Schwan Self-Storage

Addendum to
Schwan Self-Storage Project
Mitigated Negative Declaration
Case No. 17-055-DP RV

Prepared by:

City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

September 2017
Addendum to Schwan Self-Storage Project
Final Mitigated Negative Declaration

Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Introduction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Overview</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Background – Schwan Self Storage Proejct, Case No. 07-229-DP</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Ceqa Authority For The Addendum Analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Scope Of Addendum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Adoption And Availability Of Addendum</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Project Description</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Project Location</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Revised Project</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 CEQA Environmental Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Introduction</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Determining Significance</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Requirements For Cumulative Impact Analysis</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Consistency With Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Environmental Impact Analysis</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1 Potential Environmental Impacts Of The Proposed Project</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture And Forest Resources</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology And Soils</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards And Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology And Water Quality</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use And Planning</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population And Housing</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation And Traffic</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities And Service Systems</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Figures

Figure 1 – Project Location .............................................................................. 8
Figure 2 – Revised Project Site Plan .................................................................. 10

List of Appendices

Appendix A - Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND (October 14, 2011)
Appendix B - Schwan Self-Storage Project - Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Memorandum (Dudek June 29, 2017)
Appendix C - Schwan Self-Storage CalEEMod Report (CalEEMod.2016.3.1)
Appendix D - Trip Generation Comparison and Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export Truck Route for the Schwan Self-Storage Project (ATE August 1, 2017)
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The City of Goleta ("City") has prepared this Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Schwan Self-Storage Project. The Final MND (10-MND-004) evaluated the potential environmental effects of the Schwan Self-Storage Project and was adopted by the Planning Commission in 2011. This document is prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §§ 15000, et seq.). The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND is available for review at the City Planning and Environmental Review Department.

1.2 BACKGROUND – SCHWAN SELF STORAGE PROEJCT, CASE NO. 07-229-DP

On October 24, 2011, the Goleta Planning Commission approved the Schwan Self-Storage Project for the construction of a new 110,600 square foot self-storage facility containing 685 units on a 2.06-acre site (Approved Project). The Final MND for the Schwan Self-Storage Project addressed the associated environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

On April 25, 2017, the Applicant filed a Revised project description (Revised Project) proposing several changes, including a reduction in building coverages and the addition of basements to each building. The changes were the result of a Union Pacific Railroad policy change in which they no longer granted longer term leases of their property. As the Original Project relied on the use of the long-term lease area to meet its fire access requirements, in order to maintain access the building had to be pushed further back from the property line to allow for the fire access. As a result of pushing the buildings back the building foot prints were reduced in size, to make up for the loss square footage the Applicant incorporated basements into the project. Due to the effort involved in the addition of a basement to one building to make up the units, the Applicant chose to add basements to all three buildings. Due to the increase in the amount of grading and building area resulting from the addition of the basements, the applicant has submitted a request for a Development Plan Revision.

1.3 CEQA AUTHORITY FOR THE ADDENDUM ANALYSIS

According to CEQA Guidelines § 15164, an addendum to a previously certified Final MND or adopted Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental document in instances when "only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in [CEQA Guidelines] Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred." CEQA Guidelines § 15162 calls for the preparation of a subsequent negative declaration if the lead agency determines that:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the Project which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration
due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
   a. The Project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous negative declaration;
   b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous Final MND;
   c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the Project, but the Project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
   d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Final MND would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the Project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

As set forth in this Addendum, none of the conditions described above will occur in relation to the Schwan Self-Storage Revised Project. Therefore, an Addendum is appropriate for this Revised Project. This document describes the Revised Project and the minor changes, the similarity in impact levels or lack of new mitigation measures compared to those identified in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND.

As discussed in the following sections, the impacts associated with the Revised Project do not substantially exceed those impacts identified in the adopted Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND. As supported by the analysis below, the Revised Project would have no new significant environmental effects beyond those identified in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND. Therefore, this Addendum is the appropriate environmental document under CEQA. As discussed below, mitigation measures identified in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND would remain applicable to the Revised Project.

1.4 SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

This Addendum to the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND analyzes environmental impacts and mitigation measures that may be associated with implementation of the Revised Project described in detail in Section 2.0, Project Description. The scope of analysis of this Addendum addresses each of the environmental resource areas that were previously analyzed in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND, including the following:

- Aesthetics/Visual Resources
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Circulation
- Utilities and Service Systems
1.5 ADOPTION AND AVAILABILITY OF ADDENDUM

This Addendum to the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND will be considered by the Planning and Environmental Review Director as part of the Revised Project consideration. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15164(c), an Addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final MND. The decision-making body considers the Addendum with the Final MND before making a decision on the Project.

The Addendum will be available on the City's website for general public reference and at the following locations:

City of Goleta
Planning & Environmental Review Department
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California 93117

Goleta Library
500 N. Fairview Avenue
Goleta, CA 93117

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project site is located at 10 South Kellogg Avenue. The parcel is located at the north end of South Kellogg Avenue between the 101 Freeway and Union Pacific Railroad in the City of Goleta (City). The project site is also identified as Assessor’s Parcel No. (APN) 071-090-082. Figure 1 shows the Schwan Self-Storage Project location.

2.2 REVISED PROJECT

The Schwan Self-Storage Project was previously approved for 3 buildings with 685 storage units on its 2.23-acre site (including the UPR lease area). The proposed project ("Revised Project") includes the following elements:

- Remove the Union Pacific Railroad (UPR) lease area (7,433 square feet) from inclusion in the project area. The revised project area is now 89,734 square feet (2.06 acres).
- Narrow the width of proposed buildings B and C by decreasing foot print by 10 feet on the southern side so that adequate fire access and landscaping can be provided without using the UPR lease area.
- Add basements to all three buildings (A, B, and C), resulting in an increase in overall square footage of 25,141 sq. ft. (from 110,600 gross square feet to 135,741 gross square feet). Individual building increase are provided below in table 1.
- Remove managers care taker unit and convert area to additional storage units.
- Increase the number of storage units from 685 to 863 units (178-unit increase).
- Additional soil export of 11,415 cubic yards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Approved Project</th>
<th>Revised Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross SF</td>
<td>Net SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A</td>
<td>34,850</td>
<td>32,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The building square footage would increase by 25,141 gross square feet, a 22.7% increase over the Approved Project.

### Table 2
**Site Coverage – Approved and Revised**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approved Project</th>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Project</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>% of Area</td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>% of Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprints</td>
<td>37,210</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>33,094</td>
<td>36.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Enclosures</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Included Above</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Areas</td>
<td>20,908</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>21,259</td>
<td>23.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drain Infiltration Areas</td>
<td>Included Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Included Above</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape and Paving</td>
<td>38,650</td>
<td>39.79</td>
<td>35,381</td>
<td>39.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Site Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,061</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Entitlements:** The Revised Project includes a request for the following entitlement:

**Development Plan Revision (17-055-DP RV):** to allow an increase in the number of storage units, to allow an increase in the square footage of the buildings, addition of basements, and other minor changes.

**Development Plan Revision (DP RV):** The existing Schwan Self-Storage Development Plan permits three buildings containing 685 storage units and 32 parking spaces on the 2.23-acre (including 0.17-acre lease area) Project site. The proposed change would increase the number of storage units from 685-unit to 863-units through the addition of basements to each building. The lease area would no longer be counted toward the project area, and as a result building B and C will be located further away from the southern property line, losing 10 feet along the southern portion of the buildings. The changes to the building footprint of buildings B and C, will result in the building coverage being reduced from 37,210-square feet to 33,094-square feet.

The number of buildings (3) and the building heights will remain the same at a maximum height of 35-feet between the Approved and Revised Projects. In addition, the overall building design will remain the same. Twenty-six (26) parking spaces are proposed to serve the storage project, for which 12 spaces are required.

Grading on the Project site would include approximately 13,365 cubic yards (CY) of cut and 1,950 CY of fill. The Revised Project will require 11,415 CY of soil to be exported from the project site, due to the construction of the basements. Anticipated export hauling would occur during non-peak traffic hours over a course of approximately 3 weeks. This is an increase from the Approved Project, which required no export and 1,340CY of import.
All relevant mitigation measures and conditions of approval adopted for the Approved Project would continue to apply to the Revised Project.

Figure 1 – Project Location
Figure 2 – Revised Project Site Plan
3.0 CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This Addendum addresses the Revised Project’s effects related to the environmental topics and mitigation measures addressed in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND. The baseline for review is the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND as approved and entitled as described in section 2.0 above. The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND is included as Appendix A to this Addendum for reference.

3.2 DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE

The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts in this Addendum are the same as those contained in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND. While the criteria for determining significant impacts are unique to each issue area, the analysis applies a uniform classification of the impacts based on the following definitions:

- A designation of no impact is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
- A less-than-significant impact would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment.
- An impact that is less than significant with mitigation incorporated avoids substantial adverse impacts on the environment through mitigation.
- A significant and unavoidable impact would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment, and no feasible mitigation measures would be available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Based on the above criteria, the environmental impact analysis assesses each issue area to determine the significance level. The City categorizes Project impacts as follows:

- Class I impacts are significant adverse impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated, reduced, or avoided. During approval of the Approved Project, the City Council adopted a statement of overriding considerations, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15093, explaining why the Project benefits outweigh the disturbance caused by the significant unavoidable environmental impact.
- Class II impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly reduced or avoided through the implementation of GP/CLUP policies, or by other recommended mitigation. During approval of the Approved Project, the City Council made findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091 that impacts have been mitigated to the maximum extent feasible by implementing the mitigation measures.
- Class III impacts are adverse impacts that are less than significant. During approval of the Project, the City Council was not required to make CEQA findings regarding these impacts.
- Class IV impacts include changes to the environment as a result of Project implementation that would be beneficial.
3.3 REQUIREMENTS FOR CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

CEQA Guidelines §15130 requires a reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of a project. Cumulative impacts are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts" (CEQA Guidelines §15355).

The City’s previous adoption of the GP/CLUP involved no immediate direct physical environmental impacts. Rather, the GP/CLUP projected future development within the City, and the Final MND analysis focused on "indirect" impacts associated with the adoption of the GP/CLUP.

Because these impacts would occur over time as part of individual residential and commercial/industrial development projects, a project horizon year (2030) was established for purposes of analysis in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND. Since an Addendum involves the assessment of only minor technical changes in the conditions assumed to exist, no change in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND-assessed cumulative impacts would occur and cumulative impact assessment is not a part of this Addendum.

3.4 CONSISTENCY WITH GOLETA’S GENERAL PLAN/COASTAL LAND USE PLAN

The proposed Addendum is a minor revision to the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND that is consistent with the GP/CLUP goals and policies, as mitigated. No changes to the Approved Project are proposed that would result in any inconsistencies with the GP/CLUP.

3.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

For an Addendum to be an adequate environmental document for a Project pursuant to CEQA, the Project must involve only a minor technical change or addition. From an environmental perspective, the Lead Agency must demonstrate the following with respect to that proposed change:

- That the project will not have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous Final MND;
- That the project would not create effects that result in an increase in the severity of significant effects already identified in the previous Final MND;
- That all feasible mitigation measures are accepted and adopted; and
- That no additional mitigation measures are required to reduce one or more significant effect or, if these are required, that they are imposed as part of the environmental assessment.

This Addendum is an environmental analysis for the proposed Revised Project described in Section 2.0 Project Description.

3.5.1 Potential Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project

This section addresses each of the environmental issues discussed in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND to determine whether the Revised Project has the potential to create new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the significance of a significant impact as
compared to what was identified in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND, within the framework of CEQA Guidelines § 15162 and 15164.

AESTHETICS

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND describes the aesthetics/visual resources setting relative to the Project, impacts on aesthetics/visual resources that would result from the Approved Project, and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts. The three proposed three story buildings would have a maximum height of 35-feet in both the Approved and Revised Project. The peak height includes architectural elements that are allowed to exceed the building height definition established by the Zoning Ordinance. The Revised Project's size, scale, architecture, landscaping, lighting and fencing are designed to be consistent with the Approved Project design. The Revised Projects design is consistent with the projects approval from the Design Review Board. Therefore, the Revised Project will not result in any new significant aesthetics/visual resources impacts and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: All previously identified impacts on Visual Character, and Light and Glare in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND are still expected to occur with the Revised Project.

Cumulative Impacts: Due to continued Project specific visual impacts on night lighting, and the visual character of the surrounding area, project contributions to cumulative visual/aesthetic impacts on aesthetic resources remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures related to Project Screening, Visual Character, and Light and Glare continue to be applicable to the Revised Project: AS -1, -2, -3, -4, -5, -6, -7, -8, -9, and -10.

Residual Impacts: With implementation of the adopted mitigation measures, the residual project specific impacts to aesthetics, visual and scenic resources, as well as project contributions to cumulative changes in visual character of the surrounding area due to exterior lighting, would be less than significant.

AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND stated that no lands zoned as forest lands or timberlands are located on the project site or in its immediate vicinity and therefore the Approved Project would have no impact on forest resources in the area.

Project-Specific Impacts: As with the Approved Project, the Revised Project would not result in an impact on forest resources in the area.

Cumulative Impacts: The Revised Project would result in no contribution to the cumulative loss of agricultural land and resources within the City.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact: None
AIR QUALITY

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND describes the air quality setting relative to the Approved Project, impacts on air quality that would result from the Project and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially adverse but not significant impacts. The City of Goleta has adopted specific thresholds for reactive organic gases and nitrogen oxides, but not for carbon monoxide or particulate matter. See Appendix B, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas – URBEMIS Results Health Risk Assessment, for details.

Construction Emissions Assumptions

Construction emissions were modeled for the previously approved Approved Project and the proposed Revised Project. The Approved Project evaluated in the 2011 Schwan Self Storage Final MND includes development of 110,600-square feet of storage space containing 685-units. The Revised Project includes development of 135,741-square feet of storage space, containing 863-units. Emissions for the Approved Project and the Revised Project were estimated to determine the difference in construction emissions. Estimated emissions were based on construction information provided by the Project Applicant (Schwan), the previous analysis contained in the 2011 Schwan Self Storage Final MND, and the Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4 (Urbemis) default values were utilized when project–specific information was not known and/or immediately available. Urbemis was used to generate construction phasing for both scenarios for consistency since it was used for the calculation of the original air quality analysis. The Revised Project was also run in the most recent version of CalEEMod (CalEEMod.2016.3.1) to provide emission estimates using a more up to date program, to provide a more accurate Revised Project emission estimate. The analysis contained herein is based on the following assumptions for the Approved and the Revised Projects (duration of phases is approximate):

**Estimated Construction Phasing for Approved Project**
- Grading/Soil Export/Hauling – 30 days
- Building Construction – 160 days
- Paving – 10 days
- Application of Architectural Coatings – 20 days

**Estimated Construction Phasing for Revised Project**
- Grading/Soil Export– 52 days
- Building Construction – 213 days
- Paving – 10 days
- Application of Architectural Coatings – 29 days

The variety of construction equipment used for estimating the construction emissions of the Approved and Revised Project is based on URBEMIS and CalEEMod defaults and is shown in Table 1 of Appendix B Construction Scenario Assumptions and Appendix C OffRoad Equipment, respectively. The Revised project assumed the same construction equipment as assumed in the 2011 Final MND, as well as the hours of operation duration.

The Approved Project’s analysis in the 2011 Schwan Self Storage Final MND more accurately presents the difference in construction emissions for both the Approved and Revised Projects, URBEMIS Version 9.2.4 was used for the analysis of both scenarios, which includes updated
calculation equations and emission factors. For this analysis, it was assumed that heavy construction equipment will operate 5 days a week during Project construction for both scenarios. The same assumptions were used for the CalEEMod modelling as well. Additionally, worker vehicle trips and vendor truck trips are based on URBEMIS Version 9.2.4 and CalEEMod 2016.3.1 default values.

The haul truck assumptions for the Revised Project scenario were based on information provided by the applicant and Association Transportation Engineers (ATE) *Trip Generation Comparison and Soil Export Evaluation for the Schwan Self Storage Project* memorandum (ATE 2017; Appendix D). An additional 11,415 yards (cy) of soil are required to be exported off-site as a result of change made on the Revised Project to add the basement, when compared to the Approved Project.

The Approved Project assumes import of 1,340 cubic yards of soil material; the Revised Project assumes export of 11,415 cubic yards of excess cut material. Haul truck trips for all export activities are estimated based on the estimated export volume and the haul truck capacity provided by ATE (ATE 2017) (i.e., 15 cubic yards per truck). Accordingly, the additional 11,415 cubic yards of export is estimated to require an additional 1,520 one-way haul truck trips (760 round truck trips).

### Table AQ-1
**Estimated Annual Construction Emissions for the 2011 Final MND and Revised Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM₁₀</th>
<th>PM₂.₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011 Final MND for the Approved Project vs. Revised Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Project (URBEMIS)</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Project (URBEMIS)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Project Emissions (Revised Project Increase)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Project (CalEEMod)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thresholds</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** See Appendix B and C for detailed results.

ROC = reactive organic compounds; NOx = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SOx = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = coarse particulate matter; PM₂.₅ = particulate matter.

As shown in Table AQ-1, the annual construction emissions estimated in the 2011 Final MND for the Approved Project using Urbemis would not exceed the SBCAPCD threshold guidelines of 25 tons per year for any pollutant. Buildout of the Revised Project would result in a slight decrease in estimated annual construction emissions for ROC, NOx, CO, and SOx compared to the 2011 Final MND. However, there was an estimated increase in PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅ emissions for the Revised Project compared to the 2011 Final MND due to the increase in fugitive dust created from the soil export. When run in CalEEMod the Revised Project would result in slight decrease to all emissions with the exception of NOx, which would increase slightly. While the Revised Project would result in a slight increase in some construction emissions, under both the
Urbemis and CalEEMod estimates, these minor increase in construction emissions would not represent a substantial change in project-generated construction emissions and would not alter the impact significance conclusions of the previous 2011 Final MND. In both Urbemis and CalEEMod the Revised Project’s emissions do not exceed the SBCAPCD threshold guidelines for construction.

*Operation Emissions*

The Revised Project would include the development of an additional 178-storage units over what was analyzed in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND.

Project-generated trip estimates used were calculated based on the land use and trip generation rates identified in the ATE 2017 memo the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND. Trip generation rates for mini storage and apartments are based on the number of units. As, the Revised Project would in remove the apartment unit but increase the number of storage, the traffic generated by the Revised project would generate more traffic than the Approved Project. As a result, the total emissions generated by the Revised Project would increase slightly over the Approved Project as shown in Table AQ-2 below.
Table AQ-2
Estimated Maximum Daily Operational Emissions for the Approved 2011 Final MND and Revised Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROC</th>
<th>NO₂</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO₂</th>
<th>PM₁₀</th>
<th>PM₂₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pounds per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Final MND for the Approved Project (Urbemis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular (Mobile) Source Emissions</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Total Emissions</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Project (Urbemis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular (Mobile) Source Emissions</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Total Emissions</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Revised Project Emissions (Urbemis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROC</th>
<th>NO₂</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO₂</th>
<th>PM₁₀</th>
<th>PM₂₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pounds per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Final MND</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Project</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change in Total Emissions</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised Project (CaIEEMod)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROC</th>
<th>NO₂</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO₂</th>
<th>PM₁₀</th>
<th>PM₂₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pounds per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source Emissions</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular (Mobile) Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Total Emissions</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Appendix B and C for detailed results.
Emissions presented are the maximum daily summer or winter emissions results from URBEMIS.
ROC = reactive organic compounds; NO₂ = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO₂ = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = coarse particulate matter; PM₂₅ = fine particulate matter, lbs./day = pounds per day.
Emissions associated with natural gas usage (energy source emissions) are included in the Area Source Emissions.

As shown in Table AQ-2, the previously evaluated project in the 2011 Final MND was determined not to exceed any of the SBCAPCD emission thresholds. Similarly, the Revised Project would not exceed any of the SBCAPCD emission thresholds. Compared to the 2011 Final MND, the Revised Project would decrease all criteria pollutant emissions during operation. This can be attributed to a decrease in the trip rates compared to the 2011 Final MND and a more efficient vehicle fleet in 2019 compared to 2010. It should be noted that although the Trip Memo (ATE 2017) showed that the Revised Project would have higher average daily traffic than the Approved Project, the 2011 MND modelled traffic emissions based on a higher traffic rate than what was estimated in the 2017 Trip Memo for the Revised Project. When compared in Urbemis the Revised Project would result in lower overall operational emissions for pollutants with adopted significance thresholds (i.e., ROC, NOx, CO, and PM10). When run in CalEEMod and compared to the Approved Project, the Revised Project would result in lower overall operational emissions for NOx, CO, and PM10 pollutants, only ROC will increase slightly. However, even with the increase in ROC emissions under CalEEMod, the Revised Project’s emissions would not exceed adopted significance thresholds. Therefore, the Revised Project would not represent a substantial change in operational emissions compared to the Approved Project and would not alter the impact conclusions of the previous 2011 Final MND.

The Revised Project air quality impacts would remain potentially significant but mitigable. The Revised Project will still be subject to all mitigation measures for air quality and transportation identified in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND, such as dust control, energy conservation, transportation system improvements and, and permitting requirements of the SBCAPCD.

**Project-Specific Impacts:** All the previously identified impacts related to construction emissions, demolition, and long term operation emissions in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND are still expected to occur.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Cumulative impacts on air quality remain the same

**Mitigation Measures:** The following mitigation measures related to appropriate ventilation, air quality disclosures, dust generation, mitigation of construction equipment emissions, and asbestos notifications continue to be applicable to the Revised Project: AQ -1, -2, -3, -4, -5, -6, and -7.

**Residual Impacts:** Under the above mitigation measure, residual Project-specific and cumulative impacts would continue to be reduced to less than significant.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Section 4.3 of the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND describes the biological setting relative to the Project, impacts on biological resources that would result from the Project, and includes mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts to Class II. The Revised Project does not include any elements that would affect biological resources in a new or different manner. Therefore, no new impacts will occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.
Project-Specific Impacts: All previously identified impacts related to Streamside Protection Area buffers, creek runoff, disturbance of wildlife habitat, and habitat removal in the Final MND are still expected to occur.

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative impacts on biological resources remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures related to erosion control, creek buffers, habitat restoration, maintenance agreements, tree protection, wildlife surveys, and construction management are still required: BIO -1, -2, -3, -4, -5, -6, -7, -8, -9, -10, -11, -12, -13, -14, -15, -16, -17, and -18.

Residual Impacts: With the above mitigation measures, the Revised Project’s impact on biological resources would be reduced to less than significant.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND describes the archaeological setting relative to the Schwan Self-Storage Project, impacts on archaeological resources that would result from the Project, and includes mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts. The Revised Project does not include any elements that would affect archaeological resources in a new or different manner. Although, the construction of the basements would require substantially more excavation the Final MND found that based on the project specific Phase I Archaeological Survey and review of the soil study auger borings the likelihood of encounter cultural resources on site was low as nothing was found. However, since the presence of archaeological/cultural resources cannot be absolutely ruled out, potential project impacts on such possible resources are still considered potentially significant. Therefore, no new impacts are expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary, however due to the additional excavation one additional recommended mitigation has been added to require monitoring during initial excavations.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts regarding potential disturbance of cultural resources in the Final MND is still expected to occur:

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative impacts on archaeological resources remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure related to discovery of cultural resources is still required: CR-1.

Residual Impacts: With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual Revised Project-specific and cumulative impacts related to archaeological and historic resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND describes the geologic setting relative to the Project, impacts on geologic resources that would result from the Project, and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts. While the Revised Project would require additional grading and excavations, the project would still be subject to the City adopted California Building Code, and would not affect geologic resources in a new or different manner. Therefore, no new impacts are expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: All previously identified impacts related to soil erosion and soil compression in the Final MND are still expected to occur.
**Cumulative Impacts:** Cumulative impacts on geology and soils remain the same.

**Mitigation Measures:** The following mitigation measures are still required to further ensure that necessary geotechnical and erosion control measures are incorporated into final plans and implemented during construction: GEO - 1 and -2.

**Residual Impacts:** Implementation of the mitigation measures GEO 1 and 2 above would ensure residual Project-specific and cumulative impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant.

**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) were analyzed under Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND. This section evaluates the Approved and Revised Project’s GHG emissions separately. See Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND Appendix B, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Memorandum.

**Construction GHG Emissions Analysis**

As with the air quality assessment, full buildout of the Approved Project and the Revised Project were evaluated to estimate the net change in GHG emissions associated with the change of the Revised Project. The construction analysis assumed buildout conditions to evaluate the change in GHG construction emissions associated with buildout of the Revised Project compared to buildout of the Approved Project. Construction of either project would result in GHG emissions associated with use of off-road construction equipment, hauling trucks (dump trucks), vendor (material delivery) trucks, and worker vehicles. GHG emissions associated with temporary construction activity were quantified using URBEMIS and CalEEMod. A detailed depiction of the construction schedule—including information regarding phasing, equipment utilized during each phase, haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles—is included in Appendix B Section 2.1, Construction Assumptions, of this memorandum. Emissions from on-site sources (i.e., off-road equipment) and off-site sources (i.e., hauling and vendor trucks and worker vehicles) are combined for the purposes of this analysis; a breakdown of emissions by source is provided in Appendix B - Attachments A and B. Table GHG-1, Estimated Annual Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions for the 2011 Final MND and Revised Project, presents a comparison between the GHG emissions associated with the construction of the Approved and the Revised Project. As previously discussed, the 2011 Final MND used URBEMIS to estimate construction emissions. This analysis, therefore, uses URBEMIS to accurately compare the GHG emissions generated from the Approved and the Revised project.
Table GHG - 1
Estimated Annual Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions for
the Approved Project and Revised Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CO\text{2}E metric tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Project (Final MND)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Urbemis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Project (Urbemis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Project Emissions (Revised Project Increase)</td>
<td>(76.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Project (CalEEMod)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>421.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD GHG Threshold of Significance</td>
<td>None for construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Appendix B and C for detailed results.
CO\text{2}E – carbon dioxide equivalent

As shown in Table GHG-1, the estimated GHG emissions generated during the construction of the Revised Project would be approximately 236 MT CO\text{2}E. The Approved Project previously proposed for the same location would have resulted in approximately 159 MT CO\text{2}E.

