluence of San Jose Creek and Atascadero Creek located east of the Goleta Slough.

**Electric power, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications Facilities**

Electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications services are respectively provided by Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas and Cox Communications and a variety of cellular providers.

**Landfill Capacity and Solid Waste**

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

The Tajiguas Landfill is the only active landfill in Santa Barbara County (County of Santa Barbara 2018a). The landfill encompasses 497 acres, with a permitted operational area of 357 acres. Of this, the total permitted waste footprint is 118 acres for a capacity of 23.3 million cubic yards (County of Santa Barbara 2018b). The permitted waste area is comprised of both lined and unlined (pre-Subtitle D) areas. The Tajiguas landfill is permitted to accept up to 1,500 tons of municipal solid waste and yard waste per day (Santa Barbara County 2015:1-7, 1-8).

Based on current waste disposal rates, the landfill will reach permitted capacity in approximately 2036, based on current projections of materials delivery to the landfill and assuming timely completion and expected performance of the Tajiguas Resource Recovery Project (TRRP) that
would increase waste diversion (e.g., compost and recycling) rates. The landfill is classified as a
Class III (non-hazardous solid waste) disposal facility (County of Santa Barbara 2018:20,30).

ii. Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the
impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City of Goleta's *Environmental Thresholds
and Guidelines Manual* (Section 17, *Solid Waste Thresholds*) provides the following applicable
thresholds to determine whether significant noise impacts would occur:

**Threshold USM-1.** A project would result in a significant impact on the City’s landfill capacity
if it would generate more than 196 tons of solid waste per year, after a 50% reduction credit is
given due to recycling efforts.

**Threshold USM-2.** Projects with a project-specific impact as identified above (196 tons/year or
more) are also considered to have a cumulatively significant impact. Additionally, projects that
would generate more than 40 tons or more tons per year (but less than 196 tons per year) of solid
waste are considered to have a less than significant but adverse (i.e., a Class III) impact to
regional solid waste and mitigation should be recommended.

iii. Project Specific Impacts

a) **Less Than Significant.** All utilities exist on site to serve the development and have the
capacity to support the development. The relocation, addition, and/or extension of onsite
utilities to serve proposed structures will occur within the footprint of existing onsite
development and is minor in nature. The onsite stormwater drainage will be required to be
designed and constructed in compliance with Regional Water Quality Control Board
regulations and City of Goleta development standards prior to issuance of a building
permit. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant environmental effects
from addition of onsite utility distribution lines and stormwater drainage. The project would
not require the development or relocation of electric power, natural gas, or
telecommunications facilities.

b,c) **Less Than Significant.** Water for the project would be provided by the Goleta Water
District (GWD). Based on demand study and project use description prepared by MAC
Design Associates, dated December 2, 2016, and landscape demand prepared by
Earthform Design, dated February 17, 2017, and accepted by GWD per the Preliminary
Water Service Determination Letter dated October 12, 2018, the new synagogue building
with proposed property development, activities (e.g., religious and educational services)
of existing structures, and retrofits would be 0.95 acre-feet of annual demand, which is
less that the property’s historic water supply credit of 0.97 acre-feet per year (Goleta Water
District: July 11, 2019 email from Jim Heaton). As such, the project will not substantially
change water use onsite and development of the project would pose a less than significant
impact on the area’s water supply.

The project would not change existing uses onsite but would result in an overall increase
of 6,641 S.F. in building area. While the project would result in a net increase in
wastewater produced onsite, average discharge to District facilities has been less than
150,000 gallons annually and the Goleta Sanitary District anticipates that future additional
flows resulting from the project would not be a significant factor to either the District
collection or treatment facilities (Goleta Sanitary District 2019: July 12 email from Luis Astorga). Additionally, the project already has a Sewer Service Connection Permit from the GSD to guarantee sewer service and would be required to obtain a service extension to the new synagogue. Therefore, the project’s contribution to waste water discharge would be less than significant.

d,e, USM-1)  Less Than Significant.

**Construction/ Demolition Debris**
The California Green Building Code requires demolition of any structure requiring a permit to divert 65% of the construction materials generated during construction. Therefore, the City has implemented a mandatory Construction and Demolition (C&D) Debris Recycling Program to divert at least 65% of these highly recoverable materials from the landfill in accordance with state law. To address the waste, diversion reporting is required after construction in accordance with the City of Goleta’s Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Program Waste Reduction and Recycling Guidance Document. The applicant will be required to substantiate how a 65% diversion factor was achieved during construction. Compliance with adopted Green Building Code requirements will reduce the project’s short-term waste generation impacts to a less than significant level.

