



**CITY OF GOLETA
PROPOSED FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
09-MND-001
May 1, 2009**

1. **PROJECT TITLE:** Renco Encoders Addition; Case No. 07-103-DP
2. **LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS:** City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117
3. **CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:** Laura Vlk, Associate Planner; (805) 961-7546
4. **APPLICANT:**
Tim Rose, Controller
Robert M. Setbacken, President
Renco Encoders
26 Coromar Drive
Goleta, CA 93117
AGENT:
David L. Burke
Burke Design
4141 State Street
Suite C 4.1
Santa Barbara, CA 93110
5. **PROJECT LOCATION:** 26 Coromar Drive
6. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The applicant requests approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP) for an as-built permit for the existing development on site (approved prior to the requirement of FDP's), and a clean room and office addition located at 26 Coromar Drive. The parcel has a General Plan land use designation of Business Park (I-BP) and a zoning designation of Industrial Research Park (M-RP). Specific elements of the overall project include the following:

Final Development Plan (07-103-FDP)

The proposed project includes an as-built permit for the existing, approved development on site which includes a 33,600-square foot manufacturing building, a 360-square foot compressor room, a 400-square foot storage garage, a 1,000-square foot hazardous materials building, and a 2,160-square foot covered storage area. The remainder of the project will be planned in two phases, a clean room addition being Phase II, and the office addition being Phase III. Phase I consisted of the approval of the 1,000-square foot hazardous materials

building, which was approved and constructed under City case number 06-093-SCD; LUP.

Phase II consists of a new 8,800-square foot clean room addition attached to the eastern side of the main manufacturing building, two 400-square foot storage outbuildings on the north side of the building (the most westerly outbuilding will be 18' x 22'4" and the other is proposed to be 18' x 20'), and the demolition of 1,760-square feet of the covered storage area. The maximum height of the new, cleanroom addition would be 25'8" measured from finished grade to the top of the walls of the addition, which also serve as a 1'6" parapet wall (measured from the maximum height of the proposed structure – the roof ridge). The outbuildings will have a maximum height of 12'8", from finished grade to the top of the roof.

The proposed Phase II structure would be primarily located on existing pavement and unused vacant land on the east side of the existing building. Site drainage is proposed to remain as sheet flow into existing on site storm drains. Access to the site would be from three (3) existing driveways; one is a right turn only drive off of Cortona Drive near the northwest corner of the site, another is a two-way access from Cortona Drive near the northeastern corner of the site, and the last is a two-way access from Coromar Drive near the southwestern corner of the site.

Phase II conforms with all applicable setbacks with the exception of the second front-yard setback, which is required to be 80' from the centerline of Cortona Drive and 50' from the right-of-way line of Cortona Drive. The existing parking lot on the northern side of the building encroaches into the second, front-yard setback by approximately 62' and 35' respectively. As a part of the FDP application, the applicant is requesting a modification for this existing setback encroachment. A total of 98 parking spaces (typical size is 17' x 9') and three (3) truck loading spaces (30' x 10') would be provided on site. Seven (7) bicycle parking spaces would be located at the patio slab area at the east side of the cleanroom building. Pedestrian access would be provided by an existing sidewalk along the Coromar Drive frontage and a new sidewalk along the Cortona Drive frontage will be provided by the applicant as a part of this project.

Of the 155,580-square foot site area, Phase II structural development (inclusive of existing development on site, and Phase II development) would occupy a footprint of 45,360-square feet (29.15% of the site), paved areas would occupy 61,796-square feet (39.7% of the site) and landscaping would cover the remaining 49,424-square feet (31.8%) of the site.

Phase III includes a 10,400-square foot, two-story office addition attached to the east of the existing manufacturing building and to the south of the Phase II proposed cleanroom.

The maximum height of the new, office addition would be 31'4" measured from finished grade to the top of the walls of the addition, which also serve as a 1'3" parapet wall (measured from the maximum height of the proposed structure – the roof ridge). Vehicular and pedestrian access, bicycle parking facilities, and setback modification issues would be identical to that proposed in Phase II. A total of 110 parking spaces (typical size is 17' x 9') and three (3) truck loading spaces (30' x 10') would be provided on site.