Implementation of the Revised Project would, therefore, result in a slight increase of approximately 77 MT CO\text{2}E in GHG emissions generated during construction. Based on the estimated GHG emissions presented in Table GHG-1, implementation of the Revised Project would not represent a substantial change in constructions emissions and therefore, would not alter the impact conclusions of the previous 2011 Final MND. When run in CalEEMod, the Revised Project, as shown in Table GHG-1 would generate an estimated 421.9 MT CO\text{2}E of GHG emissions. As there are no GHG thresholds for construction emissions the difference in emissions would not alter the impact conclusions of the previous 2011 Final MND. However, the increase in construction emissions are accounted for in the operational emissions, which do have thresholds, and are reflected in Table GHG-2 below.

Operational GHG Emissions Analysis

The Revised Project would include the development of an additional 178 storage units, however the Approved Projects residential unit analyzed in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND has been removed.

Operation of the Approved Project or the Revised Project would result in GHG emissions from area sources, energy use, and mobile sources. GHG emissions associated with vehicle travel to and from the project site were estimated using URBEMIS and CalEEMod and were based on the trip generation estimates provided by ATE (ATE 2017) for the Revised Project. URBEMIS and CalEEMod default values for mobile sources were used consistent with the assumptions used in the air quality impact analysis (Appendix B - Section 3.2.2, Operational Emissions Analysis).

Operation of gasoline-powered landscape maintenance equipment also produces GHG emissions, although minimal. The estimation of proposed non-mobile operational emissions was
based on URBEMIS land use defaults and total area (i.e., square footage) of the proposed land use. Default natural gas usage factors in URBEMIS and CalEEMod were used for proposed building operation.

The estimated operational project-generated GHG emissions from area sources (landscape maintenance), energy usage, and motor vehicles for the Approved Project compared with operational GHG emissions of the Revised Project for 2019 (i.e., first full year of project operation) are shown in Table GHG-2, Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions for the Approved Project and Revised Project. The 2011 FMND used URBEMIS to estimate project-generated emissions, the results of which are presented in Table 6 for informational purposes. For the purpose of this analysis, the Revised Project was modeled using the same version of URBEMIS to estimate the net emissions that would result with the change from the Approved Project. Additionally, for accurate comparison to current thresholds the Revised Project was modelled in CalEEMod, as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CO\textsubscript{2}E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metric tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved Project (Final MND) (URBEMIS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>146.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>230.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Construction Emissions</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>382.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised Project (URBEMIS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>118.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>179.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Construction Emissions</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>306.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG Significance Threshold</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG Significance Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Annual Project Emissions (Revised Project Increase)</strong></td>
<td>76.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised Project (CalEEMod)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>315.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>230.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Construction Emissions</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>559.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG Significance Threshold</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG Significance Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** See Appendix B and C for detailed results. CO\textsubscript{2}E carbon dioxide equivalent

**URBEMIS:**
The Approved Project evaluated in the 2011 Final MND was estimated to generate 383 MT CO\textsubscript{2}E per year including amortized construction GHG emissions. Therefore, the 2011 Final MND was found to be below the threshold of 1,100 MT CO\textsubscript{2}E per year threshold. As shown in Table GHG-2, estimated annual GHG emissions for the Revised Project in 2019 would be
approximately 307 MT CO₂E per year. The Revised Project would result in a decrease of GHG emissions when compared to the 2011 Final MND. It should be noted that although the Trip Memo (ATE 2017) showed that the Revised Project would have higher average daily traffic than the Approved Project, the 2011 Final MND modelled traffic emissions based on a higher traffic rate than what was estimated in the 2017 Trip Memo for the Revised Project. Therefore, the Revised Project would also not exceed the significance threshold of 1,100 MT CO₂E per year. The implementation of the Revised Project would result in a decrease in GHG emissions during operation. The GHG analysis presented above would not represent a substantial change in operational emissions and therefore, would not alter the impact conclusions of the previous 2011 MND.

CalEEMod:
When modelled in the current version of CalEEMod, using the same assumptions, the Revised Project resulted in an estimated annual GHG emissions of approximately 559.79 MT CO₂E. Even though the estimated annual GHG emissions are higher it remains below the significance threshold of 1,100 MT CO2E per year. As the Revised Project would still not exceed the GHG thresholds, as shown in the GHG analysis presented above, it would not represent a substantial change in operational emissions and therefore, would not alter the impact conclusions of the previous 2011 MND.

*Project-Specific Impacts:* All previously identified impacts related to construction and operational emissions in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND are still expected to occur.

*Cumulative Impacts:* Cumulative GHG emissions impacts remain the same.

*Mitigation Measures:* As the impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions are still considered less than significant, no mitigation is required or recommended.

*Residual Impacts:* Residual impacts as a result of greenhouse gas emissions would remain less than significant under the Revised Project.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND describes the hazardous materials/risk of upset setting relative to the Project, and determined that the project would have no impact on hazards. The Revised Project does not include any elements that would affect hazardous materials/risk of upset in a new or different manner. Therefore, no new impacts are expected to occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

*Project-Specific Impacts:* All previously identified impacts in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND are still expected to occur.

*Cumulative Impacts:* Cumulative hazardous materials/risk of upset impacts remains the same.

*Mitigation Measures:* As the impacts associated with potential hazards and hazardous materials are still considered less than significant no mitigation is either required or recommended.

*Residual Impacts:* Residual impacts as a result of hazards and hazardous materials would remain less than significant.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY
The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND assesses impacts to surface drainage, surface water and groundwater quality, and flooding resulting from the Project. The Project would develop buildings, access roads, driveways, surface parking lots, landscape and hardscape areas and utilities, as well as drainage structures necessary to detain and retain surface water and to convey surface water across the Project site to the point-of-concentration along or outside the project site boundaries. Hydrology, drainage, and water quality conditions that would raise environmental issues would be addressed through the standard hydrology study/review/approval process and strict compliance with applicable regulations. City wide implementation of Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB) standards would be required to address potential impacts. With these requirements and mitigation measures, hydrology and water quality impacts have been reduced to levels of less than significant.

The Revised Project would not result in any new impacts related to surface water quality and will increase the amount of pervious surface on site, therefore, Revised project would not involve impacts beyond those identified in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND.

**Project-Specific Impacts:** All previously identified impacts related increased stormwater runoff and flooding in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND are still expected to occur.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts remain the same.

**Mitigation Measures:** The following Hydrology and Water Quality mitigation measures related to stormwater runoff prevention, stormwater treatment, and BMPs continue to be applicable to the Revised Project: HWQ - 1, -2, -3, and -4.

**Residual Impacts:** With implementation of above mitigation measure, residual impacts associated with potentially significant water quality impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

**LAND USE AND PLANNING**

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND evaluated the Project's compatibility with existing land uses in the Project area and its consistency with applicable land use policies. The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND analyzed the existing land use conditions, and review of applicable plans and ordinances.

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND also describes the land use setting relative to the Project, land use impacts that would result from the Project, and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant and potentially adverse but not significant impacts.

With the exception of the setback and landscaping modifications, the Approved Project complied with all zoning ordinance requirements, and as the modifications to zoning standards were subject to Planning Commission approval, no impacts to consistency with the zoning ordinance would have occurred as a result of the Approved Projects implementation. The Revised Project will have a reduced building footprint, however the addition of the basements will increase the overall building square footage. The changes to the building square footage and other minor changes, will not impact the Revised Projects consistency with land use policies, therefore, no new impacts are expected to occur. As mentioned in the existing setting of Land Use and Planning section of the Final MND, General Plan policy LU 4.6 and many policies within the Goleta Old Town Redevelopment Plan (OTRP) cite this property for redevelopment, cessation of unpermitted uses and implementation of mitigation of adverse
impacts on adjacent residential properties to the maximum extent feasible. The Revised Project would also cease any unpermitted uses on site as well as all existing permitted uses on site and replace them with the permitted mini-storage use. This sort of use is a lower-intensity industrial use with few vehicle trips, lower emissions, and very low noise levels. As such the Revised Project would still achieve policy consistency with these elements of the General Plan, zoning ordinance, and OTRP. Additionally, the Revised Project will maintain the same 50-foot creek buffer as the Approved Project.

Parking
Long Term Parking
While the 2011 Final MND analyzed parking, parking is no longer a CEQA issue. The following information is provided for informational purposes. The City’s parking requirements do not contain a specific parking calculation for the mini storage use however; the ordinance does allow the Director of the Planning and Environmental Review Department to determine the appropriate parking requirement in such instances. As such, for the Approved Project, the Director approved the ITE Trip Generation Manual's recommendation of 1.39 spaces per 100 square footage units for this project in addition to the City's zoning ordinance requirement that each residential unit have two parking spaces. Required parking for the Approved Project was 12 spaces (685 storage units/100 x 1.39 spaces = 10 spaces + 2 spaces for the residence = 12 spaces) and 28-spaces (including 2 for the manager's apartment) were provided for the Approved Project, exceeding this parking requirement. Due to site changes the Revised Project will lose 5 parking spaces. Required parking for the Revised Project the same at 12 spaces (863 storage units/100 x 1.39 spaces = 12 spaces) due to the removal of the manager's unit but increase in the number of storage units. 25-spaces are proposed for the Revised Project, therefore the Revised Project would continue to exceed the parking requirement. As the Revised Project has more than adequate parking capacity, no parking impacts will occur.

Project-Specific Impacts: All previously identified impacts in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND are still expected to occur.

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative land use impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation Measures to address encroachment of the fence and gates into the SPA addressed in the Biological Resources section continue to be applicable to the Revised Project.

Residual Impacts: With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Biological Resources section of this document, residual project land use and planning conflicts would be less than significant.

MINERAL RESOURCES

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND did not identify any known mineral resources on the project site and stated the Approved Project would not result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

Project-Specific Impacts: As with the Approved Project, the Revised Project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource or identified resource recovery site. No such impacts would occur.
Cumulative Impacts: The Revised Project would have no impact on any cumulative loss of mineral resources or resource recovery sites.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact: None

NOISE

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND describes the noise setting relative to the Project, impacts related to noise that would result from the Approved Project, and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts. The proposed Revised Project does not include any elements that would affect noise in a new or different manner. Therefore, no new impacts would be expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary. The current measures will mitigate the noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Project-Specific Impacts: All previously identified impacts in the Final MND are still expected to occur, with the exception of those related to the manager apartment, as that has been removed from the project.

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative noise impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following Noise mitigation measures related to Construction Noise; Operational Noise – Project Traffic Noise Generation; Commercial Operations Noise; On-Site Ambient Noise Exposure; Non-Commercial Common Area; and Vibration continue to be applicable to the Revised Project: N - 1, -2, -3, -4, -5, -6, -7, -8, and -9.

Residual Impacts: With implementation of mitigation measures described above, the Revised Project’s noise impacts would remain the same, less than significant.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND concluded the Approved Project would not result in the potential for significant impacts related to Population and Housing, because only 2-4 employees were envisioned to be employed at the facility and one family or individual in the manager’s unit. The anticipated increase in employees resulting from the project would be so minimal that no measurable impact due to population growth in the area would occur. Because the Revised Project does not change the expected number of employees and removed the manager’s unit, the projected population resulting from the project would remain the same.

Project-Specific Impacts: As with the Approved Project, the Revised Project no new roads or infrastructure that could support other new development would be required. As such, impacts resulting from potential inducement of population growth in the area would be considered less than significant. Also, the Revised Project would not displace any existing housing units or require the displacement of any people thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing.

Cumulative Impacts: The Revised Project is not expected to result in any significant contribution to cumulative housing and population impacts either within the City or the surrounding Goleta Valley.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required or recommended.
Residual Impact: The Revised Project would not result in any significant residual impacts on housing and population either within the City or the surrounding Goleta Valley.

PUBLIC SERVICES

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND analyzed potential impacts to services of fire protection, police protection, libraries, and schools. The Revised Project does not change the number of employees and removes the manager’s unit, thus demand on public services would decrease as compared to the Approved Project. Therefore, no new impacts would be expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: All previously identified impact in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND is still expected to occur.

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative public facilities impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following Public Service mitigation measures related to fire department access and fire suppression infrastructure continue to be applicable to the Revised Project: PS - 1 and -2.

Residual Impacts: All residual impacts would remain less than significant.

RECREATION

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND analyzed the Project’s impacts on recreational facilities in the City. The Revised Project will not result in increased population. Therefore, no new impacts would be expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: All previously identified impact in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND is still expected to occur.

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative recreation impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures were required in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND and, therefore, no new mitigation measures would be required for the Revised Project.

Residual Impacts: The Schwan Self-Storage Project’s impacts were considered less than significant prior to mitigation. The Revised Project would remain the same.
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND identified potentially significant impacts (Class II), and less than significant impacts (Class III) related to hazards, emergency access, and circulation capacity within the City. See Appendix D, Trip Generation Comparison and Soil Export Route Evaluation (ATE 2017) for details.

Operational
The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND anticipated development of 685 storage units and a manager's apartment unit. The Revised Project has increase the number of storage units to 863 and eliminated the manager's apartment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Project</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Project</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table TT-1 above show that the Revised Project generates 38 more average daily trips, 2 more A.M. peak hour trips and 2 more P.M. peak hour trips when compared to the Approved Project analyzed under the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND. The small amount of additional traffic generated by the Revised Project would not have the potential to generate significant roadway or intersection impacts based on the City of Goleta traffic impact thresholds. Therefore, due to the insignificant increase in traffic produced, no new operational impacts will occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Soil Export
The Revised Project will require export of 11,415 cubic yard (CY) of soil, due to the additional excavations required for the basements, from the site to a receiver site. The material would be exported off-site over a 11-day period. Inbound trucks accessing the site would exit U.S. 101 at the SR 217 interchange, travel west on Hollister Avenue to Kellogg Avenue, and proceed north to the site. Inbound trucks from the north would exit U.S. 101 at the Patterson Avenue interchange, travel north on Patterson Avenue to the U.S. 101 northbound on-ramp and merge onto the SR 217 off-ramp to access Hollister Avenue, proceed westerly to Kellogg Avenue and then proceed northerly to the site. Outbound trucks would travel southerly on Kellogg Avenue, make a left-turn and travel westerly on Hollister Avenue to the SR 217 northbound on-ramp. Trucks traveling south on US 101 would use the SR 217 ramp to U.S. 101 and trucks traveling north on U.S. 101 would exit at Patterson Avenue, proceed north on Patterson Avenue and turn left at the U.S. 101 northbound on-ramp.

It is estimated that a maximum of 760 trucks would arrive and depart at the project site over the haul period (ATE 2017). Based on truck carrying capacity the soil export would generate an average daily traffic (ADT) volume of 138 trucks per day over a 11-day haul period.
Table TT-2
Soil Export Traffic Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Existing ADT</th>
<th>Proposed ADT (During Export Only)</th>
<th>Acceptable Capacity</th>
<th>Exceeded?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg Avenue South of Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>9,280</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue east of Kellogg Avenue</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>20,538</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table TT-2, the Project would temporarily add an additional 138 ADT to these two segments over the 11-day haul period. Even during the limited period, the additional truck traffic would not significantly affect operations along Kellogg Avenue or Hollister Avenue in the project vicinity based on City Impact Thresholds. Additionally, hauling hours would be limited to avoid impacts to the area intersections during the A.M. and P.M. peak commute periods. The soil export would not create any additional impacts and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary. While the truck trips would create additional wear and tear on the impacted roads, roadway wear and tear is not an analyzed CEQA issue. However, subject to the approval of the Project will be conditioned address or offset and damages to roadways.

Overall, impacts from development of the site on the circulation system capacity would be similar and the proposed project would not create additional impacts related to the circulation system beyond those identified in the Schwan Self-Storage Final MND

Project-Specific Impacts: All previously identified impacts in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND are still expected to occur.

Cumulative Impacts: All previously identified impacts in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND are still expected to occur.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures related to Construction Parking and Union Pacific Railroad Safety continue to be applicable to the Revised Project: TT-1, -2, and -3.

Residual Impacts: With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, the Revised Project’s traffic impacts would continue to be reduced to a less than significant level.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND addressed Project impacts on water supply, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. The evaluation was based on Project estimated demand for utilities relative to the supplies and capacities of the systems and facilities that would provide service to the Schwan Self-Storage Project.

Water Supply
On April 19, 2017, the Goleta Water District (GWD) issued Preliminary Water Service Determination stating that the project parcel has adequate historical water credit for the estimated potable water demand associated with the DP RV. Accordingly, there is sufficient water to serve the Revised Project.
Wastewater Treatment
The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) and the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD) would provide wastewater collection and treatment, respectively, for the Project site. Based on the analysis provided in the Schwan Self-Storage Final MND impacts on wastewater collection would be less under the Revised Project due to the removal of the manager’s apartment unit, which accounted for half of the total wastewater generation of the Approved Project. With the additional storage units Revised Project Impacts would be relatively similar to or less than the Approved Project. Therefore, no new impacts would be expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Solid Waste
Solid waste generation would increase by 40.01 tons/year as a result of the Revised Project. With a 50% recycling the total increase in waste sent to landfill would be 20 tons/year. The total Revised Project solid waste generation, accounting for the 50% credit, would be 108.5 tons/year. As this is less than the 196 tons/year threshold, the solid waste generation impact remains less than significant. Solid Waste Management Plans for construction and demolition waste and ongoing operations will continue to be required as mitigation measures for the Revised Project. No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: All previously identified impacts in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND are still expected to occur.

Cumulative impacts: Cumulative public facilities impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures related to utility service connections, Water Conservation, and Waste Management continue to be applicable to the Revised Project: UTIL-1, -2, -3, -4, -5, -6, -7, and -8.

Residual Impacts: With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, the revised project’s contribution to cumulative solid waste impacts, would be considered less than significant.

CONCLUSION
Impacts associated with the DP RV for the Revised Project are within the parameters considered in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND. Consequently, the Revised Project would not create any new significant impacts or increase the severity of impacts previously identified in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND. As a result, no additional mitigation measures are required for the Revised Project. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances identified in the Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND under which the Revised Project would require major revisions. This Addendum identifies the changes to the Schwan Self-Storage Project and the associated Schwan Self-Storage Project Final MND that would occur under the Revised Project. Therefore, this Addendum is the appropriate environmental document under CEQA for the proposed Project.
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CITY OF GOLETA
FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
10-MND-004

1. PROJECT TITLE:
Schwan Self Storage Project
Case No. 07-229-DP

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

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:
Shine Ling, Assistant Planner; (805) 961-7548

4. APPLICANT/PROPERTY OWNER: AGENT:
Tom Schwan
Schwan Brothers Properties, LLC
P.O. Box 6453
Santa Barbara, CA 93160

5. PROJECT LOCATION:
10 S. Kellogg Avenue; APN 071-090-082

Greg Rech, AIA, LEED AP
Architects West
1530 Chapala Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
6. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The applicant requests approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP) for a mini-storage facility. The parcel has a General Plan land use designation of General Industrial (I-G) and a zoning designation of Light Industry (M-1). Specific elements of the overall project include the following:

The property includes a 4,400-square foot, two-story warehouse/office, an 875-square foot garage, and a 1,750-square foot carport for a total of floor area of 7,025-square feet on a 97,061-square foot lot (inclusive of the lot of 89,628 SF and a lease area from Union Pacific Railroad of 7,433 SF) in the M-1 zone district. The property also contains several contractor storage, and similar storage uses. The project includes the demolition of all existing structures and grading involving approximately 610-cubic yards of cut and 1,950-cubic yards of fill to prep the site for the construction of a 3-story self-storage facility comprised of 3 separate, 3-story buildings with both drive-up and interior storage units. The project also includes an office/sales space and a manager's residential unit. Construction would occur in two phases.

Phase I would consist of Buildings A and B (the westerly most buildings) and associated improvements. Building A would be 34,850 square feet with 1,110 square feet devoted to office/sales use and include a 2-story manager's apartment of 1,575 square feet. Building B would be 37,930 square feet, all of which would be devoted to storage. A total of 19 parking spaces would be provided (17 for the mini storage use and 2 for the residential use). Phase I landscaping would include landscape improvements in the parking areas and around the perimeter of the property, as well as in the area adjacent to San Jose Creek. Two Coast Live Oak trees along the northern property line would be removed for project construction. The property's perimeter would be fenced with an automatic gate at the entrance.

Of the 97,061-square foot site area, Phase I structural development would occupy a footprint of 25,540-square feet (25.3% of the site), paved areas would occupy 55,013-square feet (56.7% of the site and inclusive of equipment storage yards that will be in place until implementation of Phase II), and landscaping would cover the remaining 17,508-square feet (18%) of the site.

During implementation of Phase I, the project would upgrade water service from the Goleta Water District, connect to the Goleta Sanitary District sewer system, and perform electrical upgrades, grading and installation of drainage structures on the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way to improve drainage from Highway 101 and the railroad in the vicinity of the project site. Such improvements would serve both Phases of the project.

Phase II consists of Building C, which would be 37,820 square feet, all of which would be devoted to storage space. Phase II would also remove 16,070-square feet of paving and walkways and install an additional 3,400-square feet of landscaping. Therefore, structural development from both Phases would occupy a footprint 37,210-square feet (38.3% of the site), paved areas would occupy 38,943-square feet (40.2% of the site), and landscaping would occupy 20,908-square feet (21.5% of the site).

The maximum height of each building in both phases would be 35 feet measured from finished grade to the top of the walls of the buildings, some of which also would serve as
a 3 foot parapet wall (measured from the maximum height of the structure to the roof ridge. The height of the parapet varies with the architectural elements of the structures).

Site drainage would retain the existing sheet flow pattern for both Phases with the exception of the installation of a two detention/dispersion trenches. One along the southern property line and one near the southern property line within the Union Pacific lease area, and the grading and installation of a drainage structure to correct drainage issues from the U.S. Highway 101 along the northern property line in the Caltrans right-of-way. These improvements are included in Phase I, and would serve both Phases of the project. Currently, approximately 80 percent of the site's runoff flows to the south from the western side of the property, and approximately 20 percent of the site's runoff flows to the north into an existing, unlined drainage ditch located within the Highway 101 Right-of-Way (ROW) immediately adjacent to the north of the subject property. The unlined drainage ditch flows west to east into San Jose Creek.

Access to the site for both Phases would be through an existing 20 foot easement for road and utility purposes that begins where Kellogg Avenue ends, and ceases at the northern property line of the subject property. This easement also serves as a two-way driveway for the site.

Both Phases of the project conform with rear (east), front (west) and side (south) yard setbacks, but do not conform to the side (north) yard setback, which is required to be 10 feet. Modifications to this side yard setback, as well as other modifications being requested, are listed below:

1. A modification to allow three required parking spaces at the northwest corner of the site within the northern side yard setback (GMC §35-275.3);
2. A modification to allow for a partial encroachment of 5 feet for each building and trash enclosure into the northern side yard setback (GMC §35-275.3)
3. A modification to reduce the required width of the landscape screening strip along a portion of the northern property line from 5 feet to 1 foot (GMC §35-263).
4. A modification to reduce the required width of the landscape screening strip along a portion of the southern property line from 5 feet to 2 feet (GMC §35-263).
5. A modification to reduce the required width of the landscape screening strip along the remainder of the southern property line from 5 feet to 4 feet (GMC §35-263).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing General Plan Land Use Designation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Ordinance, Zone District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present Use and Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrounding Uses/Zoning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities and Public Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**Baseline for Environmental Review**

The permit history of the site indicates that between 1900 and 1974, several buildings or structures totaling 7,900 SF were constructed on site; however, the permit history is unclear as to exactly what those buildings/structures were. In the last ten years or so, several documents, including the Goleta Old Town Revitalization Plan (1998) and the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (2006), indicate that the site contains similar uses to those that are present today, which are primarily contractor storage areas. Therefore, the environmental analysis for this project considers a worst-case scenario of 7,900-square feet of development on site as the baseline.

**Topography and Soils**

The parcel is nearly flat, with an average elevation of 48-51 feet above sea level. The only variation in topography occurs in the undeveloped eastern portion of the property between the creek top-of-bank and the eastern property line. The lowest point on the property is 45 feet above sea level at the southeast corner of the property on the western bank of San Jose Creek. The majority of the property (96.3%) is developed and the soils are capped with asphalt or concrete pavement. The only part of the property where the soils are exposed at the surface is
on the western bank of San Jose Creek. The U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service (USDA 1981) has mapped two soil types as occurring on the property: Elder sand loam (map symbol EaA) and Elder-Soboda complex (map symbol Eb) (Watershed Environmental, July 2008).

**Fauna, Flora, and Surface Water Bodies**
The only vegetated portion of the property is a 3-4 foot wide by approximately 1,000 foot long landscaped northern section of the property adjacent to the Caltrans ROW and the eastern portion of the property next to San Jose Creek. The paved/developed portion of the property does not contain any vegetation. The areas to the south and west are, respectively, a gravel railroad ROW with two eucalyptus trees and an asphalt-paved roadway (S. Kellogg Avenue). The area to the north is the Caltrans ROW and 101 freeway. The vegetation along the northern property line and within the Caltrans ROW serve as screening trees and vegetation from the U.S. Highway 101 including an approximately 820-foot long row of screening trees and approximately 160 feet of arundo, a tall, nonnative grass that also serves as screening. The only wildlife expected to occur in this strip of vegetation are small mammals.

The vegetation type within the undeveloped eastern portion of the 10 S. Kellogg property along the San Jose Creek corridor is black cottonwood (poplar)/black walnut riparian woodland. The dominant tree species in this area are walnut, and black cottonwood. Dominant shrubs and herbs include wild blackberry, sourgrass, smilo grass, petty spurge, poison oak, Italian thistle, wild cucumber and giant creek nettle. The riparian vegetation provides some wildlife habitat for foraging birds, small mammals, and a few common reptiles and amphibians. The value of this habitat type to wildlife is severely limited by: 1) urban development, which extends to the top of bank on either side of the creek, 2) dominance of nonnative vegetation within this habitat type, and 3) alteration of the hydrologic regime caused by channelization of portions of San Jose Creek. Nonetheless, the San Jose Creek corridor is designated as a Riparian/Marsh/Vernal Special Species Habitat in the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP), and is also designated as a critical habitat for federally endangered southern steelhead.