**Long Term Operations**
The City’s Thresholds Manual provides a project-specific threshold of 196 tons of solid waste generated per year, which is equivalent to the annual waste generated by 70 single-family dwellings. The project would not change existing uses onsite but would result in an overall increase of 6,641 S.F. in building area. The City of Goleta’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* provides specifics methods assess the impact associated with residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional projects, although none are specific to religious institutions. Conservatively applying the “Educational Institutions” annual generation rate (of 0.0010 tons/year/square foot of new development), the proposed project would generate an additional 6.75 tons/year of solid waste, and at least half of this would be diverted (e.g., recycled or composted). Given this, and the fact that that the proposed changes to ongoing activities are minor, the project would not have the potential to generate 196 tons of solid waste annually. Therefore, the project’s operational specific impact on solid waste disposal capacity at the Tajiguas Landfill would be less than significant.

iv. **Cumulative Impacts**

Based on the above analysis, the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in use of available utility capacity, including the GWD’s water supply, GSD’s sewage treatment capacity, or the City storm drain system. Regarding disposal capacity at the Tajiguas Landfill, for the reasons described above, the project would not have the potential to generate 40 tons/year of additional solid waste and therefore would not exceed Threshold USM-2. Therefore, the project’s public utility impacts would not be cumulatively considerable or significant.

v. **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are proposed or needed.
vi. **Residual Impact**

The project would result in no residual impacts to utilities and service systems.
### T. WILDFIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If located in or near a state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### i. Existing Setting

The project site is not located in a very high fire hazard severity zone or in or near areas of state responsibility. The site is located in a designated Local Responsibility Area (LRA) as designated on the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Fire Hazards Severity Zone in State Responsibility Areas Map (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2007).

#### ii. Thresholds of Significance

The project would have a significant impact if it is near a state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, if the project were found to cause an impact defined in the above checklist.

#### iii. Project Specific Impacts

#### a) Less Than Significant Impact

The project is located approximately 1,880 feet south of the nearest designated High Fire Hazard Area in a state responsibility area. The project will consist of residential, office, religious service, educational service, storage, parking, and landscaping uses, all of which exist on-site and are located in an urban area that receives fire protection from the County of Santa Barbara Fire Department. The project does not propose a use that has been determined to be inconsistent with adopted plans including emergency response plans or an evacuation plan, and therefore would have a less than significant impact to such plans.
b,c)  **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is not located on moderate or steep slopes, in an area with potential wildfire fuels, or an area with difficult or constrained access. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase existing wildfire risks. The project would not introduce new structures or people into areas with an existing high wildfire risk, nor does the project propose infrastructure or utility construction requiring fire breaks. The project is in an urbanized area wherein prevailing winds could carry wildfire smoke and ash to the project site. This is an existing situation that affects the entire City and is not unique to the project site. Since the project is not proposing new uses within or adjacent to a designated wildfire hazard area, and would not substantially increase existing wildfire risk, the project would not result in a significant increase in potential wildfire-related impacts.

d)  **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is located on a developed urban site. Although small portions of the project site (i.e., the entrance to the existing and proposed synagogue parking lot, as well as the westernmost corners of the property [north and south]) are located within the 100-year flood zone (FEMA 2012), all proposed structures would be located outside the 100-year flood zone. While there is a slightly elevated risk of post-fire flooding and mud flows given the proximity to Las Vegas Creek, the exposure is minimal given the distance of the building away from the creek, the elevation of the site, and relatively small increase in building area, and distance from mountainous areas. As such, neither people nor structures would be exposed to significant risks such as downslope or downstream flooding or landslides because of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Additionally, the project site is well removed (i.e., is located approximately 1,880 feet) from a designated High Fire Hazard zone located in a state responsibility area. Therefore, the project would not be positioned in a manner that would directly or indirectly exacerbate the risk of a natural disaster by bringing new development to vulnerable areas and would have a less than significant impact.