**Cultural Resources**
During the late prehistoric period and early in historic times, the study area was part of the territory occupied by the Barbareno branch of Chumash-speaking people. At the time of early Spanish exploration of this area, several Chumash villages were located within a few miles of the project. The closest of these was the very large village of Saspili (translated as “root”). This important settlement with a population approaching 1,000 persons was located within 0.6 miles of the project site (Applegate 1975). The area around the nearby Goleta Slough may have been the most densely populated area within the entire Chumash territory. During the Spanish Mission period and subsequent Mexican Rancho period, the project area was used for farming and grazing livestock. This area was also once part of the original Mexican Land Grant Rancho Los Dos Pueblos (Tompkins 1962).

A Phase I Archaeological Investigation was conducted by Laurence W. Spanne of Archaeological Assessment and Management. Spanne concluded that the project will have no apparent adverse impact on important archaeological or other cultural resources located within or near the boundaries of the project site (Phase 1 Archaeological Survey Report for Schwan Brothers Self-Storage Facility, Laurence W. Spanne, M.A., November, 2008).
10. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

11. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mitigated Negative Declaration Determination made on October 15, 2010 by Patricia S. Miller, Planning Manager, City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Services (on file).

12. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AESTHETICS

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

Existing Setting

There are no scenic views, public lands with view opportunities, or scenic corridors as identified by the Visual and Historic Element of the City's General Plan that would be affected by the project. A very limited view of the Santa Ynez Mountains is available from the road easement providing access to the property from Kellogg Avenue. No other views of natural landforms or open space are available from the street/access easement.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) The project would have no effect on any protected public view or public land with view opportunities as no "scenic views to be protected" that are designated in the City's GP/CLUP are within the project vicinity. As such, the project poses no impacts to a scenic vista.

b) The project is directly adjacent to the U.S. Highway 101, a state scenic highway as designated by the State of California and a local scenic corridor as designated by the
City’s GP/CLUP. As designed and planned, the project could result in a departure from the existing visual character on the southbound U.S. 101 due to the height and size of the project. Any removal of existing screening trees and vegetation could, as a result, be considered a potentially significant impact.

c) The entire site will undergo a significant change in its existing visual character. The property includes a 4,400-square foot, two-story warehouse/office, an 875-square foot garage, and a 1,750-square foot carport for a total of floor area of 7,025-square feet on an 89,628-square foot lot in the M-1 zone district. The applicant proposes the demolition of all existing structures and grading involving approximately 610-cubic yards of cut and 1,950-cubic yards of fill to prep the site for the construction of a 3-story self-storage facility comprised of 3 separate, 3-story buildings with both drive-up and interior storage units. The project also includes an office/sales space and a manager’s residential unit.

New materials consist of metal building panels and related trim pieces with “signature 200” siliconized polyester finishes. New colors/other materials consist of the following:

- Primary wall color: Surf Sand
  - Window and Door Trim: Emerald Green
- Primary accent wall color: Emerald Green
  - Window and Door Trim: Emerald Green
- Secondary accent wall color: Light Stone
- Wall coping: To match wall color
- Window and door awnings: Emerald Green
- Windows and doors: Dark Anodized Aluminum
- Roll up doors: Desert Tan
- Gutters: To match wall color
- Down spouts: To match wall color

The Design Review Board (DRB) conceptually reviewed this project and commented that the soft, earth tones are appreciated and will soften the mass of the buildings. However, the DRB was concerned about the height and mass of the structures, and how that would affect the view from Highway 101, a designated scenic corridor, and the surrounding neighborhood. Some factors that eased this concern include that the applicant will not remove the existing, mature vegetation in the Caltrans right-of-way that will screen the buildings well, and again, the colors and use of down-lighting will soften the buildings appearance.

While project components would soften the visual impact of this project, the introduction of approximately 110,600 square-feet in two, three story structures (Phase I) and the addition of another three story structure in Phase II would significantly change the existing visual character of the area. If not properly designed and landscaped, this change in the visual character of the area would be considered potentially significant.

d) Exterior night lighting, including lighting of the parking area along the west side of the creek corridor, could result in the exposure of adjoining areas to excessive light and glare if such lighting is not properly shielded and directed away from the creek and neighboring land uses; or if the light standards are excessively tall creating a situation
where appropriate light shielding is not possible. Such light and glare spillover impacts are considered potentially significant.

**Cumulative Impacts**

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

**Required Mitigation Measures**

1. The permittee shall receive Preliminary and Final approval from the Design Review Board. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The review shall include site plan, floor plan, elevations, grading plan, landscape plan, and lighting plan consistent with the DRB submittal requirements. Particular attention shall be paid to compatibility with the area and surroundings, views from Highway 101 and the surrounding neighborhood, color palette, and landscape plantings used for screening buildings. Additional materials shall be provided as required by the DRB to complete their review. Preliminary and Final approval shall be granted prior to issuance of an LUP.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to issuance of an LUP, during field inspection, and prior to final inspection.

2. The height of structural development shown on final plans shall not exceed the mean height and peak height shown on approved project exhibit maps. Finished grade shall be consistent with the approved final grading plan. Height limitations shown on issued-LUP plan sets shall be adhered to during construction. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** During the framing state of construction and prior to commencement of roofing, the permittee shall submit verification from a licensed surveyor demonstrating that the mean height and peak height conform to those shown on issued-LUP plan sets.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to issuance of an LUP, during field inspection, and prior to commencement of roofing.

3. Project landscaping shall consist of approximately seventy-five percent (75%) drought-tolerant native and/or Mediterranean type species which adequately complement the project design and integrate the site with surrounding land uses. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The final landscape plan shall identify the following:

   a. type of irrigation;
   b. all existing and new trees, shrubs, and groundcovers by species;
   c. size of all plantings; and
   d. location of all plantings.

The final landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the DRB and City staff prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** Prior to final inspection, City staff shall site inspect to ensure that landscaping has been installed consistent with the final landscape plan.
4. The permittee shall enter into an agreement to install required landscaping and water-conserving irrigation systems as well as maintain required landscaping for the life of the project. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall sign the landscape installation and maintenance agreement, including at least a 3-year maintenance period, prior to LUP issuance. Performance securities for installation and maintenance shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** Prior to final inspection, City staff shall site inspect to ensure installation according to approved plan. City staff shall check maintenance as needed. Release of any performance security requires appropriate documentation and City staff signature.

5. The permittee shall submit a composite utility plan for City staff and DRB Preliminary/Final review. All external/roof-mounted mechanical equipment (including HVAC condensers, switch boxes, etc.) shall be included on all building plans and shall be designed to be integrated into the structure and/or screened in their entirety from public view. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Detailed plans showing all external/roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be submitted for review by City staff and the DRB prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** Prior to final inspection, City staff shall verify installation of all external/roof mounted mechanical equipment per the approved plans.

6. All new utility service connections and above-ground mounted equipment such as backflow devices, etc, shall be shall be screened from public view and/or painted in a soft earth-tone color(s) (red is prohibited) so as to blend in with the project. Screening may include a combination of landscaping and/or fencing/walls. Whenever possible, utility transformers shall be placed in underground vaults. All gas and electrical meters shall be concealed and/or painted to match the building. All gas, electrical, backflow prevention devices and communications equipment shall be completely concealed in an enclosed portion of the building, on top of the building, or within a screened utility area. All transformers and vaults that must be located within the right-of-way shall be installed below grade unless otherwise approved by the City, and then must be completely screened from view. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The plans submitted for City staff and DRB Preliminary/Final review shall identify the type, location, size, and number of utility connections and above-ground mounted equipment as well as how such equipment would be screened from public view and the color(s) that it would be painted so as to blend in with the project and surrounding area.

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

7. Any exterior night lighting installed on the project site shall be of low intensity, low glare design, and shall be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels. Exterior lighting fixtures shall be kept to the minimum number and intensity needed to ensure public safety. These lights shall be dimmed after 11 p.m. to the maximum extent practical without compromising public safety. Upward directed exterior lighting is prohibited. All exterior lighting fixtures shall be appropriate for the architectural style of the proposed structure and surrounding area. **Plan**
Requirements and Timing: The locations of all exterior lighting fixtures, complete cut-sheets of all exterior lighting fixtures, and a photometric plan prepared by a registered professional engineer showing the extent of all light and glare emitted by all exterior lighting fixtures shall be reviewed and approved by the DRB and City staff prior to LUP issuance.

Monitoring: Prior to final inspection, City staff shall inspect to ensure that exterior lighting fixtures have been installed consistent with approved plans.

8. Trash/recycling enclosure(s) shall be provided. Plan Requirements and Timing: The enclosure shall be compatible with the architectural design of the project, shall be of adequate size for trash and recycling containers (at least 50 SF and a minimum of 50% of the total area shall be dedicated to recyclables), shall be accessible by users and for removal. The trash/recycling area shall be enclosed with a solid wall of sufficient height to screen the area, shall include a solid gate and a roof, and shall be maintained in good repair in perpetuity. The enclosure(s) shall be shown on project plans and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff and the DRB prior to LUP issuance.

Monitoring: Prior to final inspection, City staff shall site inspect to ensure installation according to approved plan.

9. No signs of any type are approved with this action unless otherwise specified. All signs require a separate sign permit and Design Review Board (DRB) approval and shall comply with the City of Goleta sign regulations (Article I, Chapter 35 of the Municipal Code). Plan Requirements and Timing: Future signage shall comply with the requirements of Article I, Chapter 35 of the Municipal Code prior to issuance of any Sign Certificate of Conformance.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance with this requirement.

10. Any new utility lines within the project site shall be placed underground. Plan Requirements and Timing: Construction plans for these improvements shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance. Improvements shall be implanted prior to occupancy.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify completion of the improvements in the field.

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific impacts to aesthetics, visual and scenic resources, as well as project contributions to cumulative changes in visual character of the surrounding area due to exterior lighting, would be less than significant.
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. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

According to the USDA Soil Conservation Service, native soils onsite consist of Elder sandy loam (EaA) on approximately the western half of the property and Elder-Soboba complex (Eb) on the eastern half of the property. EaA is a nearly level soil common on alluvial fans with moderate permeability, slow runoff, and a slight hazard for erosion. Such soils are considered prime (Capability Unit II, 4(19). Eb soils are in long narrow valleys dissected by meandering stream channels. About 30% of this complex is Elder sandy loams and about 30% is such recently formed soils as Soboba stoney coarse sandy loam or stony loamy sand. Eb runoff is slow to medium, and the hazard of erosion is moderate to high. Eb soils are considered Class
IV soils (Capability Unit IVw-2(19), which have very severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants or that require very careful management. (USDA, 1981)

Virtually all of the subject property is developed with impermeable surface with the exception of the riparian corridor along the eastern edge of the property. The remainder of the property is developed with a 4,400-square foot, two-story warehouse/office, an 875-square foot garage, and a 1,750-square foot carport. There are also several uses quartered off on the property such as materials storage and stone cutting. As such, there is no area of undisturbed surface prime soils left onsite.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a-c) The project site is not mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use nor is it part of a Williamson Act contract. Because none of the project site has been utilized for agricultural purposes in at least several decades, and due to its industrial use history, the conversion of the remaining open areas onsite to a developed condition would not result in any loss of local farmland. There are no lands zoned as forest lands or timberlands on the project site or in its immediate vicinity and therefore the project would have no impact on forest resources in the area.

d-e) There are no lands zoned as forest lands or timberlands on the project site or in its immediate vicinity. The project would not result in any environmental changes that would involve the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses and therefore the project would have no impact on forest resources in the area.

Cumulative Impacts

The project would result in no contribution to the cumulative loss of agricultural land and resources within the City.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required or recommended.

Residual Impact

None.
## AIR QUALITY

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

## Existing Setting

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

Surface temperature inversions (0 to 500 feet) are most frequent during the winter, and subsidence inversions (1000 to 2000 feet) are most frequent during the summer. Inversions are an increase in temperature with height and directly related to the stability of the atmosphere. Inversions act as a cap to the pollutants that are emitted below or within them. The subsidence inversion is very common during the summer along the California coast, and is one of the principal causes of air stagnation. Poor air quality is usually associated with air stagnation (high stability/restricted air movement).

The project is located in the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB). The SCCAB encompasses San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties. The site is located in Santa Barbara County.
Ambient Air Quality Standards

The Federal Government and the State of California have established air quality standards and emergency episode criteria for various pollutants. Generally, State regulations have stricter standards than those at the Federal level. Air quality standards are set at concentrations that provide a sufficient margin of safety to protect public health and welfare. Air quality at a given location can be described by the concentration of various pollutants in the atmosphere. The significance of a pollutant concentration is determined by comparing the concentration to an appropriate Federal and/or State ambient air quality standard.

Federal standards are established by the U. S. 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 (ARB) and are called the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). The region generally has good air quality, as it attains or is considered in maintenance status for most ambient air quality standards. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is required to monitor air pollutant levels to assure that Federal and State air quality standards are being met.

Criteria Pollutants

The criteria pollutants of primary concern include ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM₂.₅). Also regulated are sulfates, lead, hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), and vinyl chloride.

Ozone air pollution is formed when nitrogen oxides (NOₓ) and reactive organic compounds (ROCs) react in the presence of sunlight. According to the APCD, the major sources of ozone precursor emissions in Santa Barbara County are motor vehicles, the petroleum industry, and solvent usage (paints, consumer products, and certain industrial processes). Sources of PM₁₀ include grading, demolition, agricultural tilling, road dust, mineral quarries, and vehicle exhaust.

Air Quality Planning

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

In 2001, an attainment plan was developed 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 Santa Barbara County portion of the SIP, designed to meet and maintain Federal clean air standards. The adopted 2010 CAP incorporates updated data and is currently the most recent Clean Air Plan for ultimately meeting the state ozone standard.

As of 2008, Santa Barbara County is designated as a Federal ozone attainment area for the 8-hour ozone standard (the 1-hour Federal standard was revoked for Santa Barbara County). A new California 8-hour ozone standard was implemented in May 2006. This standard has been
exceeded by air quality conditions in the County and the State standard for \( PM_{10} \) continues to be exceeded. Santa Barbara County is therefore a non-attainment area for the State standards for ozone and \( PM_{10} \). The County is in attainment for the Federal \( PM_{2.5} \) standard and unclassified for the State \( PM_{2.5} \) standard (based on monitored data from 2006 to 2008), and is designated “attainment” or “unclassified” for other State standards and for all Federal clean air standards.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant air quality impact could occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist (a-e). In addition, per the City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, a significant air quality impact could occur, if the project would:

f. Interferes with progress toward the attainment of the ozone standard by releasing emissions which equal or exceed the established long-term quantitative thresholds for NO\(_x\) (nitrogen oxides) and ROC (reactive organic compounds; same as reactive organic gases [ROG]). Thresholds are 25 lbs/day of either NO\(_x\) or ROC;

g. Equals or exceeds the State or Federal ambient air quality standards for any criteria pollutant (as determined by modeling);

h. Result in toxic or hazardous air pollutants in amounts which may increase cancer risks for the affected population.

**APCD Thresholds**

The following significance thresholds have been established by the Santa Barbara County APCD (*Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents*, SBCAPCD, 2010). 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**

The project would result in a significant impact, either individually or cumulatively, if it would:

1. Emit 240 pounds/day or more of ROC (reactive organic gases; same as reactive organic compounds [ROCI]) and NO\(_x\) from all sources;
2. Emit 25 lbs/day or more of unmitigated ROC from any motor vehicles trips only;
3. Emit 25 lbs/day or more of unmitigated NO\(_x\) from any motor vehicle trips only;
4. Emit 80 lbs/day or more of PM-10;
5. Cause or contribute to a violation of any California or Ambient Air Quality standard (except ozone);
6. 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
7. Be inconsistent with Federal or State air quality plans for Santa Barbara County.

The cumulative contribution of project emissions to regional levels should be compared with existing programs and plans, including the most recent Clean Air Plan (CAP; 2010). Due to the County’s non-attainment status for ozone and the regional nature of ozone as a pollutant, if a project’s emissions from traffic sources of either of the ozone precursors (NO\(_x\) or ROC), exceed the operational thresholds, then the project’s cumulative impacts are considered significant.
For projects that do not have significant ozone precursor emissions or localized pollutant impacts, if emissions have been taken into account in the 2010 CAP 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, short-term impacts such as exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generation during grading must be discussed. In the interest of public disclosure, the APCD recommends that construction-related NO\textsubscript{x}, ROC, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5} emissions, from diesel and gasoline powered equipment, paving, and other activities be quantified. The APCD uses 25 tons per year for NO\textsubscript{x} and ROC as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts.

Under APCD Rule 202 D.16 (http://www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule202.pdf), 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. APCD Rule 345 (http://www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule345.pdf) regulates generation of visible fugitive dust emissions at demolition and construction sites.

**Project Specific Impacts**

As noted in the Environmental Setting above, staff has determined that it is appropriate to perform air quality calculations using the worst-case baseline scenario of 7,900 square feet of development on site.

The project would result in the construction of three new, three story, self storage buildings (two buildings in Phase I and one building in Phase II), resulting in a worst-case scenario, net increase of 102,700 SF on site (inclusive of second and third stories of each building). Grading and construction would result in new short-term air quality impacts. New air quality impacts associated with both operational and vehicular sources would also occur as a result of an estimated increase in vehicular trips of seven (7) average daily trips (ADTs; see also Transportation/Traffic section).

The City’s methodology for quantifying criteria pollutant emissions relies upon the URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 air quality modeling software for identifying short-term construction and long-term operational emissions in pounds/day for the unmitigated condition.

**Short-Term Construction Impacts:**

a,b) Short-term air quality impacts generally occur during project grading. Preliminary earthwork quantities are estimated at 610 cubic yards of cut and 1,950 cubic yards of fill. As such, construction of the project is anticipated to generate 11.25 lbs/day of PM\textsubscript{10} dust. Short-term construction emissions of ozone precursors are projected to be 114.83 lbs/day of ROCs and 54.19 lbs/day of NO\textsubscript{x}. Neither the City nor the APCD has adopted any significance thresholds for construction-generated ROC, NO\textsubscript{x}, or PM\textsubscript{10}. These
emissions have been adequately incorporated into the 2010 Clean Air Plan in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities. Therefore, impacts are considered adverse, but less than significant.

d, h) Fine particulate emissions from diesel equipment exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the State of California. PM10 exhaust emissions for heavy equipment involved in project construction are estimated at 3.30 lbs/day. These short-term emissions would not constitute “substantial” concentrations of diesel particulate emissions and are considered adverse, but less than significant.

However, the project will also involve demolition of existing structures which may release friable asbestos. Friable asbestos crumbles into a dust of microscopic fibers that can remain in the air for long periods of time. If inhaled, they pose a serious health threat as asbestos fibers can become permanently lodged in body tissues. Since there is no known safe level of exposure, all asbestos exposure should be avoided. This is particularly important when removing asbestos insulation. As such, this temporary project generated friable asbestos release would be considered to have a potentially significant impact on sensitive receptors.

e) Construction of new parking areas onsite would require application of aggregate concrete (AC aka asphalt) that could create objectionable odors. Such odors would be temporary and localized. APCD Rule 329, a prohibitory rule governing the application of cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials in the County, would apply to all project paving activities. Therefore, impacts related to objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people are considered less than significant.

Long-term Operational Impacts:

a,b,f,g) Using the screening table in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, operational, long-term air pollutant emissions for all criteria pollutants generated by the self storage facility would be well below City and APCD thresholds for a potentially significant impact. To quantitatively confirm the findings from the screening table, staff prepared a long-term pollutant emission analysis for the project using the URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 air quality modeling software for the 2008 lbs/day unmitigated condition. Under that analysis long-term area source and operational emissions for the center are estimated at 3.33 lbs/day of NOx, 3.42 lbs/day of ROCs, and 3.25 lbs/day of particulate emissions (PM10.2.5). As such, long-term operational project impacts on air quality as well as the region’s ability to meet air quality attainment goals would be considered less than significant.

d,e,h) The project would be located within an existing mixed commercial/residential area of Old Town. The project would not result in objectionable long-term smoke, ash, or odors or expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of such pollutants. Therefore, such potential air quality impacts would be considered less than significant.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has developed land use guidelines designed to minimize sensitive receptor exposure to a variety of ambient hazardous compounds. For on-road vehicular emissions, these guidelines recommend a 500-foot setback from a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles per day, or rural roadways.
that carry 50,000 vehicles per day. These guidelines were derived from urban freeways carrying hundreds of thousands of vehicles per day. The U. S. Highway 101 near the project site currently carries 92,000 average daily trips (ADT) (Table 3.13-2, City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR, September 2006). The project abuts both the U. S. Highway 101 and the Union Pacific railroad (also a generator of hazardous diesel particulate emissions). As such, health risks involving residents of the apartment unit are considered potentially significant.

Cumulative Impacts

c,f,g) Per the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, a project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considered significant if the project's total emissions of either NO\textsubscript{x} or ROCs exceed the long term threshold of 25 lbs/day. The project's long-term contribution to NO\textsubscript{x} and ROCs emissions associated with the self storage facility would be far less than this threshold, and therefore the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts involving NO\textsubscript{x} and ROCs would be considered less than significant. The construction related project emissions would be considered less than significant. The construction related project contribution to cumulative NO\textsubscript{x}, ROC\textsubscript{s}, and PM\textsubscript{102.5} emissions would also be considered adverse but less than significant as these emissions are believed to have been adequately incorporated into the 2010 Clean Air Plan in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. Ventilation systems that are rated at Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value of "MERV13" or better for enhanced particulate removal efficiency shall be provided for the apartment unit and office area. All new residents/employees shall be provided information regarding filter maintenance/replacement for the life of the project. Plan Requirements and Timing: This requirement shall be shown on applicable plans submitted for approval of any Land Use and Building permits.

   Monitoring: City of Goleta staff shall verify compliance onsite prior to final inspection.

2. The applicant shall record an Air Quality Disclosure Statement and provide the same to all new potential residents, summarizing the results of technical studies that reflect a health concern resulting from exposure to air quality emissions generated within 500 feet of a freeway. Plan Requirements and Timing: The applicant shall provide this disclosure statement to the City Attorney and Planning and Environmental Services for review and approval in the form of a Notice of Covenant on Real Property.

   Monitoring: City of Goleta staff will ensure that the disclosure statement was recorded prior to Land Use Permit issuance.

Recommended Mitigation Measures

3. Dust generated by construction and/or demolition activities shall be kept to a minimum. Plan Requirements: The following dust control measures shall be shown on all building and grading plans and the permittee shall ensure that these measures are implemented by the contractor/builder:
a. During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, and/or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems are to be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day’s activities.

b. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency shall occur whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour. If wind speeds increase to the point at which such measures cannot prevent dust from leaving the site, construction activities shall be suspended.

c. Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce onsite vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.

d. Gravel pads, knock-off plates, or similar BMPs, shall be installed at all access points to the project site to prevent tracking of mud onto roadways.

e. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting soil material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.

f. All gravel, dirt, and construction material shall be cleaned from the right-of-way at a minimum of once a day at the end of the work day.

g. After clearing, grading, earth moving, and/or excavation is complete, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, or revegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed in a manner that prevents dust generation.

The permittee shall ensure that the contractor or builder designates a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering as necessary to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to City staff and the APCD and shall be posted in three locations along the project site’s perimeter for the duration of grading and construction activities.

Timing: All requirements shall be noted on all clearance plans and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure measures are printed on plans and shall periodically site inspect to ensure compliance. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.

4. Grading and construction contracts must specify that contractors shall adhere to requirements that reduce emissions of ozone precursors and particulate emissions from diesel exhaust. Plan Requirements: The following shall apply:

a. All portable diesel-powered construction equipment shall be registered with the state’s portable equipment registration program OR shall obtain an APCD permit.

b. Fleet owners of mobile construction equipment are subject to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Regulation for In-use Off-road Diesel Vehicles (Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9, Section 2449).

c. All commercial diesel vehicles are subject to limitations on idling time (Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9, Section 2485). Idling of heavy-duty diesel
construction equipment and trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five (5) minutes. Electric auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible.

d. Diesel construction equipment meeting the CARB Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used. Equipment meeting CARB Tier 2 or higher emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible.

e. Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.

f. If feasible, diesel construction equipment shall be equipped with selective catalytic reduction systems, diesel oxidation catalysts, and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by CARB or the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

g. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.

h. All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.

i. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.

j. The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.

k. Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing lunch onsite.

Timing: All requirements shall be noted on all clearance plans and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure measures are printed on plans and shall periodically site inspect to ensure compliance. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.

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

a. seeding and watering to revegetate graded areas; and/or

b. spreading of soil binders; and/or

c. any other methods deemed appropriate by City staff.

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

Monitoring: City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance.

6. Diesel fuel emissions shall be limited. Plan Requirements: The following limitations on diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds shall apply during all construction and subsequent operational activities:

a. Diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds shall not idle in one location for more than five (5) minutes at a time.

b. Diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds shall not use diesel-fueled auxiliary power units for more than five (5) minutes to power heater, air conditioner, or other ancillary equipment on any such vehicle.
c. The permittee shall designate one or more locations as deemed appropriate, for the permanent posting of a notice(s) to all drivers of diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds of these limitations on vehicle idling in all areas of the property that may be frequented by such vehicles. Such signs will be maintained in their approved location(s) as long as diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds are being used.

Timing: All requirements shall be noted on all clearance plans and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods. The location and information provided on the sign(s) shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure measures are printed on plans and shall periodically site inspect to ensure compliance. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.

7. The permittee shall submit to the APCD a completed Asbestos Demolition/Renovation Notification form and comply with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants—Asbestos during all demolition activities for the removal or remodeling of any structure on site constructed before 1979. Plan Requirements and Timing: The permittee shall provide written verification that a completed Asbestos Demolition/Renovation Notification form has been submitted to the APCD. In addition, all plans submitted for a demolition permit shall include a note that all demolition activities shall comply with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants—Asbestos. These requirements shall be met prior to issuance of the demolition permit.

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

Residual Impact

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | | | | | |
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? | | | | | |
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | | | | |
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? | | | | | |

Existing Setting

The only vegetated portion of the property is a 3-4 foot wide by approximately 1,000 foot long landscaped northern section of the property adjacent to the Caltrans ROW and the eastern portion of the property next to San Jose Creek. The paved/developed portion of the property does not contain any vegetation. The areas to the south and west are, respectively, a gravel railroad ROW with two eucalyptus trees and an asphalt-paved roadway (S. Kellogg Avenue). The area to the north is the Caltrans ROW and 101 freeway. The vegetation along the northern property line and within the Caltrans ROW serve as screening trees and vegetation from the U.S. Highway 101 including an approximately 820-foot long row of screening trees and approximately 160 feet of arundo, a tall, nonnative grass that also serves as screening. The only wildlife expected to occur in this strip of vegetation are rats and mice.

The vegetation type within the undeveloped eastern portion of the 10 S. Kellogg property along the San Jose Creek corridor is black cottonwood (poplar)/black walnut riparian woodland. The dominant tree species in this area are walnut, and black cottonwood. Dominant shrubs and herbs include wild blackberry, sourgrass, smilo grass, petty spurge, polson oak, Italian thistle, wild cucumber and giant creek nettle. The riparian vegetation provides some wildlife habitat for foraging birds, small mammals, and a few common reptiles and amphibians. The value of this habitat type to wildlife is severely limited by: 1) urban development, which extends to the top of bank on either side of the creek, 2) dominance of nonnative vegetation within this habitat type, and 3) alteration of the hydrologic regime caused by channelization of portions of San Jose Creek. Nonetheless, the San Jose Creek corridor is designated as a Riparian/Marsh/Vernal Special Species Habitat in the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP), and is also designated as a critical habitat for federally endangered southern steelhead.
Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Biological Resources would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, per the City's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* a project would pose a significant environmental impact(s) on biological resources in any of the following would result from project implementation:

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) No candidate, sensitive, or special status plant or animal species as designated by either the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) were observed onsite by the consulting project biologist (Watershed Environmental, July 2008) during biological surveys. The project site does however have suitable habitat to support, at least seasonally, Southern California steelhead and Least Bells vireo, both listed by the CDFG and/or USFWS as sensitive and/or endangered species. The project site could support other sensitive bird species as well. While no least Bell’s vireo, or other protected bird species nests were identified in the project’s biological report, if any exist during project construction, impacts to these federally listed species could occur. Such impacts are considered potentially significant.

The only structures proposed in the San Jose Creek riparian corridor and its buffer area are the two storm drains, the associated 24” rock rip rap at the pipe outlets and a portion of a 6’ high black vinyl chain link fence and 12’ gates. Disruption of the creek bank to install the new storm drains and rock rip raps cannot be avoided as such overflow stormwater must ultimately be discharged into the creek in a non-erosive manner. However, it is possible to move the new fence outside of the 50-foot Streamside Protection Area (SPA) upland buffer. Such impacts are considered potentially significant.

Furthermore, fine sediment from construction runoff could enter San Jose Creek and degrade Southern California Steelhead Trout habitat in San Jose Creek and tidewater goby habitat downstream in Goleta Slough, and smother tidewater goby eggs. Such impacts are considered potentially significant.

b) Figure 4-1 of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) designates San Jose Creek and its associated corridor as Riparian/ Marsh/ Vernal Special Status Habitat in the City’s GP/CLUP. San Jose Creek is also designated by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS, 2005) as critical habitat for federally endangered Southern California Steelhead Trout. The federally listed species, tidewater goby, are known to occur in the Goleta Slough, which San Jose Creek eventually drains into.

Policy CE 2.2 of the GP/CLUP requires a SPA upland buffer from San Jose Creek of 100 feet outward on both sides of the creek, measured from the top of the bank or the
outer limit of wetlands and/or riparian vegetation, whichever is greater. In this instance, and in accordance with the biological report prepared for the project (Watershed Environmental, July, 2008), measurement from the top of bank would provide a greater buffer, and as such, is used for SPA measurement purposes. Policy CE 2.2 allows the City to reduce the SPA upland buffer to no less than 25 feet if 1) there is no feasible alternative siting for the development, and 2) the project’s impacts will not have significant adverse effects on streamside vegetation or the biotic quality of the stream.

The project includes a 50-foot SPA upland buffer from the top of bank of San Jose Creek due to the long and narrow shape of the property, which limits redevelopment opportunity on the site. Such limitations include City and Fire Department development standards including, but not limited to, building height, setbacks, landscaping, driveway width, and parking spaces/sizes/location. As such, there is no feasible alternative siting for the development on the subject site.

Further, the project biological study (Watershed Environmental, July, 2008) did not identify any sensitive species on site requiring protection within the required 100-foot SPA upland buffer. However, as stated above, San Jose Creek is designated as Southern California Steelhead Trout critical habitat, and the creek drains into the Goleta Slough, which is habitat to the federally listed tidewater goby.

The California Department of Fish and Game Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan (CDFG, 1996) does not require specific watershed restoration activities for protection of the Steelhead, but instead provides general concepts and practices to lessen harmful effects from various land-use activities including stream restoration. These concepts and practices call the out maintaining healthy watersheds and sufficient flows as a highest priority.

The project’s 50-foot SPA upland buffer is consistent with this priority as the project involves removing concrete driveways from within the 50-foot San Jose Creek SPA upland buffer, and, by condition, non-native species from San Jose Creek, its associated ESHA and 50-foot SPA upland buffer area. Further, mitigation measures requiring compliance with the City’s Stormwater Management Plan for construction and the life of the project will provide improved water quality runoff from the site as no filters, drains or other Best Management Practices exist on site today. This improved water quality will also benefit the tidewater goby species in the Goleta Slough.

Once the restoration plan for the San Jose Creek, its ESHA and upland buffer is implemented, this improved creek corridor would have a greater likelihood of providing habitat for other sensitive species, such as the least Bells vireo and raptor species. As such, the project’s impacts will not have significant adverse effects on streamside vegetation or the biotic quality of the stream, but will more likely significantly improve this portion of the San Jose Creek corridor. Therefore, it can be argued that a more expansive SPA upland buffer of 50 to 100 feet would not substantially reduce existing adverse edge effects over that achieved through implementation of a 50-foot wide buffer.

For instance, the intent of the SPA as defined in the GP/CLUP is to protect the biotic quality of the City’s streams and riparian corridors from such adverse impacts at the development/corridor interface including exposure to polluted urban runoff, heightened
sediment loading of surface flows, increase creek bank erosion, invasion of non-native plant species, and intrusion of urban uses, night lighting, and human activities into wildlife movement corridors. In this instance, implementation of a 50-foot wide buffer as part of the project would be sufficient to provide creek channel shading and protection of habitat for wildlife movement along San Jose Creek, result in the removal of existing concrete and light industrial uses, provide adequate space to implement a native riparian revegetation/restoration effort with the removal of all non-native species from the existing riparian corridor, and expand the width of the existing corridor to reduce human intrusion into the habitat that could adversely affect wildlife use of the stream channel and associated habitat.

Further, due to the improvements to stormwater management mentioned above, a 50-foot buffer would provide for a level of protection against the introduction of contaminated stormwater runoff into the creek channel substantially equivalent to that which could be provided by a 100-foot buffer. Therefore, in this instance imposition of a SPA in excess of 50 feet would only marginally improve the riparian habitat and biotic quality of this ESHA beyond that realized through a 50-foot buffer. Thus, implementation of a 50-foot SPA upland buffer is considered appropriate under GP/CLUP Policy CE 2.2. Project impacts associated with the 50-foot buffer include the water quality issues identified above and lighting spillover issues analyzed under item d below. These impacts are considered potentially significant pending final architectural and engineering plans that indicate appropriate treatment of lighting fixtures and project drainage.

c) The majority of the property (96.3%) is paved. The runoff from these paved areas sheet-flows across the property. The western side of the property flows to the south (approximately 60% runoff), while the eastern side flows to the north into an existing unlined drainage ditch located within the Highway 101 ROW immediately adjacent to the north of the subject property. The unlined drainage ditch flows west to east into San Jose Creek.

The project includes installation of two new storm drains, one within the Highway 101 ROW just north of the property boundary, and one within the project site and the Union Pacific railroad leased area along the southern property line/project boundary. Both storm drains will have inlet/junction structures installed with Abtech Industries Ultra Filters.

Approximately half of the drainage that flows to the north of the property will drain westward into an existing bioswale that ultimately drains to the Las Vegas creek and then to the Goleta Slough. The remainder of the drainage that flows to the north of the property will be collected into the new storm drain which drains eastward into the San Jose Creek, and then to the Goleta Slough, through newly installed 24-inch rock rip rap.

Currently, approximately 80 percent of the site's runoff flows to the south from the western side of the property, and approximately 20 percent of the site's runoff flows to the north into an existing, unlined drainage ditch located within the Highway 101 Right-of-Way (ROW) immediately adjacent to the north of the subject property. The unlined drainage ditch flows west to east into San Jose Creek. The remainder of the site drainage that flows into the southern stormdrain/detention-dispersion trench will flow into San Jose Creek via a 24” rock rip rap.
Such improvements, if properly designed and maintained, can provide for significant runoff filtration which could ensure that stormwater discharged into the City’s storm drain system would not pose a significant threat to water quality in San Jose Creek, and ultimately, Goleta Slough.

Phase I of the project would cover the project site with approximately 56.7% of impervious surface, and Phases I and II combined would cover the site with approximately 40.2% impervious surface. Most of these impervious surfaces would be comprised of a parking lot for employees and customers on site. Runoff from large parking areas is often contaminated with a mix of petroleum products and other pollutants resulting from vehicular use. In addition, tailwater from landscape irrigation is often contaminated with fertilizers, pesticides, fungicides, and herbicides resulting from improper application methods and/or over-application. All such contaminants can pose potentially significant, adverse effects on sensitive riparian systems, surface water quality, and wetlands such as Goleta Slough.

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

d) As mentioned above in b, disturbance to the riparian corridor of San Jose Creek associated with installation of the new overflow storm drain could affect aquatic species and bird species using the corridor for nesting purposes during the avian nesting season. Such impacts are considered potentially significant.

In addition, installation of parking lot lighting along the eastern edge of the project area could adversely affect long-term wildlife movement along the corridor as well as nesting and foraging activities by various bird species. The photometric plan submitted by the applicant indicates that light from two (2) new bollard light standards along the eastern edge of the project area would spill over into the 50-foot Streamside Protection Area (SPA) along the edge of the riparian corridor of the creek, which could be disruptive to wildlife movement along the creek. As such, project impacts on wildlife movement, bird nesting/foraging activities, and use of the creek by aquatic species are considered potentially significant.

e) Construction of the drainage improvements and associated grading along the northern property line will require the removal of two mature coast live oak trees, two sapling coast live oak trees, and may cause disturbance to two other coast live oak trees in this area. Coast live oak trees are protected trees in accordance with the City’s Environmental Thresholds Manual and the policies within CE 9 of the GP/CLUP. As such, project impacts on native trees and shrubs are considered potentially significant.

f) There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that covers this segment of San Jose Creek.
Cumulative Impacts

Given that the project poses potentially significant, project specific impacts on the biological resources within San Jose Creek and its riparian corridor, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on biological resources in the area are also considered potentially significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. A final grading and erosion control plan shall be designed to minimize erosion and shall include the following:
   a) Methods such as retention basins, drainage diversion structures and spot grading shall be used to reduce siltation into adjacent streams during all grading and construction activities.
   b) Graded areas within the banks of San Jose Creek shall be revegetated within three (3) days of grading activities with deep-rooted, native, drought-tolerant species in accordance with the project landscape plan to minimize slope failure and erosion potential. Geotextile binding fabrics shall be used if necessary to hold slope soils until vegetation is established.
   c) Temporary storage of construction equipment shall be prohibited within 50-feet of the top-of-bank/riparian corridor of San Jose Creek at all times.
   d) All runoff water from impervious areas shall be conveyed by impervious conduits to San Jose Creek in a non-erosive manner.
   e) Erosion control structures shall be installed per the approved final grading/drainage plan.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The grading and erosion control plan(s) shall be submitted for review and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. The permittee shall notify Planning and Environmental Services prior to commencement of grading. All components of the approved final grading/erosion control plan shall be implemented prior to final inspection.

Monitoring: Planning and Environmental Services staff shall photo-document revegetation and ensure compliance with the approved final grading/drainage plan. City staff shall verify installation of all temporary erosion and drainage control measures prior to the beginning of any structural construction. City staff shall verify installation of all permanent drainage and erosion control facilities prior to final inspection.

2. The permittee shall limit excavation and grading to the dry season of the year (i.e. April 15th to November 1st) unless a City-approved erosion control plan is in place and all measures therein are in effect. All exposed graded surfaces shall be reseeded with ground cover vegetation to minimize erosion. Plan Requirements and Timing: This requirement shall be noted on all grading and building plans. Graded surfaces shall be reseeded within four (4) weeks of grading completion, with the exception of surfaces graded for the placement of structures. These surfaces shall be reseeded if construction of structures does not commence within four (4) weeks of grading completion.
**Monitoring:** City staff shall site inspect during grading to monitor dust generation and four (4) weeks after grading to verify reseeding and to verify the construction has commenced in areas graded for placement of structures.

3. The fence and gate currently proposed within the required 50 foot Streamside Protection Area (SPA) of San Jose Creek shall be relocated so that it does not encroach into said SPA. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The updated plan set reflecting this change shall be submitted to City staff for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

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

4. The alignment and location of all drainage control facilities constructed within the SPA of San Jose Creek shall be in substantial conformance with the Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan for the project prepared by Flowers and Associates and stamped received June, 2009. However, minor adjustments to the location and alignment of the drainage control facilities shall be allowed to avoid disturbance to any native riparian trees and/or shrubs to the maximum extent feasible. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Any minor adjustments to the proposed alignment and location of the drainage control facilities within the SPA of the creek shall be reviewed and noted on the final grading/drainage plans and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify that the installation of all drainage improvements within the SPA of San Jose Creek is done pursuant to the approved final drainage plan prior to Final Building Inspection.

5. The permittee shall prepare and implement a plan for the removal of invasive non-native weedy species within San Jose Creek and its associated ESHA and SPA as shown on the Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan prepared by Flowers and Associates and dated received June, 2009, including, but not limited to, pampas grass, fennel, tamarisk, cape-ivy, English ivy, and Giant reed. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The plan for removal of non-native, invasive weedy species shall be prepared by the project biologist and submitted to City staff for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. All non-native invasive weedy species shall be removed from the SPA of the creek prior to any final inspection.

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

6. A riparian corridor restoration plan shall be prepared for the Old San Jose Creek ESHA and SPA within the project boundary. The plan shall also include the tributary swale along the northern property boundary. The plan shall be prepared by a City-approved biologist and shall include specific goals for habitat restoration. **Plan Requirements:** Elements of the plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
   a. Author, date, project description, and project implementation.
   b. A description of existing biological resources.
c. Goals and objectives for the restoration plan.
d. Site preparation methods and measures for protection of resources during construction.
e. Weeding requirements and a list of non-native species to be removed and methods for removal.
f. A planting plan for the riparian corridor and swale area with appropriate treatment of ESHA and SPA locations.
g. Use of only local genetic stock for all seeds and plantings and seed collection schedule.
h. Performance criteria by which restoration success is measured.
i. Methods to protect plantings until established, including short-term and long-term maintenance.
j. Actions necessary in the event performance criteria are not met.
k. Irrigation requirements.
l. Detailed mapping of ESHA and SPA boundaries and illustration of restoration areas.
m. Cost estimate to implement the restoration plan, including installation as well as maintenance and monitoring requirements.

**Timing:** The plan shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of an LUP. Implementation shall be completed prior to occupancy clearance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall site inspect during installation and shall ensure completion prior to issuance of occupancy clearance.

7. The permittee shall provide performance securities and enter into agreements for installation and maintenance of the riparian corridor restoration plan. The maintenance period shall be a minimum of five (5) years. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The performance securities shall be provided and agreements signed, prior to issuance of an LUP.

**Monitoring:** Prior to occupancy clearance, City staff shall site inspect to ensure installation according to the riparian corridor restoration plan. City staff shall check maintenance as needed. Release of any performance security requires appropriate documentation and City staff signature.

8. The permittee shall prepare a tree protection and replacement plan for the project. **Plan Requirements:** The tree protection plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following tree protection measures:
   a. An exhibit showing the location, diameter and tree canopy of all oaks and any other specimen trees located onsite. Other trees that are to be protected shall also be included on the exhibit.
   b. Only trees designated for removal on the approved tree protection and replacement plan shall be removed. The Plan shall be consistent with the analysis in the environmental document and shall ensure that not more than 2 designated oak trees would be directly removed and that direct impacts to any additional oak trees shall be avoided and/or minimized.
   c. Any Oak trees that will not be removed on site shall be flagged and protected with the use of a tree guard or fencing. Fencing shall be located no closer than
six feet outside of the dripline of each tree and be at least four (4) feet in height consisting of a chain link or other material acceptable to City staff and shall be staked every six (6) feet.

d. Workers shall be instructed to stay outside of the fenced areas.

e. No activities or storage of construction materials shall be allowed within the fenced areas unless approved by the project arborist.

f. Any encroachment within the critical root zone of native trees shall adhere to the following standards:
   i. Walls and/or fencing with continuous footings shall be prohibited. Any walls/fencing shall be installed without continuous impacts on specimen trees along the wall/fence line. Impacts shall be limited to single postholes for support structures at intervals that minimize impacts on oak trees.
   ii. Any paving shall be of pervious material (i.e. gravel, brick without mortar or turf block).
   iii. Any trenching required within the protected area of specimen trees shall be done by hand.
   iv. Any roots one inch in diameter or greater encountered during any grading, construction, or similar activities shall be cleanly cut with a sharp saw to allow for new root regeneration, backfilled immediately or kept moist to prevent drying out and dying.

g. All specimen trees located within 25 feet of buildings shall be protected from stucco and/or paint during construction.

h. Any areas where grading, trenching, construction, landscaping or other similar activities would encroach within 6 feet of any protected tree dripline shall be identified in the plan. All encroachment is subject to review and approval by City staff.

i. All proposed driveways, utility corridors, walls/fencing, irrigation lines, and similar infrastructure shall be shown on the tree protection exhibit. New utilities shall be located within roadways, driveways, or a designated utility corridor such that impacts to trees are avoided or minimized.

j. No ground disturbance, including grading for utility installation, access, buildings, and other similar activities, shall occur within 25 feet of any oak tree canopy, unless specifically authorized by the approved Tree Protection and Replacement Plan.

k. Any approved root disturbance to any of the protected trees shall be done by hand and under the supervision of the project arborist.

l. Any tree affected by the construction process shall be deep-root fertilized to promote better health and vigor.

m. Compaction of the root zone shall be avoided by spreading 3-4" of mulch. If necessary, plywood or equivalent shall be placed on top.

n. During hot, dry periods, the project arborist shall be consulted to determine if the foliage needs to be washed with high pressure water to remove construction dust. The project arborist shall supervise any such washing.

o. Any emergency activities necessary to be performed within six feet of the dripline of any protected tree shall be first the project arborist. If any such activities are approved, they shall be completed under the supervision of the project arborist.

p. Native or specimen trees shall be mitigated at a 10 to 1 ratio. The Plan shall identify appropriate onsite, and offsite if necessary, mitigation for any specimen
tree that is removed, unsuccessfully relocated, and/or damaged. Mitigation locations, replacement sizes and replacement ratios shall be identified.

q. Any unanticipated damage that occurs to a specimen tree resulting from grading, construction or similar activities shall be mitigated in a manner approved by City staff. A mitigation plan shall be funded by the permittee under the direction of the City and include location of replacement, installation, maintenance and performance criteria.

Timing: The Tree Protection and Replacement Plan shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. The Plan shall be in effect and fully implemented throughout all project grading and construction.

Monitoring: City staff shall monitor in the field to ensure compliance during all construction/demolition activities.

9. The permittee shall obtain all applicable California Department of Fish & Game (CDF&G) permits or a project waiver for installation of the overflow stormdrain into the creek channel of San Jose Creek. Plan Requirements and Timing: Such permits or waiver shall be submitted to the City prior to the issuance of any LUP for the project.

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

10. The permittee shall obtain a permit for the discharge of fill in federally protected waters pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers for all work and/or site disturbance within the riparian corridor of San Jose Creek, or a written waiver from the Corp from such permitting requirements. Plan Requirements and Timing: A Section 404 permit or written waiver from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers for all proposed work/site disturbance within the riparian corridor of San Jose Creek shall be submitted to the City prior to the issuance of any LUP for project construction.

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

11. The permittee shall obtain any applicable Santa Barbara County Flood Control District permits or a project waiver for installation of the overflow stormdrain into the creek channel of San Jose Creek. Plan Requirements and Timing: Such permits or waiver shall be submitted to the City prior to the issuance of any LUP for the project.

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

12. The permittee shall revise the exterior lighting plan to ensure that all lighting does not spill over into San Jose Creek or its associated ESHA and SPA upland buffer. All exterior lighting along the eastern extent of the project site shall not be on any kind of motion sensor. Plan Requirements and Timing: Final approval of the exterior lighting plan shall be approved by staff and the DRB prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.
Monitoring: Installation of all exterior lighting shall be inspected by City staff for compliance with the approved final lighting plan prior to final inspection.

13. A pre-construction survey for nesting birds, particularly nesting raptors, shall be prepared by the project biologist or other, City-approved biologist, two (2) weeks prior to commencement of construction activities to identify and avoid active nests. If an active raptor nest or other protected bird species nest is found and work is proposed while the nest is active, a construction buffer of 500 feet for raptors, and a buffer to be determined by the City-approved biologist and City staff for other sensitive bird species, shall be maintained until August 15th or until the young have fledged, whichever occurs later. The size of the buffer may be adjusted by a qualified ornithologist with approval of the City Biologist based on the proposed activity, the species nesting, and the status of the nest, but shall be large enough to prevent disturbance. Plan Requirements and Timing: The permittee shall provide the name and qualifications of the biologist to be used for avian survey purposes for City approval. The survey shall be submitted to the City, CDFG, and any other applicable agencies within 30 days of completion and prior to construction activities.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance prior to commencement of construction as well as during all construction activities.

14. A pre-construction survey for protected botanical and wildlife species, in particular the Southern California Steelhead Trout, shall be conducted no more than two (2) weeks prior to commencement of construction to identify any protected biological resources within the demolition/construction area to ensure that such resources are identified and protected to the maximum extent feasible. If a protected species is found and work is proposed while near the species, or within the spawning season, a construction buffer to be determined by the City approved biologist and City staff in accordance with City and the California Department of Fish and Game regulations. Plan Requirements and Timing: The permittee shall provide the name and qualifications of the biologist to conduct the required pre-construction surveys for review and approval by City staff. The project biologist shall prepare and submit a written report of the findings of the pre-construction survey and to City staff for review and approval. All identified protective measures approved by City staff shall be implemented prior to commencement of construction/demolition.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance prior to commencement of construction/demolition activities as well as field-inspect to ensure compliance during such work.

15. Temporary, protective chain-link fencing along with erosion control measures such as wattles, straw bales, and sedimentation fencing along the bottom of the fence shall be erected at the edge of the SPA measured 50-feet from the top-of-bank as represented on the prepared by Flowers and Associates and dated July, 2009 to identify the limits of construction and prevent intrusions and release of sediment laden stormwater into the creek and its riparian corridor. Plan Requirements and Timing: Such protective fencing shall be a minimum of six (6) feet high and staked every six (6) feet. Plans for the required temporary chain link fencing and construction stormwater management measures shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for
the project. All approved protective chain-link fencing and construction stormwater management measures shall be implemented prior to commencement of construction/demolition and maintained through the entirety of construction activities per the approved plans.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall monitor in the field to ensure compliance during all construction/demolition activities.

16. All construction/demolition staging and stockpiling shall be limited to paved and/or disturbed surfaces within the protective fenced area noted above at all times. Absolutely no staging and/or stockpiling of any materials shall be allowed within San Jose Creek and its associated ESHA and SPA at any time. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** These requirements and prohibitions shall be included on all plans submitted for issuance of any LUP, building permit, or grading permit.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall monitor in the field to ensure compliance during all construction/demolition activities.

17. During construction, washing of concrete, paint, or equipment shall occur only in areas where polluted water and materials can be contained for subsequent removal from the site. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** A designated wash-out area shall be identified on all plans submitted for any LUP, grading permit, or building permit and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. The approved wash-out area shall be maintained in good condition throughout all construction activities.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance, during periodic field inspections during project construction.

18. The permittee shall submit drainage and grading plans with a Storm Water Management Plan for review and approval by Community Services and Building staff and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The plan shall incorporate appropriate Best Management Practices to minimize storm water impacts in accordance with the City’s Storm Water Management Plan and the City’s General Plan. The plans shall also include an erosion control plan for review and approval by Community Services staff prior to the issuance of any LUP for the project.

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

**Residual Impact**

With implementation of these mitigation measures, as well as restrictions on construction noise generating activities described in the discussion of Noise, residual project specific impacts to biological resources, as well as the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts to biological resources, are considered less than significant.
CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

During the late prehistoric period and early in historic times, the study area was part of the territory occupied by the Barbareno branch of Chumash-speaking people. At the time of early Spanish exploration of this area, several Chumash villages were located within a few miles of the project. The closest of these was the very large village of Saspli (translated as "root"). This important settlement with a population approaching 1,000 persons was located within 0.6 miles of the Schwan Project Site (Applegate, 1975). The area around the nearby Goleta Slough may have been the most densely populated area within the entire Chumash territory. During the Spanish Mission period and subsequent Mexican Rancho period, the project area was used for farming and grazing livestock. This area was also once part of the original Mexican Land Grant Rancho Los Dos Pueblos (Tompkins, 1962).