iv.  **Cumulative Impacts**

The project is located approximately 1,880 feet (0.36 mile) south of the nearest designated High Fire Hazard Area in a state responsibility area. The project will consist of residential, religious services, and educational services uses and located in an urban area that receives fire protection from the County of Santa Barbara Fire Department. The project would not substantially increase existing wildfire-related impact risk on the project site or other existing development in the City. Therefore, the project’s cumulative wildfire-related impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would not be significant.

v.  **Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required as the project would have a less than significant impact to state responsibility areas.

vi.  **Residual Impact**

Based on the above analysis, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts to Wildfire would be considered less than significant.
### U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 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 rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a)** The project is located within an urbanized area on a site developed with residential, office, religious service, educational service, storage, parking, and landscaping uses. Section 15.D, *Biological Resources*, fully analyzes the potential direct as well as indirect impacts (e.g., new lighting) on biological resources, including potential impacts to Las Vegas Creek. The analysis concluded there may be project effects on roosting and nesting birds during construction activities. As such, the *Nesting Birds* Condition of Approval was proposed by the City and agreed to by the applicant. Therefore, with the implementation of the *Nesting Birds* Condition of Approval and the MMRP, the City has a mechanism to verify that any impacts to migrating and nesting birds would be reduced.

The Cultural and Tribal Resources sections of this study indicates possible project effects on cultural and tribal resources. The Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources sections detail mitigation for reducing impacts to these important Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources to less than significant.

**b)** This project is consistent with the designated land uses in the City of Goleta General Plan. This initial study has identified potential impacts in the areas of biological resources and
cultural/tribal cultural resources that individually are limited and require mitigation to ensure that the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level both incrementally and cumulatively. The project approval is conditioned upon implementation of these mitigation measures that avoid incremental effects that would emerge with implementation of cumulative projects.

c) Project effects on human beings related to cultural resources, noise, hydrology, and transportation/traffic have been analyzed in this study. Impacts on human beings would be less than significant with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures, where required.
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Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM-CUL-1: Historic Building Relocation.</strong> The Applicant/Permittee, at its sole expense, shall make a good faith effort to relocate the barn/storage building not less than 90 days. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, the Applicant shall offer the building to be moved, at the expense of the recipient, to another site including working with a Realtor to advertise the building. The order of preference for relocation is 1) in Goleta; 2) in the South Coast area of Santa Barbara County; 3) in Santa Barbara County; and 4) outside of the County. This offer will be made through an advertisement placed in a paper general circulation twice within a 60-day time period, and a direct offer to local preservation groups including the Goleta Valley Historical Society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **MM-CUL 2: Historic Building Documentation.** The Permittee/Applicant shall have a City-approved architectural historian provide written and photographic documentation of the barn/storage garage’s historical features and former setting using historic photographs, measured drawings, and archival quality photography. The City shall review and approve the documentation prior to issuance of demolition permit. One copy of the historical documentation shall be kept with the City of Goleta and | Chabad of Santa Barbara | The applicant shall secure approval of the architectural historian by the City of Goleta prior to the documentation phase. Further, the review of the written and photographic history of the site must be completed, approved, and submitted to the designated | Planning Director or designee shall verify compliance before issuance of the demolition permit; qualified architectural historian |
### Environmental Conditions of Approval/Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Party Obligation</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>copies shall be deposited with the Goleta Valley Historical Society and in the Special Collections Department of the Davison Library of the University of California, Santa Barbara.</td>
<td>repositories prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.</td>
<td>Planning Director or designee must verify compliance before grading/construction in the vicinity of the find may be resumed; qualified archaeologist; Native American observer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MM-CUL-3: Discovery of Cultural Resources.** If archaeological resources are encountered during grading, work must be stopped immediately or redirected until a City-approved archaeologist and local Chumash Native American consultant can evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to the Phase 2 investigation standards set forth in the City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 2 study must be funded by the Applicant/Permittee at his sole expense. If resources are found to be significant, they must be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 3 mitigation program must be funded by the Applicant/Permittee.

Chabad of Santa Barbara

If archaeological resources are encountered during grading, the identification of the City-qualified archaeologist and Chumash Native American consultant shall be approved by the City prior to additional grading in the vicinity of the find. The monitors must be onsite during all project excavation, grading or other soil disturbance required to conduct the Phase 2, and if necessary, Phase 3 investigations.

**Tribal Cultural Resources**

Refer to Mitigation Measure CUL-3.

---

I have read and agree to the conditions and mitigation measures in this document:

Applicant’s Name ___________________________ Signature ________________________ Date ___________________________