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) The project site is not shown to contain significant historical resources (GP/CLUP Figure 6-2). The nearest identified resource occurs approximately 50 feet to the southwest (as determined by the Map of the Subdivision of the Estate of P.F. Kellogg, December 1900), which has been identified as the historic location of the La Goleta Station. However, the La Goleta Station closed, and was then abandoned in the 1970s. In 1981, the La Goleta Station structure was moved to the Lake Los Cerreros City Park. No further known remnants of the La Goleta station remain on its original site. The possibility of encountering any such remnants is considered extremely low and therefore any potential impacts are considered less than significant.
The Phase I Archaeological Survey report prepared for this project indicated that a substantial number of archaeological studies were conducted within 0.5 miles of the general project area over the past 20 years of so (mostly Phase I surveys). Earlier studies in the greater project area, such as those conducted by D. B Rogers (1929), resulted in the establishment of the first regional chronological framework for ancestral Chumash sites. Subsequent research such as that by Erlandson and Colten (1991) and King (1981) led to the development of more scientifically accurate chronologies for the southern Santa Barbara County coastal area. (Laurence W. Spanne, 11/29/08)

This records and literature search revealed that eastern portion of the project site may have been previously surveyed, although the exact extent and intensity are questionable. The search also indicated that two previously recorded archaeological sites, one prehistoric and the other historic, are located within 0.5 miles of the Schwan Project Site. The prehistoric site, a small scatter of shell and lithic artifacts is nearest the project, located about 2000 feet distant and north of Highway 101. The important Chumash Village of Saspiii (CA-SBA-60) is located about 0.6 miles from the project, somewhat more distant than the other two sites. (Laurence W. Spanne, 11/29/08)

Another part of the project's Phase I study included an intense surface survey of the project area. The soils at the project site were largely obscured by pavement and existing structures, but some exposures were present along the boundaries with Kellogg Avenue, the Union Pacific Railroad, Highway 101, and San Jose Creek. Surface visibility was poor, but observations were supplanted by data from 10 soil borings drilled to depths of 25 to 70 feet (Pacific Materials Laboratory 2007). Soils observed at the surface were a dry, light brown to grayish brown sandy silt or silty sand. These were often mixed with imported gravels from construction of the existing facility, the railroad, and other nearby roadways. A pile of large, imported boulders was present near the eastern edge of the project site. The surface of the project area is essentially level at 0% slope. Surface visibility averaged less than 3% overall, with somewhat better visibility (5 to 20%) just beyond the project boundaries. (Laurence W. Spanne, 11/29/08)

The intense surface survey of the project area did not produce evidence of archaeological resources within the boundaries of the Schwan Project Area. Likewise, the soils study did not reveal any such evidence, with auger borings producing only evidence of subsurface disturbance, recent historic fill, and young alluvial soils. (Laurence W. Spanne, 11/29/08) However, since the presence of archaeological/cultural resources cannot be absolutely ruled out, potential project impacts on such possible resources are considered potentially significant.

c) The project site does not contain any unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature. No such impacts as a result of project implementation would occur.

d) Given the results of the Phase I Archaeological Investigation, it is considered highly unlikely that the project site contains the buried remains of any prior human inhabitants. However, there is always the potential that isolated human remains could be encountered during project grading and excavation. While the possibility of such disturbance is considered low, such an impact is considered potentially significant.
Cumulative Impacts

Although the possibility of encountering isolated and previously unknown human remains and/or significant archaeological/cultural resources is considered quite low, that possibility does pose a potentially significant contribution to cumulative impacts on archeological and cultural resources within the Goleta Valley.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. In the event archaeological resources are encountered during grading, work shall be stopped immediately or redirected until the City-approved archaeologist and Native American representative can evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigation standards set forth in the City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 2 shall be funded by the permittee. If resources are found to be significant, they shall be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 3 shall be funded by the permittee. Plan Requirements and Timing: This requirement shall be printed on all plans submitted for any LUP, building, grading, or demolition permits.

Monitoring: City staff shall conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground disturbing activities and shall ensure preparation of any necessary Phase 2 and/or Phase 3.

Residual Impact

With implementation of this mitigation measure, residual project specific impacts as well as the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on archaeological/cultural resources would be less than significant.
## GEOLOGY and SOILS

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

### Existing Setting

The project site is located within the Transverse Ranges geomorphic/geologic province of Southern California. The Transverse Ranges is oriented in a general east-west direction, transverse to the general north-northwest structural trend of the remainder of the State. The Transverse Ranges Province extends from the San Bernardino Mountains, west to Point Arguello. The province is bounded on the north by the San Andreas and Santa Ynez Faults, on the east by the Mojave geomorphic/geologic province, on the south by the Peninsular geomorphic/geologic province, and on the west by the Pacific Ocean.

The western Transverse Ranges extend from Ventura County to Point Arguello and are composed of sedimentary, volcanic, and metamorphic rocks ranging in geologic age from Jurassic (144 to 208 million years ago) to Holocene (recent). North/south tectonic compression has resulted in regional east-west trending faults and folds within rocks of the western Transverse Ranges.
The project site is situated on Quaternary alluvium deposited in the Goleta Basin. The Goleta Basin is isolated from the Pacific Ocean to the south and west by tectonic uplift associated with the More Ranch Fault, which trends approximately east-west and defines the southern boundaries of the basin. The basin is bounded on the north by the Santa Ynez Mountains.

The project site is virtually flat lying at an elevation of 45 to 51 feet above mean sea level (MSL) until it descends into the creek channel of San Jose Creek. The Creek flows into the Goleta Slough and then the ocean approximately 1 mile to the south.

No folds or faults have been mapped beneath the project site; however, the potentially active More Ranch Fault lies approximately 1.2 miles to the south.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on geology/soils would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual assumes that a project would result in a potentially significant impact on geological processes if the project, and/or implementation of required mitigation measures, could result in increased erosion, landslides, soil creep, mudslides, and/or unstable slopes. In addition, impacts are considered significant if the project would expose people and/or structures to major geological hazards such as earthquakes, seismic related ground failure, or expansive soils capable of creating a significant risk to life and property.

Project Specific Impacts

ai-ii) As noted above, the project site is more than 1 mile north of the nearest earthquake fault line, the More Ranch Fault. While this fault is not considered active by the State Department of Mines and Geology or subject to an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, the More Ranch Fault is considered active based on the existence of a geologically recent fault scarp (City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, Safety Element, 2006). All project construction would be subject to compliance with the Zone 4 seismic safety standards of the California Building Code, which has been adopted by the City. As such, potential risks to people and improved property associated with seismic hazards due to the project’s location in proximity to the More Ranch Earthquake are considered less than significant.

aiii,b) Phase I of the project does involve 610 cubic yards of cut and 1,950 cubic yards of fill, which could result in erosion and sediment loss from stockpiled soils and graded areas onsite. Mitigation to address such potentially significant geologic impacts is discussed in detail under the Hydrology and Water Resources section.

Liquefaction is a phenomenon that occurs in a specific soil condition when disturbed by ground motions. The specific soil condition conducive to liquefaction is loose sands and silty sands below the water table and typically the result of a seismic event. The preliminary foundation investigation for the proposal prepared by Pacific Materials Laboratory in June 2007 reported that soils that have the potential to liquefy were encountered at this site between the depths of 0 to 23 feet below the present grade. However, the potential for liquefaction to occur is considered to low to non-existent on
site. In addition, the California Uniform Building Code requires all new construction to address the liquefaction potential in the design of structures.

The preliminary foundation investigation also stated that the potential mode of seismically induced settlement is anticipated to be the result of volumetric compression. The total anticipated seismic settlement due to volumetric compression would probably contribute a differential settlement of 0.05 to 1.1 inches to the structure in a seismic event. Cosmetic damage to the building due to the settlement would require repair and the floor system may require re-leveling. If the recommendations given in the report are not implemented into the design and construction, potential risks to people and improved property associated with seismic related ground failure would be considered potentially significant.

aiv) The topography of the site and surrounding parcels is relatively flat and the site is not mapped in an area with a high landslide potential (General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR, Figure 3.6-4). Therefore impacts due to landslides are considered less than significant.

c, d) The Elder sandy loam and Elder-Soboba soils comprising the project site are classified as having a low shrink/swell potential by the USDA Soil Conservation Service. As such, impacts from expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property are considered less than significant.

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

Cumulative Impacts

As the project poses a potentially significant project specific liquefaction/settlement/erosion risk, its contribution to the cumulative risk of erosion in the Goleta Valley would also be considered potentially significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The final grading and erosion control plan shall be designed to minimize erosion. Plan Requirements: The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. Best management practices (BMPs), such as temporary berms and sedimentation traps (such as silt fencing, straw bales, and sand bags), shall be installed in association with project grading. The BMPs shall be placed at the base of all cut/fill slopes and soil stockpile areas where potential erosion may occur and shall be maintained to ensure effectiveness. The sedimentation basins and traps shall be cleaned periodically and the silt shall be removed and disposed of in a location approved by the City.

b. Non-paved areas shall be revegetated or restored (i.e. geotextile binding fabrics) immediately after grading and installation of utilities, to minimize erosion and to re-establish soil structure and fertility. Revegetation shall include drought-resistant, fast-growing vegetation that would quickly stabilize exposed ground surfaces. Alternative
materials rather than reseeding (e.g., gravel) may be used, subject to review and approval by Planning and Environmental Services and Community Services.

c. Runoff shall not be directed across exposed slopes. All surface runoff shall be conveyed in accordance with the approved drainage plans.

d. Energy dissipators or similar devices shall be installed at the end of drainpipe outlets to minimize erosion during storm events.

e. Grading shall occur during the dry season (April 15th to November 1st) unless a City approved erosion control plan is in place and all erosion control measures are in effect. Erosion control measures shall be identified on an erosion control plan and shall prevent runoff, erosion, and siltation. All exposed graded surfaces shall be reseeded with ground cover vegetation to minimize erosion. Graded surfaces shall be reseeded within four (4) weeks of grading completion, with the exception of surfaces graded for the placement of structures. These surfaces shall be reseeded if construction of structures does not commence within four (4) weeks of grading completion.

f. Site grading shall be completed such that permanent drainage away from foundations and slabs is provided and so that water shall not pond near proposed structures or pavements.

Timing: Final grading, drainage, and erosion control plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance. BMPs and erosion control measures shall remain in place/shall be implemented for the duration of grading and construction.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance during grading and construction activities.

2. The project shall comply with the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Preliminary Foundation Investigation for the project dated October 16, 2008. Plan Requirements and Timing: Said plan must be reviewed and approved by Planning and Environmental Services Department prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance.

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific and project contribution to cumulative geological hazards and impacts to geological processes would be considered less than significant.
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

Existing Setting

The project site is located in the South Kellogg Industrial Area. As noted in the Environmental Setting above, the site is considered to have 7,900 square feet of approved development consisting of various industrial uses.

Background

Certain gases in the earth’s atmosphere, classified as greenhouse gases (GHGs), play a critical role in determining the earth’s surface temperature. Solar radiation enters the earth’s atmosphere from space. A portion of the radiation is absorbed by the earth’s surface, and a smaller portion of this radiation is reflected back toward space. This absorbed radiation is then emitted from the earth as low-frequency infrared radiation. The frequencies at which bodies emit radiation are proportional to their temperature. The earth has a much lower temperature than the sun; therefore, the earth emits lower frequency radiation. Most solar radiation is not absorbed by GHGs; however, infrared radiation is absorbed by these gases. As a result, radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is instead “trapped,” resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon, known as the greenhouse effect, is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate on earth. Without the greenhouse effect, earth would not be able to support life as we know it.

Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide CO₂, methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and have led to a trend of unnatural warming of the earth’s climate, known as global climate change or global warming. It is extremely unlikely that global climate change of the past 50 years can be explained without the contribution from human activities (IPCC, 2008).

Climate change is a global problem. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants (TACs) which are pollutants of regional and local concern. Whereas criteria pollutants and TACs with localized air quality effects have relatively short atmospheric lifetimes (about one day), GHGs have long atmospheric lifetimes (one year to several thousand years). GHGs persist in the atmosphere for long enough time periods to be dispersed around the world. Although the exact lifetime of any particular GHG molecule is dependent on multiple variables and cannot be pinpointed, it is understood that currently more CO₂ is emitted into the atmosphere than is sequestered by ocean uptake, vegetation, and other forms of sequestration.
Of the total annual human-caused CO₂ emissions, approximately 54 percent is sequestered within a year through ocean uptake, uptake by northern hemisphere boreal forest growth, and other terrestrial sinks, whereas the remaining 46 percent of human-caused CO₂ emissions remains stored in the atmosphere (Seinfeld and Pandis, 1998).

Similarly, impacts of GHGs are borne globally, as opposed to localized air quality effects of criteria air pollutants and TACs. The quantity of GHGs that it takes to ultimately result in climate change is not precisely known; suffice it to say, the quantity is enormous, and no single project alone would measurably contribute to a noticeable incremental change in the global average temperature, or to global, local, or micro climate. From the standpoint of CEQA, GHG impacts to global climate change are inherently cumulative.

Greenhouse Gas Emission Sources
Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the transportation, industrial/manufacturing, electric utility, residential, commercial, and agricultural sectors (California Air Resources Board [CARB], 2009). In California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHGs, followed by electricity generation (CARB, 2009). Emissions of CO₂ are primarily byproducts of fuel combustion. CH₄, a highly potent GHG, typically results from fugitive emission sources such as agricultural activities and landfills. N₂O is also largely attributable to agricultural activities and soil management. Smaller amounts of CH₄ and N₂O emissions occur as a byproduct of fuel combustion. CO₂ sinks, or reservoirs, include vegetation and the ocean, and absorb CO₂ through sequestration and dissolution, respectively.

California has one of the largest economies in the world, and is consequently one of the larger emitters of GHGs. In 2004, California released 484 million metric tons (MMT) of CO₂e (CARB, 2009) and is the 12th to 16th largest emitter of CO₂ in the world (CEC, 2006).

CO₂e is a measurement used to account for the fact that different GHGs have different potential to retain infrared radiation in the atmosphere and contribute to the greenhouse effect. This potential, known as the global warming potential (GWP), is a measure of the heat trapping ability of a given GHG over a 100-year period relative to the heat trapping ability of CO₂. Expressing individual GHG emissions as CO₂e converts the heat trapping ability and longevity of the individual GHGs to a common basis that is equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO₂ were being emitted.

Combustion of fossil fuel in the transportation sector was the single largest source of California’s GHG emissions in 2004, accounting for 38 percent of total GHG emissions in the state. This sector was followed by the electric power sector (including generation sources both in-state and out-of-state that supply electricity to California) (22 percent) and the industrial sector (20 percent) (CARB, 2008).

Regulatory Setting
CEQA requires that lead agencies consider the reasonable foreseeable adverse environmental effects of projects they are considering for approval. Greenhouse gas emissions have the potential to adversely affect the environment because they contribute to global climate change. In turn, global climate change as the potential to result in rising sea levels, which can inundate low lying areas; to affect rain and snowfall, leading to changes in water supply; and to affect
habitat, leading to adverse effects on biological and other resources. Thus, GHG emissions require consideration in CEQA documents.

In considering global climate change, past regulatory actions of the State of California are informative. For example, in 2002, the State adopted Assembly Bill (AB) 1493 requiring that CARB adopt by January 1, 2005, regulations to achieve: "The maximum feasible reduction of greenhouse gases emitted by passenger vehicles and light duty trucks and other vehicles determined by CARB to be vehicles whose primary use is non-commercial transportation in the state." CARB adopted implementing regulations for AB 1493 in 2004.

In 2005, the Governor of California adopted Executive Order S-3-05, declaring that increased temperatures could reduce the Sierra Nevada mountain range's snowpack, increase air quality problems, and potentially cause a rise in sea levels. To address those concerns, the Executive Order set greenhouse gas emissions targets such that emissions would be reduced to year 2000 levels by the year 2010, year 1990 levels by the year 2020, and 80% of year 1990 levels by the year 2050.

In 2006, AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, was signed into law. AB 32 establishes regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions and a cap on state-wide GHG emissions. It requires that state-wide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. To effectively implement that cap, among other things, AB 32 directs CARB to develop and implement regulations to reduce state-wide GHG emissions from stationary sources. In October 2008, CARB published its climate change proposed scoping plan, which is the state's plan to achieve GHG reductions in California required by AB 32.

In August 2007, the State adopted Senate Bill (SB) 97. This bill directed the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to prepare, develop, and transmit to the California Natural Resources Agency guidelines for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions of the effects of GHG emissions, as required by CEQA by July 1, 2009. The Natural Resources Agency was required to certify or adopt those guidelines by January 1, 2010. Those guidelines were submitted, and on March 18, 2010 became effective. In relevant part, those guidelines in Section15126.4(c) provide as follows:

Consistent with Section 15126.4(a), lead agencies shall consider feasible means, supported by substantial evidence and subject to monitoring or reporting, of mitigating the significant effects of greenhouse gas emissions. Measures to mitigate the significant effects of greenhouse gas emissions may include, among others:

(1) measures in an existing plan or mitigation program for the reduction of emissions that are required as part of the lead agency's decision;
(2) reductions in emissions resulting from a project through implementation of project features, project design, or other measures, such as those described in Appendix F;
(3) off-site measures, including offsets that are not otherwise required, to mitigate a project's emissions;
(4) measures that sequester greenhouse gases;
(5) in the case of adoption of a plan, such as a general plan, long range development plan, or plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, mitigation may include the identification of specific measures that may be implemented on a project-by-project basis. Mitigation may also include the incorporation of specific measures or policies found in an adopted ordinance or regulation that reduces the cumulative effect of emissions.

In 2007, the Governor directed the California Building Standards Commission to work with specified State agencies on the adoption of green building standards for residential, commercial, and public building construction for the 2010 Code adoption process. That process resulted in the adoption of the 2010 California Green Building Code (CalGREEN). Specific elements of the CalGREEN Code include:

- 20 percent mandatory reduction in indoor water use, with voluntary goal standards for 30, 35, and 40 percent reductions;
- separate water meters for nonresidential buildings' indoor and outdoor water use, with a requirement for moisture-sensing irrigation systems for larger landscape projects;
- requirement for diversion of 50 percent of construction waste from landfills, increasing voluntarily to 65 and 75 percent for new homes and 80 percent for commercial projects;
- mandatory inspections of energy systems (i.e. heat furnace, air conditioner, mechanical equipment) for nonresidential buildings over 10,000 square feet to ensure that all are working at their maximum capacity according to their design efficiencies;
- requirement for low-pollutant emitting interior finish materials such as paints, carpet, vinyl flooring, and particle board.

On November 2, 2010, the Goleta City Council adopted CalGREEN. That action became effective January 1, 2011. CalGREEN mandates new requirements for planning and design, energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material conservation and resource efficiency, environmental quality, and installer and special inspector qualifications.

On November 2, 2010, the Goleta City Council also adopted an ordinance implementing a local building energy efficiency standard for the City that includes a "reach" goal of an additional 15% reduction in GHGs when compared to the Title 24 (2008) California Building Standards Code. The increased energy efficiency standards apply to new buildings or structures of any size, including the project.

Thresholds of Significance

As directed by SB 97 and noted above, the California Natural Resources Agency adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines that became effective on March 18, 2010. These new CEQA Guidelines provide regulatory guidance on the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions in CEQA documents. According to the amendments made to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the project would have a significant impact if it would:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

The adopted CEQA amendments require a Lead Agency to make a good-faith effort based, to the extent possible, on scientific and factual data in order to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project. They give discretion to the Lead Agency whether to:

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

In addition, a Lead Agency should consider the following factors, among others, when assessing the significance of impacts from greenhouse gas emissions on the environment:

- The extent to which the project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;
- Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the Lead Agency determines applies to the project; and
- 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 greenhouse gas emissions.

The amendments call on Lead Agencies to establish significance thresholds for their respective jurisdictions and clarify that the effects of greenhouse gas emissions are cumulative, and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA’s requirements for cumulative impact analysis.

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 CAPCOA in its technical advisory entitled CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act Review (CAPCOA, 2008):

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Emission Source Category</th>
<th>Operational Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other than Stationary Sources</td>
<td>1,100 MT CO₂e/yr OR 4.6 MT CO₂e/SP*/yr (residents + employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Sources</td>
<td>10,000 MT CO₂e/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>6.6 MT CO₂e/SP*/*/yr (residents + employees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SP = Service Population

The BAAQMD threshold is a promulgated CEQA threshold that has undergone full public review and comment, with approval by the BAAQMD governing board, and technical support by BAAQMD staff. It applies to a nine-county portion of northern California consisting of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, the western portion of Solano, and the southern portion of Sonoma counties. It extends from the urban core surrounding the San Francisco Bay to the pastoral and rural areas of Napa, Marin, Solano, and Sonoma counties. The BAAQMD GHG threshold applies to a nine county area of very diverse population and land use.

The BAAQMD GHG significance threshold has a strong regulatory and technical underpinning. It is based on substantial data, is intended as a regulatory threshold, and applies in some areas of the BAAQMD jurisdiction that resemble some land use patterns in the Goleta area. The climatic regime in the Goleta-Santa Barbara area that governs energy demand for space heating and cooling is also very comparable to that occurring in the BAAQMD. Additionally, in June 2010, the Santa Barbara County Planning and Development Department produced a memorandum “Support for Use of Bay Area Air Quality Management District Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards”, providing evidentiary support for reliance on the proposed BAAQMD standards as interim thresholds of significance in Santa Barbara County (SBCPD, 2010). The memorandum notes that certain counties in the Bay Area are similar to Santa Barbara County in terms of population growth, land use patterns, General Plan policies, and average commute patterns and times.

Accordingly, given that the City of Goleta does not have established thresholds of significance for GHG emissions, and as the City is located in Santa Barbara County, the rationale for applicability of the BAAQMD thresholds would generally apply. Therefore, for this project, the City has applied the following two thresholds of significance to the project:

Would the project:
1. Exceed the daily significance threshold adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, i.e., of 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr, for operational GHG emissions and/or result in significant GHG emissions based on a qualitative analysis?
2. Employ reasonable and feasible means to minimize GHG emissions from a qualitative standpoint, 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 of Goleta has formally adopted, or should adopt, as a GHG significance threshold for all present or future project analyses.

Sea Level Rise
The chief potential impact of climate change on the project is a rise in sea level such that the project would be impacted by coastal flooding events whose intensity is enhanced by sea level rise. However, accurate assessment of the impact of climate change on the project is a highly speculative activity. Published scientific articles indicate that there is no commonly-accepted methodology that exists at this time for determining such impacts. There is lack of scientific consensus as to how potential future climate change will influence future coastal flooding storm events, and any such analysis would rely on the selection of hypothetical climate change scenarios whose predictive accuracy cannot be confirmed. Quantitative estimates of future climate impacts at any particular site are speculative and not subject to accurate evaluation at this time. In addition to the speculative nature of inquiry into the impacts of climate change on development projects, there is no requirement under CEQA that such impacts be reviewed. Impacts associated with sea level rise are therefore not analyzed in this document.

Project Specific Impacts

Given the global nature of climate change resulting from GHG emissions, GHG emission impacts are inherently cumulative in nature. As such, the determination of whether a project's GHG emissions impacts are significant depends on whether emissions would be a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact. This is assessed below.

Cumulative Impacts

a,b) There are a number of modeling tools that can be used to estimate GHG emissions associated with various project types. The most consistently used model for estimating a project's direct impacts is the Urban Emissions Model (URBEMIS). URBEMIS is designed to model emissions associated with development of urban land uses and attempts to summarize criteria air pollutants and CO$_2$ emissions that would occur during construction and operation of new development. This model is publicly available and widely used by CEQA practitioners and air districts, including the ARB. Use of this model would ensure consistency statewide in how CO$_2$ emissions are modeled and reported from various project types (CAPCOA, 2008).

The URBEMIS model does not contain emission factors for GHGs other than CO$_2$, except for methane from mobile sources, which is converted to CO$_2$e. This may not be a major problem since CO$_2$ is the most important GHG from land development projects (CAPCOA, 2008). It also constitutes approximately 84 percent of all GHG emissions in California and is considered a "reference gas" for relating the amount of heat absorbed to the level of GHGs emitted.

The URBEMIS model also does not calculate GHGs associated with consumption of energy produced offsite (indirect impacts) and may in some instances, result in the double counting of "linked" trips (i.e., the concept that a residential trip and a commercial trip are quite possibly the same trip, resulting in "double-counting"). However, as noted
above, this model is still considered appropriate. Therefore, the City’s methodology for quantifying GHG emissions relies upon the URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 air quality modeling software, which is the most current version available.

**Project Short-term Construction Emissions.** Project construction activities for the self storage project, especially those associated with heavy equipment operations for grading, would contribute to cumulative GHGs and global climate change. Based on construction model runs conducted using the URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 air quality modeling software for the 2008 unmitigated condition, anticipated that project construction-generated CO₂ emission levels would be 2.33 metric tons per day. Assuming that construction would occur over the course of a 6-month period, the project’s total GHG emissions due to construction would be 425.9 MT.

**Project Operational Emissions.** Direct operational CO₂ emissions would occur as a result of project-generated traffic, onsite consumption of fossil fuels for water and space heaters, and other activities such as landscape maintenance that consumes fossil fuels. Based on long-term operational model runs conducted using the URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 air quality modeling software for the 2008 unmitigated condition, anticipated direct project operational CO₂ emissions for the project are estimated at 2,305.26 lbs/day or 383.3 metric tons/year (1.05 metric tons/day).

Indirect long-term emissions associated with the self-storage project would include energy produced offsite in order to service the project (such as at utility providers associated with the project’s energy and water demands). For projects such as this, these indirect emissions are expected to be minor and incremental, would not require the construction of any new utility facility, and would not conflict with programs that utility providers have adopted in order to reduce GHG contributions.

**Project Significance.** The project’s short-term construction and long-term operational GHG emissions are substantially less than the previously noted BAAQMD threshold value. The project would implement measures required by CalGREEN and the City’s local building energy efficiency standards (the “Reach Code”). The project would also not conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Therefore, impacts associated with climate change greenhouse gases are considered less than significant.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**
As the impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions are considered less than significant, no mitigation is required or recommended.

**Residual Impact**
Residual impacts as a result of greenhouse gas emissions would remain less than significant.
### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

### Existing Setting

The project site is not listed on the Cortese List pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 as a hazardous materials site nor does the project site lie within ¼ mile of any school. Although no private airstrips are in the vicinity of the project site, the property does lie within 1 mile of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBA). The project site lies well out of the Wildland Fire Hazard Area of the City.
Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact with regard to hazards and hazardous materials would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* addresses public safety impacts resulting from involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. These thresholds focus on the activities that include the installation 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 particularly applicable. However, for the purposes of this analysis, the project would be considered to pose a significant impact if it results in the exposure of people to a variety of hazards or hazardous materials as listed above.

Project Specific Impacts

a-d) On April 8, 2009, a California Environmental Assessor from Applied Environmental Technologies, Inc. (AET) visited the site for the purposes of preparation of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Update (the original assessment was completed in 2001) for the site. Documentation of the site visit indicated that the property is used primarily to store equipment and materials in multiple fenced yards. Uses on site at the time of the aforementioned Phase I site visit included storage areas for roofing, landscaping, tile, painting and other similar storage uses. No pits, ponds, above ground or underground storage tanks, stained soils, or stressed vegetation were observed. No environmental liens or Activity and Use Limitations (AULs) were found for the site. The project site is not listed on the Coriese List pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 as a hazardous materials site nor does the project site lie within 1/4 mile of any school. The self storage use would not involve routine use, transport or disposal of hazardous materials. As such the project would not 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.

e, f) Although the project site does lie within two miles of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, it is located well to the north of the main runway Approach Zone and well east of the secondary N/S runway approach zone. As such, the project poses no safety risk or hazard resulting from its proximity to the airport for employees, residents, or visitors to the mixed use commercial center. There are no private airports or airstrips in the vicinity that could pose a safety hazard or risk to residents, employees, or visitors to the project.

g, h) The project would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Due to its location well outside of the wildland fire hazard area (City of Goleta General Plan/Local Coastal Plan Figure 5-2), the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Cumulative Impacts

The project's contribution to cumulative hazards risks is considered less than significant.
Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is either required or recommended to address potential hazards and hazardous materials conflicts posed by the project.

Residual Impact

As the project poses a less than significant impact related to hazards and hazardous materials, all residual project hazards and hazardous materials impacts would also be considered less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Would the project:)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentialy Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Docume nt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

San Jose Creek runs along the eastern property line of the project site. The creek is identified in the City's General Plan as a blue-line stream and has an associated flood hazard area that parallels the creek approximately 140 feet wide. The base flood elevation (BFE) for the 100 year storm event in this location is approximately 52-feet above mean sea level (msl) which follows the topographic contour of the top-of-bank for the west side of the stream channel. Existing site drainage sheet flows along the southern and northern property lines (within the Union Pacific lease are and the Caltrans ROW, respectively). Approximately 60 percent of the site’s runoff flows to the south from the western side of the property. Approximately 40 percent of the site’s runoff flows to the north into an existing, unlined drainage ditch located within the Highway 101 Right-of-Way (ROW) immediately adjacent to the north of the subject property. The unlined drainage ditch flows west to east into San Jose Creek.

Water for both the existing array of industrial uses and the Phase I and II mini storage uses would be provided by the Goleta Water District (GWD) and as such, no groundwater use would be involved with project implementation.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant impact on hydrology and water quality would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual assume that a significant impact on hydrology and water resources would occur if a project would result in a substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns, alter the course of a stream or river, increase the rate of surface runoff to the extent that flooding, including increased erosion or sedimentation, occurs, create or contribute to runoff volumes exceed existing or planned stormwater runoff facilities, or substantially degrade water quality.

**Project Specific Impacts**

a, f) The project would increase stormwater runoff as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces. To address potential water quality impacts associated with stormwater runoff, the applicant's preliminary grading/drainage plan includes the installation of two detention/dispersion trenches. One along the southern property line and one near the southern property line within the Union Pacific lease area, and the grading and installation of a drainage structure to correct drainage issues from the U.S. Highway 101 along the northern property line in the Caltrans right-of-way. These improvements are included in Phase I, and would serve both Phases of the project.
Stormwater conveyed into the detention/disperse trenches would be filtered by AbTech Industries Ultra Urban Filters that would provide for a high level of stormwater treatment if properly designed, installed, and maintained. However, if the design, installation, and/or maintenance of such systems are not adequate, stormwater treatment prior to discharge into San Jose Creek would not be adequate and result in potential impacts on water quality. Such impacts would be potentially significant.

b) The project would be served by the GWD and would not involve the use of groundwater pumped from private wells. Project implementation involves the conversion of existing pervious surface to impervious surface. As the site only allows for only minor recharge into the Goleta Groundwater Basin (GGWB) due to the type of sediments found there, and since the amount of new impervious surface quite minor compared to the overall size of the GGWB (1.5 acres compared to 9,210 acres), project impacts on recharge of the GGWB would be less than significant.

c-e) As noted above, the project would increase stormwater runoff as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces. Per the drainage analysis prepared for the project (Flowers and Associates, June 26, 2009), peak, post-project stormwater discharge from the project site without detention for the 25 year storm event would exceed the pre-project condition by .46 cubic feet/second (4.78 CFS vs. 5.24 CFS). To ensure that the post-project stormwater discharge rate did not exceed the pre-project rate, the applicant has included an underground stormwater storagefiltration system into the project design as described above.

The site would continue to drain as it has in the past with the addition of a new storm drain and associated inlet/junction structure that will outlet into a 24" rock rip rap, which would then flow into San Jose Creek. Based on this preliminary analysis, the new drainage control improvements appear to be adequate to ensure that the pre-development condition is not exceeded by the post-development condition. However, changes to the project that might occur as it undergoes review by the City could require adjustments to the final drainage plan. As such, until a final plan is approved, drainage impacts associated with final project approval would be considered potentially significant.

g, h) As described in the discussion of the existing setting above, the flood hazard area for the 100-year storm event is within the banks of the stream channel of Old San Jose Creek at an elevation of 52 feet above MSL. All new development on site would remain above the 52-foot msl contour along the creek. A portion of Building C (Phase II) is located within the AE flood zone; however, the finished floor of this building would be 53 feet above msl, which is two feet higher than the existing grade. This additional two feet is compliant with the City’s Floodplain Management Ordinance (Chapter 15.10, Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code), which allows structural development within the 100-year floodplain if the finished floor elevation is raised at least two feet above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE). As such, associated flooding impacts as a result of project implementation would be less than significant.

i) There are no levees or dams on San Jose Creek from the project site to the top of its watershed. As such, impacts to people and property associated with the failure of an upstream levee and/or dam are considered less than significant.
j) The Fire, Flood, and Tsunami Hazards Map contained in the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (Safety Element, GP/CLUP Figure 5-2) does not identify this property to be within the potential tsunami runup area. Furthermore, only one tsunami has ever been well documented (1927) and only one other event in 1812 (poorly documented) is even noted in any records of the area. Furthermore, due to topography of the ocean floor in the Santa Barbara Channel, presence of the blocking offshore Channel Islands, and lack of any near-shore oceanic trench that facilitates tsunami wave heights in other regions of the world (abrupt shallowing of coastal waters), tsunami wave heights are not expected to be significant in this area (10 feet or less per the City’s GP/CLUP). Based on the properties location out of the potential tsunami runup area, the very low frequency of previously recorded tsunamis, and the limited potential for tsunamis of large height in this area, potential risks posed by future tsunamis on property and people in the vicinity of the project site is considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The contribution of potential project specific impacts to cumulative flooding and water quality impacts within the City would be considered potentially significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The permittee shall provide of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Permit from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, or provide proof of exemption from a NPDES permit. Plan Requirements and Timing: The permittee shall submit proof and City staff shall review and approve documentation prior to LUP issuance.

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

2. The permittee shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) covering all phases of grading operations. Plan Requirements: The SWPPP shall be prepared by a licensed civil engineer and incorporate all appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) necessary to mitigate short-term construction impacts. The plan may include, but is not limited to, the following BMPs:

a. temporary berms and sedimentation traps (such as silt fencing, straw bales, and sand bags); the BMPs shall be placed at the base of all cut/fill slopes and soil stockpile areas where potential erosion may occur and shall be maintained to ensure effectiveness; the sedimentation basins and traps shall be cleaned periodically and the silt shall be removed and disposed of in a location approved by the City;

b. non-paved areas shall be revegetated or restored (i.e. geotextile binding fabrics) immediately after grading and installation of utilities, to minimize erosion and to re-establish soil structure and fertility; revegetation shall include drought-resistant, fast-growing vegetation that would quickly stabilize exposed ground surfaces; alternative materials rather than reseeding (e.g., gravel) may be used, subject to review and approval by Planning and Environmental Services and Community Services;

c. runoff shall not be directed across exposed slopes; all surface runoff shall be conveyed in accordance with the approved drainage plans;
d. energy dissipaters or similar devices shall be installed at the end of drainpipe outlets to minimize erosion during storm events;

e. grading shall occur during the dry season (April 15th to November 1st) unless a City approved erosion control plan is in place and all erosion control measures are in effect; erosion control measures shall be identified on an erosion control plan and shall prevent runoff, erosion, and siltation; all exposed graded surfaces shall be reseeded with ground cover vegetation to minimize erosion; graded surfaces shall be reseeded within four (4) weeks of grading completion, with the exception of surfaces graded for the placement of structures; these surfaces shall be reseeded if construction of structures does not commence within four (4) weeks of grading completion.

**Timing:** The final drainage/stormwater quality protection plan shall be submitted to City staff for review and approval prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify that the SWPPP has been implemented per the approved final plan prior to commencement of grading.

3. The permittee shall prepare a final drainage/stormwater quality protection plan consistent with the City's Storm Water Management Plan that identifies all Best Management Practices (BMPs). **Plan Requirements:** The final drainage/stormwater quality protection BMPs plan shall be prepared by a licensed civil engineer. The plan may include, but is not limited to, the following BMPs:

a. a final drainage analysis that provides final calculations on pre/post development stormwater runoff volumes, required storage capacity, specifications on all elements of the drainage control system, and complies with the City’s Interim LID Strategies for a Tier 3 project over 20,000 square feet;

b. regular maintenance and cleaning of catch basins and detention basins;

c. routine cleaning of streets, parking lots, and storm drains;

d. stenciling of all storm drain inlets to discourage dumping by informing the public that water flows to the ocean;

e. development of an integrated pest management program for landscaped areas of the project, emphasizing the use of biological, physical, and cultural controls rather than chemical controls;

f. provision of educational flyers to residents/commercial tenants regarding proper disposal of hazardous water and automotive waste;

g. provision of trash storage/material storage areas that are covered by a roof and protected from surface runoff.

**Timing:** The final drainage/stormwater quality protection plan shall be submitted to City staff for review and approval prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify that drainage/stormwater quality protection plan has been constructed/installed per the approved final plan prior to final inspection.

4. The permittee shall prepare a maintenance agreement that addresses maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with the stormwater quality protection/BMPs described in the final drainage/stormwater quality protection plan. **Plan**
Requirements: At a minimum, the maintenance agreement shall include requirements that all inline storm drain filters shall be inspected, repaired, and cleaned per manufacturer specifications and at a minimum prior to September 30th of each year. Additional inspections, repairs, and maintenance shall be performed after storm events as needed throughout the rainy season (November 1st to April 15th) and/or per manufacturer specifications. Any necessary major repairs shall be completed prior to the next rainy season. Prior to September 30th of each year, the permittee shall submit to the City for its review and approval a report summarizing all inspections, repairs, and maintenance work done during the prior year. Timming: The permittee shall submit the required maintenance agreement to City staff for review, approval, and execution prior to LUP issuance.

Monitoring: City staff shall periodically verify compliance with the provision of the agreement and respond to instances of non-compliance with the agreement.

Further mitigation to address erosion control is addressed in the Geology and Soils section of this document.

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual impacts on hydrology and water resources would be considered less than significant.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

Existing Setting

The project site has a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designation of General Industrial (I-G) and is located within the South Kellogg Industrial Area (as designated by policy LU 4.6 of the General Plan), the M-1 (Light Industry) zone district, and the Old Town Redevelopment Area Key Site 2 boundary. This site/area is called out for revitalization in both the General Plan and the Goleta Old Town Redevelopment Plan (OTRP) with the goal for this area being the cessation of any unpermitted uses and mitigate adverse impacts to nearby residential properties to the maximum extent feasible. The subject property is bounded on the
North by the U. S. Highway 101, on the south by the Union Pacific Railroad, on the west by the Lash Construction site and on the east by Old San Jose Creek and on the southeast by the La Goleta Condominiums.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a, b) With the exception of the setback and landscaping modifications, the project complies with all zoning ordinance requirements, and as the modifications to zoning standards are subject to Planning Commission approval, no impacts to consistency with the zoning ordinance would occur as a result of project implementation.

The project would not result in the physical division of any established community or neighborhood, but the project could displace the light industrial uses that exist on the site today as the number of light industrial and industrial properties within the South Central Coast is declining. As light industrial/industrial properties convert to other uses, many of the industrial uses that were operating on those sites are forced to relocate to areas where they are unpermitted uses. It is suspected that this is why some of the existing uses on the subject property (i.e. the rock cutting operation) ended up operating on this site. However, this property, and the industrial area that it is within, is located adjacent to residential areas. As mentioned in the existing setting, General Plan policy LU 4.6 and many policies within the OTRP cite this property for redevelopment, cessation of unpermitted uses and implementation of mitigation of adverse impacts on adjacent residential properties to the maximum extent feasible. The project would cease any unpermitted uses on site as well as all existing permitted uses on site and replace them with the permitted mini-storage use. This sort of use is a lower-intensity industrial use with few vehicle trips, lower emissions, and very low noise levels. As such the project would likely achieve policy consistency with these elements of the General Plan, zoning ordinance, and OTRP.

As mentioned in the Biological Resources section of this document, the project includes a 50-foot Streamside Protection Area (SPA) upland buffer as opposed to the 100-foot SPA upland buffer required by Policy CE 2.2 of the GP/CLUP. Policy CE 2.2 allows the City reduce the SPA upland buffer to no less than 25 feet if 1) there is no feasible alternative siting for the development, and 2) the project’s impacts will not have significant adverse effects on streamside vegetation or the biotic quality of the stream. The proposed 50-foot buffer may only be allowed if the Planning Commission agrees with the analysis of this issue detailed in the Biological Resources section of this document that supports the proposed 50-foot buffer. Since this issue requires Planning Commission approval for the project to proceed, no impacts to consistency with the GP/CLUP would occur as a result of project implementation.
Parking

Long Term Parking

The City’s parking requirements do not contain a specific parking calculation for the mini storage use however; the ordinance does allow Director of the Planning and Environmental Services Department to determine the appropriate parking requirement in such instances. As such, the Director approved the ITE Trip Generation Manual’s recommendation of 1.39 spaces per 100 storage units for this project in addition to the City’s zoning ordinance requirement that each residential unit have two parking spaces. Required parking for Phase I of this project would be 6 spaces (454 storage units/100 x 1.39 spaces = 4 spaces + 2 spaces for the residence = 6 spaces). 19 spaces (including 2 for the manager’s apartment) are included in Phase I of this project, exceeding this parking requirement. The additional required parking for Phase II of the project would be 4 spaces (231 storage units/100 x 1.39 = 4 spaces). The project includes an additional 13 parking spaces for Phase II, which also exceeds this parking requirement. As the project has more than adequate parking capacity, no parking impacts will occur.

c) There are no habitat or natural community conservation plans that apply to the project site. Therefore, no associated impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this document (including those in the Biological Resource section for encroachment into the San Jose Creek SPA), the project’s contribution to cumulative land use and planning conflicts would be considered less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Mitigation to address encroachment of the fence and gates into the SPA is address in the Biological Resources section. No other mitigation beyond is either required or recommended to address potential land use and planning conflicts posed by the project.

Residual Impact

With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Biological Resources section of this document, residual project land use and planning conflicts would be less than significant.

MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing Setting
There are no known mineral resources have been identified on the project site nor would the project result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

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

Project Specific Impacts

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

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

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

Residual Impact
None.

**NOISE**

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

<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>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

**NOISE**

The project site lies within the existing and future (2030 for roadways and railroad; 2025 for airport) 70 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) for roadways as well as airport and railroad noise exposure contours within the City. Noise exposure contours map points of equal average noise levels in the same way that topographic contours map points of equal elevation. The primary sources of noise in the area are vehicular traffic on U.S. Highway 101, train traffic on the Union Pacific railroad, aircraft operations at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, and to a lesser extent noise generated from surrounding industrial uses.

Noise is defined as unwanted or objectionable sound. The measurement of sound takes into account three variables; 1) magnitude, 2) frequency, and 3) duration. Magnitude is the measure of a sound’s "loudness" and is expressed in decibels (dB) on a logarithmic scale. Decibel levels diminish (attenuate) as the distance from the noise source increases. For instance, the attenuation rate for a point noise source is 6 dB every time the distance from the source is doubled. For linear sources such as Highway 101 or the railroad tracks, the attenuation is 3 dB for each doubling of distance to the source.

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

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

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

**VIBRATION**

The project site is subject to vibration from the Union Pacific Railroad located immediately south of the site. As described in the Federal Transit Administration's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (FTA, 2006), ground-borne vibration can be a serious concern for nearby neighbors of a transit system route or maintenance facility, causing buildings to shake and rumbling sounds to be heard. In contrast to airborne noise, ground-borne vibration is not a
common environmental problem. It is unusual for vibration from sources such as buses and trucks to be perceptible, even in locations close to major roads. Some common sources of ground-borne vibration are trains, buses on rough roads, and construction activities such as blasting, pile-driving and operating heavy earth-moving equipment.

Thresholds of Significance

NOISE
A significant noise impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. The City’s adopted thresholds assume that outdoor CNEL noise levels in excess of 65 dB are considered to pose significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors. A significant impact would also generally occur where interior noise levels cannot be reduced to 46 dB or less.

Also, a project will generally have a significant effect on the environment if it will increase substantially the ambient noise levels for noise-sensitive receptors in adjoining areas. This may generally be presumed when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors are increased to 65 dB or more. However a significant effect may also occur when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors increase substantially but remain less than 65 dB.

Lastly, noise from grading and construction activity within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors would generally result in a potentially significant impact.

VIBRATION
The City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual does not include thresholds for vibration impacts. Given the proximity of the project to the UPRR, CEQA Appendix G guidelines were used to establish a vibration threshold. The project would result in significant impact if it would result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise level.

The Thresholds Manual provides no quantitative vibration standards; however, the Federal Transportation Agency (FTA) has adopted vibration thresholds for various types of land uses, including residential occupancy. The suggested threshold for vibration events applicable to the project site, based upon the number of train movements and type of occupancy, is an 80 dB root mean square (r.m.s.) vibration velocity (re: 10^-6 inch/second) (FTA, 2008). Vibration levels within project residences exceeding 80 dB r.m.s would be considered a significant impact.

Project Specific Impacts

a,b,e) A noise study prepared for the project by DUDEK (dated January 28, 2008) measured hourly Leq noise levels during a 24-hour period at the site on January 17 and January 18, 2008. The monitored Leq ranged between 58 and 75 dB, resulting in a calculated existing weekday CNEL noise level of 74 dB. The City’s General Plan considers noise levels between 70 to 75 dB to be conditional acceptable for industrial uses, and such, the mini-storage use is compatible with the City’s noise regulations. The General Plan considers noise levels between 50 to 60 dB “normally acceptable” and noise levels between 60 to 65 dB “conditionally acceptable” for low density residential units.
Therefore, the outdoor deck and manager’s apartment would likely exceed the aforementioned noise requirements. Such an impact is considered potentially significant.

The commonly accepted human threshold of perception for vibration is 65 vibration decibels (VdB, re: 10−6 in/sec). The dividing line between mildly perceptible and clearly perceptible is around 75VdB. At 85VdB, the vibration becomes intrusive for sleeping, reading or most other “quiet” activities.

The Federal Transit Administration has developed recommended impact criteria for transit projects (FTA, 2006). In the absence of City standards for train activity vibration, these guidelines have been incorporated into the following discussion.

The FTA’s suggested vibration impact criteria are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residences with sleeping areas</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses with primarily daytime operations</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹More than 70 events per day.  
²Less than 70 events per day.

The FTA Manual provides a screening distance for vibration effects. Unless there are unusual vibration propagation conditions, passage of a heavy rail passenger, commuter or freight train moving at moderate speed (50 mph) will have no perceptible impact following distances:

- Occupied residences – 200 feet from tracks
- Uses with primarily daytime operations – 120 feet from tracks

The project includes a manager’s unit within 200 feet of the tracks and the self storage uses would be located within 120 feet from the tracks. A more detailed vibration analysis is specified in the FTA Guidelines if a screening analysis cannot rule out impact potential.

Existing train activity is estimated at 16 train movements per day. Minor growth in rail service adjacent to the project site is anticipated to occur over time. However, track utilization is only expected to increase by a few trains per day. Ultimate track activity is expected to remain at less than 20 per day, which is considered “infrequent” (<70/day). The vibration velocity impact criterion for residences is 80 VdB for infrequent occurrences.

For freight trains, the vibration velocity as a function of distance from the track (“D”) is expressed as follows (FTA Manual, 1995):
VdB (at "D") = 78 − 20 x log (D/100)

where VdB in decibels (re: 10⁻⁶ in/sec) and D is expressed in feet.

Inside a home, the interface between the building shell and its foundation will absorb about 5 VdB of vibrational energy. However, the resonance of the structure will amplify the net vibration by +6 dB. Within 1 dB, the vibration velocities outside the structure and within the interior are identical.

Based upon the above predictive equation, the zone of potentially perceptible vibration extends as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from track midpoint (feet)</th>
<th>Vibration velocity (VdB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50'</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85'</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100'</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125'</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150'</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The zone of potential vibration impact therefore extends as far as 80-feet from the track centerline. The closest project façade would be 60 feet from the tracks. The façade of the manager’s unit would be 65 feet from the tracks. Perceptible vibration would be minimal, especially in upstairs rooms (the manager’s unit is entirely within the second and third floors of its building) where both the structure sub-floor and any flooring materials such as carpet would additionally dampen train vibration. The project’s residential unit is placed just within the zone of potentially significant vibration impacts from both ground-borne and air-borne vibration induced by passing trains. Any possible vibration effects would be confined to window rattles on building façades facing the track, which may cause a nuisance. This nuisance could be avoided with the use of double-pane windows because of the resilient de-coupling between double sheets of glass. However, prior to assurance that windows facing the track would be double-pane, window rattling would be considered a potentially significant impact.

c) The project would likely reduce noise levels on site as more noisy industrial uses, such as rock cutting, will be eliminated from the site. However, the project would increase the amount of mechanical equipment on site as the majority of the site is currently used as contractor storage areas, and the self storage use and manager’s apartment would require some mechanical equipment such as air conditioners. Further, the self storage use would result in moving trucks on site, which could potentially increase noise levels on site if vehicle engines, truck and fork lifts, radios and the like are left on. It is also likely that musical instrument playing could occur on site as mini-storage units are known to support band practice and musical instrument storage. This could increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Such an impact would be considered potentially significant.
d) To the east, the project site is bordered by the San Jose Creek ESHA and then the La Goleta condominiums, which are considered sensitive receptors, and therefore, noise associated with heavy equipment operation and construction activities, which can average as high as 95 dB or more measured 50 feet from the source would be considered to pose a potentially significant impact on such sensitive receptors. Also, the construction noise could affect employees of adjacent properties. Hence, construction noise would be considered a potentially significant impact.

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

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required Mitigation Measures

1. All noise-generating project construction activities shall be limited to Monday thru Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Construction shall generally not be allowed on weekends and state holidays. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (in the event of an emergency, for example) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Environmental Services. The permittee shall post the allowed hours of operation near the entrance to the site, so that workers on site are aware of this limitation. Plan Requirements and Timing: Three (3) signs stating these restrictions shall be provided by the permittee and posted on site. Such signs shall be a minimum size of 24" x 48". All such signs shall be in place prior to beginning commencement of any grading/demolition and maintained through to occupancy clearance. Violations may result in suspension of permits.

Monitoring: City staff shall monitor compliance with restrictions on construction hours and shall promptly investigate and respond to all complaints.

2. Stationary construction equipment that generates noise which exceeds 65 dB(A) measured 50-feet from the source in an unattenuated condition shall be shielded to reduce such noise levels to no more than 65 dB(A) at project boundaries. Plan Requirements and Timing: The permittee shall submit a list of all stationary equipment to be used in project construction which includes manufactures specifications on equipment noise levels as well as recommendations from the project acoustical engineer to shielding such stationary equipment so that it complies with this requirement for review and approval by City staff. This information shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance. All City-approved noise attenuation measures for stationary equipment used in any construction and/or demolition activities shall be implemented and maintained for the duration of the period when such equipment is onsite.
**Monitoring:** City staff shall periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance with all
noise attenuation requirements.

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

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** These requirements shall be printed all plans prior to
LUP issuance. Requirements shall also be printed on grading and building permits.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance with all
noise attenuation requirements.

4. The deck area of the manager’s apartment shall be enclosed and include a window
   section above the deck balustrade in the building façade constructed to meet the 60 dB
   CNEL noise requirements with windows closed. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The
   above measures shall be incorporated into building plan specifications.

**Monitoring:** Planning and Environmental Services staff shall review the building permits
prior to issuance to verify compliance. The Planning and Environmental Services shall
verify compliance prior to final inspection.

5. The design of the manager’s apartment must include a means by which adequate
   ventilation can be provided as the windows and doors must be closed to meet to meet
   the required noise standards. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The above measure
   shall be incorporated into building plan specifications.

**Monitoring:** Planning and Environmental Services staff shall review the building permits
prior to issuance to verify compliance. The Planning and Environmental Services shall
verify compliance prior to final inspection.

6. Any windows installed must be double paneled to reduce vibration effects resulting from
   adjacent Union Pacific Railroad operations. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The
   above measure shall be incorporated into building plan specifications.

**Monitoring:** Planning and Environmental Services staff shall review the building plans
prior to Building Permit issuance to verify compliance. Planning and Environmental
Services staff shall verify installation prior to final Building inspection.

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

**Monitoring:** Planning and Environmental Services staff shall review building plans prior to Building Permit issuance to verify compliance and verify installation prior to final Building inspection.

8. The permittee shall provide all lessees of the facility a notice of the pre-existing and predictably occurring vibration resulting from Union Pacific Railroad operations immediately south of the site. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Said notice shall be recorded with the Santa Barbara County Clerk-Recorder and proof of recordation shall be provided to the City prior to LUP issuance. The notice shall also be posted on site for the entirety of the project life.

**Monitoring:** Planning and Environmental Services staff shall ensure recordation prior to LUP issuance and via periodic site visits.

9. The permittee shall implement the following measures to minimize noise exposure to nearby sensitive receptors:

a. All vehicle engines used on site shall not be left idling longer than five (5) minutes.

b. Musical bands shall not play on site.

c. The use of horns, whistles or other loud devices is restricted.

d. The use of radios, electronic music systems and similar noise generating devices shall not be permissible in outdoor areas on site.

e. Audible truck backup alarms will be disabled between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be noted on any plans submitted for LUP issuance. A notice stating these requirements shall be presented to all lessees of the project upon acceptance of any lease and said notice shall be posted in a prominently visible location on site.

**Monitoring:** Planning and Environmental Services staff shall review plans for this requirement prior to LUP issuance and shall verify compliance via site inspections during the life of the project.

**Residual Impact**

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific noise impacts, as well as the project's contribution to cumulative noise impacts in the area, would be considered less than significant.
### POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

**Existing Setting**

The project site lies within an industrial area, which is surrounded by industrial uses on the west, the Union Pacific Railroad, then industrial uses to the south, and San Jose Creek then residential uses on the west in the Old Town Goleta area. The property is zoned M-1 (Light Industry), and designated as General Industrial (I-G) per the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The project site is used for industrial uses and associated storage areas.

**Thresholds of Significance**

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

**Project Specific Impacts**

a) Only 2 to 4 employees are envisioned to be employed at the project facility and only one individual or family will reside in the manager's unit. The anticipated increase in employees resulting from the project would be so minimal that no measurable impact due to population growth in the area would occur. No new roads or infrastructure that could support other new development would be required. As such, impacts resulting from potential inducement of population growth in the area would be considered less than significant.

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

**Cumulative Impacts**

The project is not expected to result in any significant contribution to cumulative housing and population impacts either within the City or the surrounding Goleta Valley.
Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required or recommended.

Residual Impact

The project would not result in any significant residual impacts on housing and population either within the City or the surrounding Goleta Valley.

PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Existing Setting

Fire Protection

Fire protection services would be provided by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD). The primary responding station would be Fire Station 12, 5330 Calle Real, just off Patterson Avenue on the north side of U.S. Highway 101.

National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and the SBCFD identify the following three guidelines regarding the provision of fire protection services:

1. A firefighter-to-population ratio of one firefighter on duty 24 hours a day for every 2,000 persons is the ideal goal. However, one firefighter for every 4,000 persons is the maximum population that should be served.
2. A ratio of one engine company per 12,000 persons, assuming three firefighters per station (or 16,000 persons assuming four firefighters per station), represents the maximum population that should be served by a three-person crew.
3. A five-minute response time in urban areas.
The mandated 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.

Station 12 has a staff of three personnel, consisting of an engine company captain, engineer, and firefighter. This station provides immediate response on incidents as determined by the type of call. The following is an assessment of the current situation regarding Fire Station 12 and the NFPA and SBCFD guidelines noted above (City of Goleta, General Plan/CLUP Final EIR, Table 3.12-1; 2006):

1. The current ratio of firefighters to population at Fire Station 12 is 1:5,541.
2. Fire Station 12 currently serves a population of 16,623, which is above the ratio of one engine company (three-person crew) per 12,000 population by approximately 4,623 people.
3. Response time from Fire Station 12 is typically within 5 minutes.

The SBCFD has also recently 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 to emergency calls rather than dispatching by a station's "first in area", as has been the previous practice. Basically, dynamic deployment uses a Global Positioning System (GPS) to monitor the exact location of each engine in real time. Previously, when an engine was out on routine (non-emergency) activities, such as inspections or training, the engine company was considered "in-service" and its exact location at any given moment in time was not known to County Dispatch. However, with dynamic deployment using the County's GPS, County Dispatch has real-time information on the exact location of each engine at all times and can dispatch the closest, un-engaged engine to an emergency incident, regardless of which fire station's service area the call originates from. This precludes the need for an in-service engine to have extended run times when another fire engine would be closer (G. Fidler; telecom of 8/16/11). 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”.

**Police Protection**

Police services would be provided by the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department under contract to the City. The City of Goleta 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 of Goleta police in an emergency. City of Goleta police operate from three locations: the City of Goleta offices, an office located in Old Town on Hollister Avenue, and a third location at the Camino Real Marketplace.

**Libraries**

Services at the Goleta Public Library are provided by contract with the City of Santa Barbara in a facility owned 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 for the City and nearby unincorporated areas. In 2010/2011, library visits were 266,996 and
circulation was 606,741. As of 2010/2011, about 34,500 library cards were held by area residents. Services are provided by 5 full-time and 2 part-time employees.

Schools

Public education services are provided within Goleta and the remainder of the Goleta Valley by the Goleta Union School District (GUSD) and the Santa Barbara Unified School District (SBUSD). The project site is within the elementary school attendance boundary for La Patera School (555 N. La Patera Lane) and the SBUSD secondary school attendance boundaries for Goleta Valley Junior High (6100 Stow Canyon Road) and Dos Pueblos High School (7266 Alamedo Avenue).

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Public Services would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual includes thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools. Specifically, under these thresholds any project that would generate enough students to generate the need for an additional classroom using current State standards, would be considered to result in a significant impact on area schools. Current State standards for classroom size are as follows:

1. Grade K-2—20 students/classroom
2. Grade 3-8—29 students/classroom
3. Grades 9-12—28 students/classroom

Project Specific Impacts

Background - Existing and Proposed Site Population
The property was subdivided into its current configuration in 1900. The site’s permit history indicates that between 1900 and 1974, several buildings or structures totaling 7,900 SF were constructed on site; however, the permit history is unclear as to exactly what those buildings/structures were. In the last ten years or so, several documents, including the Goleta Old Town Revitalization Plan (1998) and the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (2006) indicate that the site contains similar uses to those that are on site today, which are primarily contractor storage areas.

Therefore, staff has determined that it is appropriate to estimate the number of employees currently on site under the worst-case scenario assumption that 7,900 square feet of light industrial uses are approved on site. In accordance with the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manuals (8th Edition), the light industrial use classification generates .46 employees per 1,000 square feet. 7,900 square feet on site would provide 4 employees on site ([(0.46 employees x 7,900 square feet)/1,000 = 3.6]).

Only 2 to 4 employees are envisioned to be employed at the facility and only one individual or family will reside in the apartment unit (G. Rech, Architects West; 10/16/09). The City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Housing Element Technical Appendix Chart 10A-3 states that the average household size in the City is 3 people per household. As such, the total amount
of people on site for the project is expected to be 5 to 7 (2 to 4 employees + 3 person household = 5 to 7 people). This would increase the total amount of people on site a maximum of four.

**Fire Protection**
The fire protection services required for the project would include, but would not be limited to responding to structural fires, emergency medical services, public assistance, and other requests. The project is located within the service area of Fire Station 12, which serves a population that exceeds the NFPA guideline. The 5-minute response guideline would be met. In the event Fire Station 12 would need back-up, other available engine companies would respond via static and/or dynamic deployment. Therefore the impact of the addition of the project to the service area of Fire Station 12 would be less than significant.

The County Fire Department has reviewed the project and determined that the internal access system would provide for adequate emergency vehicle access to the site. The existing fire hydrant infrastructure in the area is substandard for the project. Three new fire hydrants would need to be installed to ensure adequate fire protection for the project (Hayden, Santa Barbara County Fire Department, June 10, 2010). If the driveways, interior drive aisles and fire hydrants are not installed per Fire Department requirements, the project would pose a potentially significant impact to fire services.

**Police Services**
The Santa Barbara County Sheriff’s Department provides 24-hour police protection services to the area under contract to 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 the City of Goleta police in an emergency. City of Goleta police operate from three locations: the City of Goleta offices, an office located in Old Town on Hollister Avenue, and a third location at the Camino Real Marketplace. The project would involve a negligible increase in population on site. The project’s land use would by nature involve the large-scale storage of customers’ personal property. The demand for police services resulting from the project would not require new police facilities or the physical alteration of existing police facilities as a result of project implementation; therefore, no impacts with respect to police services are expected.

**Schools**
Only 2 to 4 employees are envisioned to be employed at the facility and only one individual or family will reside in the apartment unit (G. Rech, Architects West; 10/16/09). Since the project would involve a negligible increase in population on site, either a small or no increase in student enrollment either within the Goleta Union or Santa Barbara School and High School Districts is expected in the foreseeable future. Therefore, there would be no need for new facilities or the physical alteration of existing facilities and as such, associated impacts on schools are not expected.

**Parks**
The closest public park/recreational facility to the project site is Armitos Park, only 0.2 miles south east of the site via the City street system. As the project would involve a negligible increase in population on site, the City’s existing public parks and recreational facilities would serve the project for the foreseeable future. Therefore, there would be no need for new park facilities or the physical alteration of existing park facilities, and as such, project related impacts on demand for and use of public parks and recreational facilities are not expected.
Other Public Facilities
Demand for other public facilities such as the City’s public library would also not exceed existing levels due to the fact that the project would involve a negligible increase in population on site and for the foreseeable future. Therefore, there would be no need for new facilities or the physical alteration of existing facilities, and as such project related impacts on other public facilities are not expected.

Cumulative Impacts
As the project would not result in any significant impacts on fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities in the foreseeable, project related contributions to cumulative impacts on such public facilities and services would also be considered less than significant. It should also be noted that this project would be subject to development impact fees for all public services such as fire, police, parks, administrative services, and libraries. Therefore, project-related contributions to cumulative impacts on such public facilities and services would be offset by these required payments.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. All access ways (public or private) shall be made serviceable. Plan Requirements and Timing: The site plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department and City staff prior to LUP issuance. Access ways shall be built per approved plans.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify Fire Department approval of access ways prior to occupancy clearance.

2. The composite utility plan to be prepared by the permittee shall include the installation of three fire hydrants on site to serve the project meeting all applicable Santa Barbara County Fire Department requirements. Plan Requirements and Timing: The composite utility plan identifying the location and specifications of the required fire hydrants shall be submitted for review and approval by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department as well as City staff and the DRB prior to LUP issuance. The required fire hydrants shall be installed and approved in the field by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department prior to any final inspection.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify Fire Department approval of the installed fire hydrant prior to any final inspection.

Residual Impact
Residual project related impacts on public services and facilities would be less than significant.
RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

The Old Town Goleta neighborhood has a population of over 4,000 people with a 0.14 acre pocket park on Nectarine Avenue north of Hollister Avenue and a 1.48 acre park located on Armitos east of South Kellogg Avenue. Additional active recreational facilities available to residents and employees of Old Town include playing fields at St. Raphael's School and the Goleta Boys and Girls Club/Community Center. In addition, the City's 10 public parks, four private parks, and 20 public open space areas comprise a total of 523 acres, which equate to approximately 18 acres/1,000 residents. The two larger City-owned regional open space preserves, the Sperling Preserve/Ellwood Mesa and Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve collectively account for 363 acres of that total. Approximately 40% of the City's two miles of Pacific shoreline is held in City ownership. Together with the neighborhood open space areas, these preserves provide many opportunities for passive recreation activities and enjoyment of natural areas. Areas specifically developed for active recreational uses however are less abundant with about three (3) acres of land/1,000 residents. The City's single recreation center, the Goleta Valley Community Center, is insufficient to fulfill all the needs of community groups and residents. Although privately owned and managed, Girsh Park provides much-needed facilities for active recreation but there remains a shortage of public facilities for active recreation such as sports fields, tennis courts, swimming pools, and dedicated trails. The closest park to the project site is Armitos Park, which is approximately 0.2 miles from the site via City streets.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) The project is expected to have 2 to 4 employees and one household of 3 people. This minimal population increase would not cause an increase in the use of neighborhood/regional parks and recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of these facilities would occur. Such impacts would therefore be considered less than significant.
b) There are no park facilities proposed as a part of this project, nor are any required. As provided in Figure 3.10-3 of the City of Goleta GP/CLUP Final EIR, there are several existing neighborhood open space areas, neighborhood parks, and community parks within the vicinity (i.e. one mile) of the project that could accommodate local recreational demands of the project employees/residents. Given the available supply of recreational facilities and the minimal population increase on site as a result of the project, no environmental impact would occur as a result of recreational facility construction associated with the project.

Cumulative Impacts

Although the project would not result in any project specific, significant effects on recreational facilities or demand for new such public amenities, the resulting incremental increase in the population of the Old Town neighborhood from the development of one residential unit and over 90,000 square feet comprising the self storage facility would represent an adverse but less than significant contribution to cumulative impacts on recreational facilities and the demand for such amenities in the area.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

The project’s contribution to cumulative demand for parks and recreational facilities would be addressed through the payment of park and recreation development impact fees. No recreational impact mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

Residual demand for parks and recreational facilities generated by the project would be considered less than significant.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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 an access easement on the north side of South Kellogg Avenue. South Kellogg Avenue is a two-way local street that provides access to Hollister Avenue, as well as access to U. S. Highway 101 via the U. S. 101/Fairview Avenue, SR 217/Hollister Avenue or U. S. 101/Patterson Avenue freeway interchanges. U. S. Highway 101 is a four-lane, north-south interstate highway that connects the City of Goleta to Santa Barbara, Carpinteria, and Ventura to the south and Buellton, Lompoc, and Santa Maria to the north. State Route 217 connects the University of California Santa Barbara and the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport to U. S. Highway 101. Fairview Avenue is a two lane, major arterial south of Hollister Avenue and is a four lane, major arterial north of Hollister Avenue. Patterson Avenue is a two-lane collector street south of Hollister Avenue and is a four-lane, major arterial immediately north of Hollister Avenue. Hollister Avenue is a four-lane major arterial that is the primary east-west route through
the City south of U. S. Highway 101. Calle Real, immediately north of the Fairview Avenue/U. S. 101 and Patterson Avenue/U. S. 101 interchanges, is another four-lane, major arterial providing east-west travel through the City.

Current intersection level of service (LOS) and GP/CLUP buildout projected LOS (without planned improvements) for intersections within the project vicinity are shown in Table 1. The only City intersection within the vicinity of the project that currently operates below level-of-service C (General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Transportation Element, Table 7-1) is the Patterson Avenue/U. S. 101 Southbound Ramps intersection as shown below in Table 1. Without implementation of planned transportation improvements, the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan estimates that under buildout conditions, several intersections within the vicinity of the project would fall below acceptable service levels (generally LOS C) as also shown in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Buildout Projected LOS (without Planned Improvements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/US 101 NB</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/US 101 SB</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister/Fairview</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister/Kellogg</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister/217 NB</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister/217/SB</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson/US 101 NB</td>
<td>C**</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson/US 101 SB</td>
<td>D**</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister/Patterson</td>
<td>C**</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Existing LOS obtained from the ATK Space Systems Expansion Project Traffic Study prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers, October 21, 2008
** Existing LOS obtained from the Jordan's Master Plan Traffic Analysis prepared by Penfield and Smith, September 28, 2009

Thresholds of Significance

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASE IN V/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(greater than)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR THE ADDITION OF

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

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

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

Project Specific Impacts

a-d) The property was subdivided into its current configuration in 1900. The site's permit history indicates that between 1900 and 1974, several buildings or structures totaling 7,900 SF were constructed on site; however, the permit history is unclear as to exactly what those buildings/structures were. In the last ten years or so, several documents, including the Goleta Old Town Revitalization Plan (1998) and the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (2006) indicate that the site contains similar uses to those that are on site today, which are primarily contractor storage areas. Therefore, staff has determined that it is appropriate to perform traffic calculations using the worst case scenario of 7,900 square feet approved on site.

In accordance with the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (8th Edition), the existing use on site is classified as General Light Industrial (ITE use number 110), and would create a worst case scenario of 8 P.M. peak hour trips. This number is based upon the ITE General Light Industrial average trip generation rate per 1,000 SF of 0.97:

General Light Industrial: 0.97 x (7,900 SF / 1,000 SF) = 8 P.M. peak hour trips
The project use of the site is classified as Mini Storage (ITE use number 151), and would create a worst-case scenario of 14 P.M. peak hour trips. This number is based upon the ITE Mini Storage average trip generation rate per storage unit of 0.02:

Mini Storage: 0.02 x 685 storage units = 14 P.M. peak hour trips

In accordance with the ITE Apartment use (ITE use number 220), the manager’s unit would add 1 ADT to the project total ADT. This number is based upon the ITE Apartment use average trip generation rate per dwelling unit of 0.62:

Apartment: 0.62 x 1 = 0.62 (rounded to 1 for a worst case scenario assumption)

The difference between the existing peak hour trips versus the project peak hour trips, in a worst case scenario, would be seven (7) additional P.M. peak hour trips from the property (15 proposed trips (mini storage + apartment) – 8 existing trips (general light industrial) = 7 new trips). Since the project is a community-oriented use, it is anticipated that approximately 50 percent of the project trips will be oriented toward the east of the project site and 50 percent of the project trips will be oriented toward the west of the project site. The net trip distribution and assignment of project trips onto Hollister Avenue will therefore be approximately 2 to 3 P.M. peak hour trips toward the east and 2 to 3 P.M. peak hour trips toward the west.

The potential project impacts to the study area intersections were evaluated by considering the existing LOS, the potential new project trips that could be oriented through the study intersections, and the amount of project trips that could result in an impact based on City thresholds. As shown in the table above, the study area intersections are currently operating in the LOS B-D range during the P.M. peak hour. Even if all of the eastbound or westbound P.M. peak hour project trips were oriented through one of the study intersections, the project traffic would not be great enough to cause a significant impacts based on City impact thresholds. And since the eastbound or westbound project traffic will actually become more disbursed at the intersections farther from the project site, it can be surmised that the project will not cause a significant impact to any of the intersections within the study area. Project specific impacts on all intersection operations within the project travelshed would therefore be considered to be adverse but less than significant.

e) The project site lies within two miles of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport; however, it is located well to the north of the main runway Approach Zone and well east of the secondary north/south runway approach zone. As such, the project would have no impact on air traffic operations or air traffic safety.

f) The City’s Engineering Design Standards establishes minimum Site Distance Standards for various posted roadway speeds to ensure that vehicles entering and exiting the traffic flow, (1) do not cause approaching vehicles to reduce speed by more than 10 miles per hour, and (2) when turning left, do conflict with vehicles approaching from the left.

Pursuant to the Engineering Design Standards, minimum sight distances standards applicable to the nearest major intersection to the project site, Hollister Avenue and Kellogg Avenue, are shown in Table 2 below. It should be noted that the standards listed
in Table 2 are based upon vehicles exiting or entering Kellogg Avenue onto or from Hollister Avenue, and the speed limits of Hollister Avenue and Kellogg Avenue in miles per hour (MPH). The speed limit on Kellogg Avenue is 25 MPH. The speed limit on Hollister Avenue is 25 MPH on the east side of Kellogg, and 35 MPH on the west side of Kellogg.

Table 2
Minimum Site Distance Standards for the Hollister/Kellogg Intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Exiting or Entering</th>
<th>Safe Sight Distance – Left (d₁)</th>
<th>Safe Sight Distance – Right (d₂)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Cars</td>
<td>Exiting</td>
<td>160 feet</td>
<td>200 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Cars</td>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>200 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Trailers</td>
<td>Exiting</td>
<td>320 feet</td>
<td>320 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Trailers</td>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>360 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurements derived from PhotoMapper software/aerial photos of this intersection, indicate that each portion of the intersection already provides for the minimum required sight distance. As the project does not include any changes to this intersection, and since new project generated trips do not exceed City thresholds, project impacts to stopping sight distance are not expected.

The City’s Engineering Design Standards also establish Stopping Site Distances to ensure that a roadway is long enough to enable a vehicle travelling at or near the roadway to stop before reaching a stationary object in its path, or react to a traffic control device such as a stop sign. Pursuant to these requirements, the following minimum stopping sight distances shown in Table 3 below apply to the nearest major intersection to the project site, Hollister Avenue and Kellogg Avenue. It should be noted that the data in the table below is for all vehicle types, and is based upon the speed limit in MPH for both Kellogg and Hollister Avenues.

Table 3
Stopping Sight Distance for the Hollister/Kellogg Intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Entering or Exiting</th>
<th>Required Stopping Sight Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg / Hollister</td>
<td>Exiting</td>
<td>150 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg/Hollister</td>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>150 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Hollister / Kellogg</td>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>150 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Hollister / Kellogg</td>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>250 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurements derived from PhotoMapper software/aerial photos of this intersection, indicate that each portion of the intersection already provides for the minimum required stopping sight distance. As the project does not propose any changes to this intersection, and since new project generated trips do not exceed City thresholds, project impacts to stopping sight distance are not expected.
Access to the site is via a private access easement that crosses the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. Currently, there are no painted warnings of the crossing on the pavement; however, the crossing is equipped with two California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Standard No. 9 (Automatic Gate Type) active warning devices and meets the current warning device standards according to the CPUC General Orders and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) (Sergio Licon, CPUC, May 13, 2011). Further, as mentioned above, the project is only expected to generate seven (7) additional PM Peak hour trips. As such, the project will increase traffic crossing the railroad tracks, and hence, increase the likelihood of traffic conflicts with trains and trespassing on the Union Pacific right-of-way. Due to these factors, impacts related to vehicles crossing the railroad tracks are considered potentially significant.

Short Term Construction Parking

Vehicular access to the project site for construction activities and workers is available from the access easement from Kellogg Avenue. However, because construction activities often conflict with onsite construction vehicle parking, such vehicles may have to be parked offsite for significant amounts of time. While offsite parking in the near vicinity may be available, it may obstruct traffic flow and/or be on land not owned by the permittee. As such, demand for construction related vehicle parking either on or offsite is considered to pose a potentially significant, short term parking impact.

g) Fire Department emergency vehicle access requirements for the project include a minimum width of 20 feet minimum width for all driveways and interior drive aisles (Brian Hayden, SBCFD; June 10, 2010). Per the project’s site plan, all driveways and interior drive aisles comply with these requirements. However, if the project is not built to these driveway and drive aisle width specifications, the project would present a potentially significant impact to fire department emergency vehicle access.

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

Cumulative Impacts

No intersections within the project’s travelshed would experience a significant change from cumulative to cumulative + project conditions as a result of project implementation. The project’s contribution to cumulative traffic impacts in the City would be addressed by payment of the required traffic development impact mitigation fees. As such, under the City's thresholds, project contributions to cumulative traffic conditions at area intersections would be considered to be less than significant.
Required Mitigation Measures

1. Construction vehicle parking and/or staging of construction equipment or materials, including vehicles of construction personnel, is prohibited along any City right-of-way. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall prepare a construction vehicle parking plan, including provisions for construction personnel parking and construction equipment/materials staging, for both on and offsite locations in the vicinity of the project site that precludes need for any construction related parking or equipment/materials staging on any City right-of-way.

   **Monitoring:** City staff shall periodically monitor in the field to verify compliance throughout all construction activities.

2. The permittee shall install two R8-8 “Do Not Stop on Tracks” signs and “stop lines” in accordance with Union Pacific Railroad and CPUC requirements for each approach at the Union Pacific Railroad crossing at the site’s southern border and Kellogg Avenue. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall include the aforementioned requirements on any plans submitted for LUP issuance.

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

3. Proof of any permits or approvals, or an exemption of such, that may be required by Union Pacific Railroad related to railroad/traffic safety within the UPRR access easement, shall be submitted to the City. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall submit written verification of compliance with this requirement prior to LUP issuance.

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

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual impacts to traffic and transportation systems would be less than significant.

### UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Wastewater Treatment

The project site is served by Goleta Sanitary District (GSD), which collects, treats, and disposes all wastewater, including wastewater received from Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD). The GSD treatment plant, located adjacent to the City and Santa Barbara Municipal Airport on William Moffett Place, has a capacity of 9.7 million gallons per day (based on average daily flow) but is currently limited to a permitted discharge of 7.64 million gallons per day. Disposal of treated effluent is by ocean outfall offshore from Goleta Beach. The plant currently operates under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency with concurrence by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Although the NPDES permit calls for all wastewater to undergo at least secondary treatment, GSD has obtained a waiver from full secondary treatment under Section 301(h) of the federal Clean Water Act. All other wastewater treatment plants in the County use a full secondary treatment. GSD's continued use of a waiver is subject to ongoing approval by the State Water Resources Control Board and the California Coastal Commission.

GSD has a flow capacity ownerships of 47.87 percent, and GSD rates for commercial uses vary for different types of businesses depending on the amount and type of wastewater generation expected. However, most businesses are charged per increment of 74,095 gallons of water.

GSD's 47.87 percent allocation of the treatment facility capacity would allow a maximum average flow capacity of 3.66 million gallons per day based on 2004 permitted maximum daily discharge of 7.64 million gallons; however, because average daily flow rates vary from year to year, depending upon the amount of rainfall, the amount of remaining capacity also varies. GSD
currently contributes about 2.54 mgd in flow to the treatment plant. This means under the currently permitted capacity of the treatment facility, GSD has 1.12 mgd of remaining capacity (General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final Environmental Impact Report; September, 2006).

In 2006, Dudek and Associates completed an updated land use survey and future wastewater projections analysis for both the GSD and GWSD. The County of Santa Barbara, the airport, and UCSB did not participate. The study identified generation factors for use in developing projected wastewater demand. To account for minor changes in land use as well as to allow for some flexibility in planning, the GSD provided a low and high range of estimated wastewater generation factors. One equivalent residential unit (ERU) is assigned a value of 184 gallons per day to 220 gallons per day. Commercial uses are evaluated at 100 gallons per day per 1,000 square feet of habitable building space.

**Water Supply**
The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water provider for the City. It operates under the Wright Judgment that prohibits overdrafting of the Goleta Groundwater Basin (GGWB) and return of the basin to a hydrologically balanced condition in 1998. The District draws its water supply from Lake Cachuma (9,322 acre feet/year or AFY), the State Water Project (4,500 AFY), the GGWB (2,350 AFY), and wastewater reclamation (3,000 AFY) for a total yearly supply of 19,172 AFY for a normal rainfall year. Average current demand for GWD water (2007) is 15,554 AFY (GWD, 2008).

**Stormwater Control Facilities**
Stormwater runoff from the project site is currently routed in two directions. Existing site drainage sheet flows along the southern and northern property lines (within the Union Pacific lease area and Caltrans ROW, respectively). Approximately 60 percent of the site’s runoff flows to the south from the western side of the property. Approximately 40 percent of the site’s runoff flows to the north into an existing, unlined drainage ditch located within the Highway 101 Right-of-Way (ROW) immediately adjacent to the north of the subject property. The unlined drainage ditch flows west to east into San Jose Creek.

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

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

a, e) Wastewater generation for the self storage use was estimated by GSD staff by comparing the rates charged for five (5) other mini storage facilities within GSD’s service area. Each of the 5 are charged GSD’s minimum rate as each facility generates less than, or equal to, GSD’s minimum allotment of discharge of 74,095 gallons per year (L. Astorga, GSD; 10/15/09). As such, GSD staff estimates that the project will generate 74,095 gallons of wastewater per year and the manager’s apartment will generate 74,095 gallons of wastewater per year as well. Based on the application of these wastewater generation estimates, it is anticipated that the project would generate approximately 408 GPD of new wastewater. This represents approximately 0.1% of the remaining available collection and treatment capacity of the GSD. While this level of estimated demand would have no potential to increase wastewater volumes conveyed to the GSD’s sewage treatment plant in excess of the District’s current operating permit from the RWQCB, the permittee has yet to provide a sewer connection permit from the GSD. As such, the project poses a potentially significant impact on the availability and adequacy of central sewage disposal service.

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

c) New stormwater detention and conveyance facilities would be required to handle stormwater runoff from the new development site. Detention facilities would include the installation of two detention/dispersion trenches. One along the southern property line and one near the southern property line within the Union Pacific lease area, and the grading and installation of a drainage structure to correct drainage issues from the U.S. Highway 101 along the northern property line in the Caltrans right-of-way. These improvements are included in Phase I, and would serve both Phases of the project.

Stormwater conveyed into the detention/disperse trenches would be filtered by AbTech Industries Ultra Urban Filters that would provide for a high level of stormwater treatment if properly designed, installed, and maintained. Two rock rip rap structures would be constructed between the pipe outlets in the San Jose Creek buffer area. As previously noted in the Hydrology/Water Resources section of this document, a final drainage plan will be required for City review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for the project and all approved drainage improvements would have to be installed prior to any final inspection. Maintenance of these facilities would be the responsibility of the permittee under a maintenance agreement with the City. Such, potential environmental impacts associated with construction of these drainage improvements have already been determined to be potentially significant.

d) The project also would not contribute to groundwater overdraft as no wells are proposed onsite. Projects served by the GWD would not cause or contribute to groundwater basin overdraft pursuant to the requirements of the Wright vs. Goleta Water District judgment.
Based on the Water Duty Factors as noted in the City's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, project water consumption would be as follows:

**Warehouse/Industrial Storage — 0.07 AFY/1,000 ft² * 110,600 ft² = 7.74 AFY**

Applying these water duty factors, it is estimated that the project would consume 7.74 AFY of GWD water. This represents approximately 0.018 percent of the water received by GWD in 2005 (See above, the GWD estimated that they received 15,300 AFY in 2005), and approximately 0.005 percent of the water available to the GWD in the near and between 2030 (See above, the GWD estimated that they will be able to receive 17,672 AFY for the next 25 years). Given these projections, the GWD has sufficient supply to service this project. However, the permittee has yet to provide a Can and Will Serve letter from the GWD. Until such a commitment is given by the GWD, a final determination as to the availability of central water service by the GWD to serve the project cannot be made. As such, the project poses a potentially significant impact on the availability and adequacy of central water service.

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

**Warehouse — 0.0016 tons/year/SF * 110,600 SF = 176.96 tons/year**

Based on the application of these solid waste generation rates, it is estimated that the project would generate a total of 176.96 tons/year before being given a 50% source reduction, recycling, and composting credit. After being given the 50% credit, the estimated yearly solid waste volume generated by the project would be 88.48 tons. As such, project specific impacts on the solid waste flow into the Tajiguas Landfill would be considered adverse, but less than significant.

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

**Cumulative Impacts**

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

**Required Mitigation Measures**

1. A Connection Permit from the Goleta Sanitary District shall be obtained. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Connection Permit shall be provided to the City prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** The Connection Permit shall be on file with the City prior to LUP issuance.
2. A Can and Will Service (CAWS) letter from the Goleta Water District shall be obtained. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The CAWS letter shall be provided to the City prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** The CAWS letter shall be on file with the City prior to LUP issuance.

3. The final landscape plan shall include measures to minimize outdoor water use. **Plan Requirements:** The following measures shall be implemented in the final landscape plan:

   a. the final landscaping shall use native and/or drought tolerant species;
   b. drip irrigation or other water-conserving irrigation shall be installed;
   c. plant material shall be grouped by water needs;
   d. turf shall constitute less than 20% of the total landscaped area if proposed under the final landscape plan;
   e. no turf shall be allowed on slopes of over 4%;
   f. extensive mulching (2" minimum) shall be used in all landscaped areas to improve the water holding capacity of the soil by reducing evaporation and soil compaction; and
   g. soil moisture sensing devices shall be installed to prevent unnecessary irrigation.

**Timing:** The final landscape plan shall include these requirements and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff and DRB. The permittee shall implement all elements of the final landscape plan prior to final inspection.

**Monitoring:** Prior to final inspection, City staff shall verify installation according to plan.

4. Building plans shall include measures to minimize indoor water use. **Plan Requirements:** The following measures shall be implemented in project building plans:

   a. all hot water lines shall be insulated;
   b. re-circulating, point-of-use, or on-demand water heaters shall be installed;
   c. self regenerating water softening shall be prohibited in all structures; and
   d. public lavatories and drinking fountains shall be equipped with self-closing valves.

**Timing:** Project building plans shall include these requirements. Indoor water conserving measures shall be implemented prior to occupancy clearance.

**Monitoring:** Prior to final inspection, City staff shall inspect to verify installation according to plan.

5. Reclaimed/non-potable water, if available, shall be used for all dust suppression activities during grading and construction. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This measure shall be included as a note on all plans submitted for any LUP, grading, and/or building permit. Evidence of availability, or lack thereof, shall be provided to the City.
Monitoring: City staff shall site inspect to ensure that reclaimed/non-potable water is being used for dust suppression.

2. A Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan (WRRP) shall be submitted to the Community Services Department for review and approval. The plan shall include the following measures, but is not limited to those measures. Said plan shall indicate how a 50% diversion goal shall be met during construction. Demolition and/or excess construction materials shall be separated onsite for reuse/recycling or proper disposal (e.g., concrete and asphalt). During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials and brush shall be provided onsite. The permittee shall contract with a City-approved hauler to facilitate the recycling of all construction recoverable/recyclable material. (A copy of the contract shall be provided to the City.) Recoverable construction material shall include but not be limited to asphalt, lumber, concrete, glass, metals, and drywall. At the end of the project, permittee shall submit a Post-Construction Waste Reduction & Recycling Summary Report documenting the types and amounts of materials that were generated during the project and how much was reused, recycled, composted, salvaged, or landfilled.

Plan Requirements and Timing: This requirement shall be printed on the grading and construction plans. Materials shall be recycled as necessary throughout construction. All materials shall be recycled prior to permit compliance sign-off.

Monitoring: City staff shall site inspect during construction and prior to permit compliance sign-off to ensure waste reduction and recycling components are established and implemented.

7. The permittee shall develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Program. The program shall identify the amount of waste generation estimated during processing of the project.

Plan Requirements: The program shall include, but is not limited to, the following measures:

a. Provision of a recyclable materials storage area of at least 50 SF, a minimum of 50% of which shall be dedicated to recyclables, within the project site that is approved by Marborg.

b. Implementation of a green waste source reduction program focusing on recycling of all green waste generated onsite.

c. Development of a Source Reduction Plan (SRP), describing the recommended program(s) and the estimated reduction of the solid waste disposed by the project. For example, the SRP may include a description of how fill will be used on the construction site, instead of landfilling, or a detailed set of office procedures such as use of duplex copy machines and purchase of office supplies with recycled content.

d. Implementation of a program to purchase materials that have recycled content for project construction and/or operation (i.e., plastic lumber, office supplies, etc.). The program could include requesting suppliers to show recycled materials content. To ensure compliance, the permittee shall develop an integrated solid waste management program, including recommended source reduction, recycling, composting programs, and/or a combination of such programs.
Timing: The permittee shall submit a Solid Waste Management Program to the City for review and approval prior to LUP issuance. All program components shall be implemented prior to occupancy clearance and shall be maintained in perpetuity.

Monitoring: Prior to final inspection, City staff shall ensure compliance with the Solid Waste Management Plan.

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

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

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project impacts, including the project’s contribution to cumulative solid waste impacts, would be considered less than significant.
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (<em>Cumulatively considerable</em> means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A. Project Plans (11” x 17” reductions)
B. Draft MND Comment Letters
ATTACHMENT A
Project Plans
(8.5" x 11" reductions)
C:\Thompson, CT

Caltrans District 5
Development Review

Chris Shephard

Sincerely,

If you have questions about this letter please contact me at (805) 549-3632.

Please ensure that a condition of approval will include work schedules that avoid bids.

Preliminary studies are completed and issued.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments upon the subject project. A review of

Dear Ms. Vik:

Subject: Schwarzy Self Storage Mitigated Negative Declaration

05-SB-101-2.163

Planning & Environmental Secs.
City of Goleta

09-09-2010

RECEIVED

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY

Submitted: Resolution No. 1712-Exhibit 1

November 9, 2010

PHONE 805/965-3100
FAX 805/965-3322
EMAIL info@santaclaritacounty.ca.us
WEBSITE www.santaclaritacounty.ca.us
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106

Po Box 60823

Homeowners, La Goleta I Condominiums

Michael F. Goldman

Sincerely,

commits

I can be reached at 805-692-7007 or michael@goletacondos.com if you have questions regarding these

minimum.

Two conditions, the potential for disturbing the nearby homeowners from this project should be
the city's nuisance and noise ordinances fall far short in protecting our quality of life. With the above
unfortunately, past experience for the homeowners of La Goleta I Condominiums have shown that

they be shut off while parked on the property and that engines lying be prohibited.

Noise and Odors: Please add a requirement that all vehicle engines, including trucks and for-

Instruments playing Public Address systems and similar activities

Notes: Please add a restriction against the use of radios, electronic music systems, musical

Conditions of Approval:

the La Goleta I Condominiums at 47 Debrajon Place, I request that the following be included in the city's

Dear MS. VIK,

Case No. 07-29-DP-07

Re: Schwarn Self Storage

Attn: Laura Vilk

Goleta, CA 93117

330 Campus Drive, Suite B

Planning and Environmental Services

City of Goleta

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above-referenced project. As an owner in

Nov 2, 2010

RECEIVED

Nov 2, 2010

Appendix A

Schwarn Self Storage Project

Resolution No. 07-12, Exhibit 1

City of Goleta
Laura

October 29, 2009

Planning and Environmental Services
City of Guelph

Dear Laura,

I am concerned about the new location for the required creek buffer. She does not see any economic benefits and is also concerned about how the trees will be protected.

The trees along the creek are a major asset to the community. They provide shade, reduce soil erosion, and improve the aesthetics of the area. Without proper protection, the trees could be at risk of damage or destruction.

Please consider the following:

1. The trees are a valuable asset to the community. They should be protected and preserved.
2. The location of the creek buffer is crucial for the health of the trees and the overall environment.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Laura

CC: slicing, generating, communicating

Received 2009-10-29

Appendix 4
Schwann Self-Damage Project
Resolution No. 17-12, Exhibit 1
The Project must generate some car exhaust that may impact air quality. Because the Project would be expected to increase travel vehicle trips and traffic volumes, some applicable mitigation measures, potential mitigation measures outlined for example, sound walls, landscaping, noise abatement measures, etc., are recommended to address the impact that the Project is likely to have on the U.R. If noise and air quality impacts are experienced, U.R. residents and businesses near the Project would be affected.

The Project may make people more aware of the sound and nuisance of people and animals make people all the more aware of the damage and nuisance. To address this issue, community efforts and effective communication with the community of the project area are being considered, which includes the following:

1. Noise Mitigation
2. Air Quality
3. Traffic Mitigation

In addition to the obvious safety concerns of which U.R. remains vigilant.

Re: Notice of Availability of Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of

City of Goleta

Planning & Environmental Services

City of Goleta

NOV 1 2010

RECEIVED

November 13, 2010
Gerard Sullivan

Very truly yours,

Omaha, Nebraska 68179-1580
1400 Douglas Street - STOP 1580
Union Pacific Railroad Company
Ms. Donna Coleman

WITH A COPY TO:

Omaha, Nebraska 68179-1580
1400 Douglas Street - STOP 1580
Union Pacific Railroad Company
Senior Manager - Real Estate
Leslie Barnes

Project as follows:

Please give notice to UP of all future hearings and other matters with respect to this

signature information: decision (with/without) signature, date and signature

significant environmental impact may result with respect to land use, safety, vehicle-traffic, air

would appreciate if the City give due consideration to the above concerns.

predominantly occurring vibration

City should at least require the developer to disclose to the general public the pre-existing and

is well-known that rail operations generate vibrations normally associated with

walls of landscape buffers, and/or use of sound-proofing materials, and techniques in the project

considerations requiring appropriate noise mitigation measures, such as construction of sound barriers. The City also should

level noise-counting monitoring. The City should require the developer to disclose to the general public the daily noise and vibration levels.

The City should ensure that the noise impacts, as a mitigation measure, be City owned.

UP rail operations generally the noise one would expect from an active railway.

the right-of-way. Buffer and setbacks design should be referred to the right-of-way.

the City should consider requiring the developer to install barrier walls or fences, paramount

in particular, the City should examine the impacts associated with the increased likelihood of

November 15, 2010
City of Omaha

Appendix A
Summary of Syndrome Project
Resolution No. 17-12, Exhibit P
included that can mitigate potential nuisance odor impacts.

Section 5.2 Air Quality - Short-Term Construction Impacts, page ST-22: Section (6) includes the

should be reviewed as well.

2. MND, Air Quality - Short-Term Construction Impacts, page ST-22: The first paragraph of this

A CP for this year. The most recently approved CP is the 2007 CP.

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

the site of 2.23 acres.

The project would also be leasing in additional 0.77 acres from Union Pacific Railroad for a total

 Parcel Map book 29, page 017-090-082, is located at 19 South Dugas Avenue in the Community of

Parcel Map book 29, page 017-090-082, is located at 19 South Dugas Avenue in the Community of

Dear Ms. Vik,

Re: ACPD Comments on Draft MND for Schwab Self Storage, 97-229-DP, DT: 10-MND-004

Georger, CA 93017
130 Ceramama Drive, Suite B
City of Goleta, Planning and Environmental Services

November 15, 2010

Received

City of Goleta

Planning & Environmental Svcs.

Laura Vik

November 15, 2010
Appendix A

Section 7: Iraq Project Agreement

Resolution No. 17-12, Exhibit 1

3. The accidental emissions from diesel equipment exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the

State of California. Therefore, during project grade, construction, and hauling construction

activities, diesel particulate filters in accordance with applicable emission standards should be

employed. The name and telephone number of an on-site contact person must be provided to

accord with the ACQD website at www.scribd.com/ACQD/774299/45559691.

4. The ACQD Rule 495, Control of fugitive dust from construction and demolition activities, became

effective on July 22, 2010 and establishes new limits on the generation of asphalt fugitive dust

under ACQD Rule 495, Control of fugitive dust from construction and demolition activities, became

the ACQD prior to issuance of land use clearance.

5. Standard dust mitigation (attachment A) are recommended for all construction and/or grading

activities. The name and telephone number of an on-site contact person must be provided to

6. MNF, Air Quality — Long-term Operational Impacts, Page 22: The text in the third full

paragraph after the section "Public Health and High Traffic Roadways" should not be read within the

500 feet of the highway.

7. MNF, Air Quality — Long-term Operational Impacts, Page 22: The text in the third full

paragraph after the section "Public Health and High Traffic Roadways" should not be read within the

500 feet of the highway.

Appendix A

Section 7: Iraq Project Agreement

Resolution No. 17-12, Exhibit 1

ACQD Comments on MND for Skinner Self Storage, 10-MND-004
Public Health and High Traffic Roadways

Diesel Particulate and NOx Emissions Measures

Factual Basis Control Measures

Attorney General

No SB 32 is effective or has any application regarding these comments; please feel free to contact

7. If contaminated soils are found at the project site, the ACCD must be consulted to determine if

请访问我们的网站 www.mdacecd.org/permitting or contact us (805) 961-8800.

7. 请访问我们的网站 www.mdacecd.org/permitting 或联系我们的客服 (805) 961-8800，

permits prior to operation. Construction activities with PEP certificate are exempt from ACCD

permits prior to operation. Construction activities with PEP certificate are exempt from ACCD

return within 12 months. All portable diesel-fueled construction equipment must be 50 brake-horsepower or greater must

return within 12 months. All portable diesel-fueled construction equipment must be 50 brake-horsepower or greater must

4. Asbestos-painting activities shall comply with ACCD Rule 329, Nuisance and Emulsified Asphalt

to reduce emissions of ozone precursors and fine particulate emissions from diesel exhaust.

to reduce emissions of ozone precursors and fine particulate emissions from diesel exhaust.

及 Asbestos-painting activities shall comply with ACCD Rule 329, Nuisance and Emulsified Asphalt

及 Asbestos-painting activities shall comply with ACCD Rule 329, Nuisance and Emulsified Asphalt

Page 3

November 15, 2010

AGC Commercial on Maui for Slaughter & Storage, 10-MND-004
MONITORING:
Lead Agency shall ensure measures are on project plans and maps to be
implemented. Lead Agency shall ensure compliance on site. ACC inspectors will respond to

Influence compliance.

Throughout all grading and construction periods:
on plans or maps prior to land use clearance or map recertification, compliance shall be achieved to

Plan requirements. All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans and at a note

1. Land use clearance for map recertification and land use clearance for initial grading of the structure.

2. Telephone number of such person shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to

3. Construction of elevator shall be performed as a person to monitor the dust control program

The contractor or builder shall designate a persons to monitor the dust control program

After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed, 1st sheet is cleared by

1. Clearing pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud onto public roads.

2. Tracks transportation of material in and from the site shall be kept from the point of origin.

3. If international, exportation and stockpiling of all materials is involved, site stockpiles for more than

4. Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce on site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.

Human consumption

Due to unforeseen possibilities, however, reclaimed water should not be used in or around crops for

In cases of severe drought, the water shall be reused from the water source once it has been

During construction use water trucks or sprinkler systems to keep all areas of vehicle movement

Duration of project, proper implementation of these measures is assumed to only mitigate future emissions.

These measures are required for all projects involving earthmoving activities regardless of the project size or

ATTACHMENT A

Air Pollution Control District
Santa Barbara County

Appendix A
Sherman Self-Torhouse Project
Resolution No. 17-12, Exhibit 1
The following measures are recommended:

1. Diesel-powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.
2. Higher emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
3. Diesel-powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.
4. Diesel-powered equipment meeting the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 1 emissions standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used.
5. Equipment meeting CARB Tier 2 or Tier 3 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used.
6. Diesel-powered equipment shall be registered with the state's portable equipment registry.
7. All commercial diesel vehicles are subject to the 125.985 of the California Code of Regulations, Title 17.
8. Regular updates of mobile construction equipment are subject to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulations.
9. Diesel-powered equipment shall be registered with the state's portable equipment registry.
10. The following measures are required by state law:
Applicability to Sonoma Bartlett County:

- Applicability to Sonoma Bartlett County: (as of 2009)

- Increased asthma hospitalizations are associated with living within 500 feet of heavy traffic. (L'Hermitte, 1999)
- Association is within 50 feet of the roadway. (Bromberger, 1999)
- Respiratory illness in children is associated with traffic density within 1,000 feet and the entrance.

Key Findings:

- Increased asthma hospitalizations are associated with living within 500 feet of heavy traffic. (L'Hermitte, 1999)
- Association is within 50 feet of the roadway. (Bromberger, 1999)
- Respiratory illness in children is associated with traffic density within 1,000 feet and the entrance.

Health Studies:

- Show the effects of pollution on health and the need for clean, green, and safe environments for all.

Conclusion:

- Public Health and High Traffic Roadways

Resolution No. 17-12, Exhibit 1

Public Health and High Traffic Roadways

Appendix A

SonomabattelleEiregionReport

Rest of County and Land Use: A Community Health Perspective, „California Air Resources Board,“ 2005
References:


Recommendation of Commission:

Recommendation: Adoption of the recommendation made by the Traffic and Engineering Committee.

Reasons for Recommendation:

1. The recommendation is based on the findings and recommendations of the Traffic and Engineering Committee.
2. The recommendation takes into account the input from the community and the stakeholders.
3. The recommendation is consistent with the goals and objectives of the project.

Decision:

The recommendation is approved by the Commission.

Action:

The recommendation will be implemented as per the decision of the Commission.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Title]

[Date]
If you have any questions, please contact me at 213-576-7085 or email at sales@xyz.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Redacted]

Appendix A
Siwanon Self-Serve Project
Resolution No. 7.12, Exhibit 1

November 15, 2010
Luna Vilk
If you have any questions, please contact Sergio Licon at (213) 576-7085 or sergio@upc.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

If install signal signs and pavement markings

to assist all approaches to the crossing, which I believe from sober judgment, under the accepted two R-8, R-10 signs. Not stop on these signs for each approach as well as the pavement of stop lines.

The Commission's Rail Crossing Engineering Section concluded that the installation of

General Orders and the MUTCD

above warning devices and meet the current warning device standards according to the CPUC

highway-rail crossing is equipped with two Commission Standard No. 9 (Automatic Gate Type) 2011. The Kellis Avenue

highway-rail crossings at the north and south approaches held on January 21. The Kellis Avenue-

innocent acts. This may have caused. Please note that after completing the Kellis Avenue

in the commission letter. Better still incorrectly described the crossing's configuration as not meeting current

Crossing No. 001B-359.42, DOT No. 455300;

Geoher, Santa Barbara County Register of Kellis Avenue Highway-Rail Crossing CPUC

generate above grade highway-rail crossing at the north and south approaches at the City of Geoher, and the

factual information re: the proposed signing and striping project. The commission ensuring the

This letter is the letter dated November 14, 2010, providing comments on your highlighted

Dear Ms. Vike,

RE: SCH# 201010016: Golden Swan Self Storage

Planning & Environmental Svcs.
City of Goleta

MAY 13 2011
RECEIVED

Golden, CA 92316
130 Coronado Drive, Suite B
City of Goleta
Associate Planner
Laura Vike

MAY 13, 2011
SCH# 201010016: Golden Swan Self Storage
Planning & Environmental Svcs.
City of Goleta

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

For Information Only: Suite 116
1800 North Market Blvd.
Sacramento, CA 95834

[Stamp]
Dear [Name],

Regarding the application number [Application Number], which concerns the above-described project, you are hereby notified of the following:

- The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not require lead agencies to respond to the comments.
- The address for comments is [Address].
- The deadline for comments is [Date].
- The deadline for the CEQA process is [Date].
- The deadline for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process is [Date].
- The deadline for the Environmental Quality Act (EQQA) process is [Date].

Please contact the State Clearinghouse at [Phone Number] or [Email Address] if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Director, State Clearinghouse

[Stamp: City of Santa Barbara]

[Stamp: Received: NOV 2 9 2010]

[Stamp: Governor's Office of Planning and Research]
Based on the review of the document, DTSC comments are as follows:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your Notice of Completion of a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the project mentioned above. The MND includes the Project Site (project parcel identification numbers identified in Table 1).

The MND satisfies the Project Site (project parcel identification numbers identified in Table 1) permit liability threshold, and project

DEAR MR. WILL

to completion, DTSC comments are as follows:

November 17, 2010

Laura Vik
Associate Planner

November 2, 2010

Re: EA No. 1712, Exhibit 1

Recieved
Sincerely,

[Signature]

This material further, please contact me at (818) 717-8550. VCP please visit DTSC’s website at www.dtsc.ca.gov. For additional information on the oversight. For Preliminary Environmental Assessment and Investigation and/or Remediation will be conducted, and which government agency will provide.

Appendix A

Sewage Sludge Storage Project
Resolution No. 17-12-13811
Assistant Engineer
Diana White

Let me know if you have questions.

Project:
Reduced from the current 96.3% of the site to 76.0% of the site as a result of the
undetermined property that suggested to me that there is sufficient surface water will be
continued, the property would occupy 21,000 square feet (21.6% of the site) and
peninsula areas would occupy 28,943 square feet (40.2% of the site). However, 3%
both properties would occupy a total of 271,210 square feet (68.3% of the site).

Section 5, Project Description on page 3, indicates that "Stormwater development from
Environmental Stewardship on page 5, notes that the majority of the property (96.3%) is
be a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces. However, Section 6,

Eweret has the following comments:

Page 99 - 16.4. Section 3 needs to add something like the baseline area shall provide a minimum of 60% for

Page 102 - You have 15 proposed - 6 existing types = 9 new types. Should this be 7 new types?

no need for newaskell --- I think the graph resolution on page 1 should say something about the increase in water from

I new for the environmental mitigation measures. We are saying they will pay the increase in fees. There would be
Page 84. On page 61, under "Facts," there should be a section on "estimated costs." There was no need for

Page 14. G. Need to put in some kind of baseline area for recycling, a minimum of 60% for

The changes are being done. Most of the changes are the same. I do not think much has been asked that I have

Attachment:

Sewer - Recommended Conditions of Approval for Sewer - Environmental Stewardship

Follow-up Flag:

Subject:

Cc:

To:

Sent:

From:

Laura Vik

Received:

DEQ 9/28/2010

Sewer Self Storage

Received No. 71.2 Exception 1
1. Prior to land use permit

APPROVAL

COMMUNITY SERVICES – RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF

CASE NO. 07-229-DP, DR-8, 10-004-MND

SUBJECT: 10 South Kellogg Avenue, APN 07-1-090-082

FROM: Diana White, Assistant Engineer

TO: Laura Vit, Associate Planner

DATE: December 7, 2010

MEMORANDUM

Appendix A
Swanen Self-Storage Project
Resolution No. 17-12, Exhibit 1