Of the 155,580-square foot site area, Phase III structural development (inclusive of existing development on site and Phases II and III development) would occupy a footprint of 50,160-square feet (32.2% of the site), paved areas would occupy 53,611-square feet (34.56% of the site) and landscaping would cover the remaining 52,409-square feet (33.7%) of the site.

7. DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:
N/A

8. SITE INFORMATION:

Site Information	
General Plan Land Use Designation	Business Park (I-BP)
Zoning Designation	Industrial Research Park (M-RP)
Site Size	155,580-square feet (3.572 acres)
Present Use and Development	Research and Manufacturing; a 33,600-square foot manufacturing building, a 360-square foot compressor room, a 400-square foot storage garage, a 1,000-square foot hazardous materials building, and a 2,160-square foot covered storage area.
Surrounding Uses/Zoning	North: Cortona Drive; manufacturing/industrial uses South: Manufacturing/industrial use East: Vacant field Northeast: Manufacturing/industrial uses West: Coromar Drive, manufacturing/industrial uses
Access	Existing: Three (3) existing driveways; one is a right turn only drive off of Cortona Drive near the northwest corner of the site, another is a two-way access from Cortona Drive near the northeastern corner of the site, and the last is a two-way access from Coromar Drive near the southwestern corner of the site. Proposed: Three (3) existing driveways; one is a right turn only drive off of Cortona Drive near the northwest corner of the site, another is a two-way access from Cortona Drive near the northeastern corner of the site, and the last is a two-way access from Coromar Drive near the southwestern corner of the site.

Site Information	
Utilities & Public Services	Water Supply: Goleta Water District Sewage: Goleta West Sanitary District Power: Southern California Edison Fire: Santa Barbara County Fire Department

9. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Renco Encoders project site is a 3.572-acre property within an urbanized, predominantly manufacturing/research/industrial area of the City. The site is bound on the north by Cortona Drive, to the east by a vacant field, to the northeast by a commercial/industrial use, to the south by a commercial/industrial facility, and to the west by Coromar Drive. Operations on site include the designing and manufacturing of rotary optical encoders for a wide variety of electronic instrument applications. Existing, approved development on site includes a 33,600-square foot manufacturing building, a 360-square foot compressor room, a 400-square foot storage garage, a 1,000-square foot hazardous materials building, and a 2,160-square foot covered storage area.

The north side of the building faces Coromar Drive and is landscaped with turf grass, two Canary Island Palm trees, and three Mexican fan palms. Asiatic jasmine and juniper have been planted near the front entrance of the building and in planters adjacent to the parking lots. Other landscaped features include a Eugenia hedgerow along the eastern property line, a podocarpus hedgerow along the southern property line and a Canary Island palm tree and small picnic area adjacent to the parking lot on the east side of the building. The topography of the parcel is nearly flat, with less than a one (1) percent slope toward the northeast (Biological Assessment, 26 Coromar Drive, Watershed Environmental, July 11, 2006).

According to City records, the main building on site was approved in 1964, and additions to that building were approved in 1996. In 2006, the 1,000-square foot hazardous materials storage building (with associated paving and landscape improvements) was approved. Access to the site would be from three (3) existing driveways; one is a right turn only drive off of Cortona Drive near the northwest corner of the site, another is a two-way access from Cortona Drive near the northeastern corner of the site, and the last is a two-way access from Coromar Drive near the southwestern corner of the site. The Coromar Drive frontage contains a right of way for the street and a sidewalk that stretches the length of the frontage. The Cortona Drive frontage contains a right of way for the street.

10. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project as indicated by the checklist and analysis on the following pages.

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

11. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

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

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

Patricia S. Miller, Manager, Current Planning Division

Date

12. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- (a) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including project specific, cumulative, construction, operational, onsite, offsite, direct, and indirect impacts. The explanation of each issue should identify the existing setting, any applicable threshold of significance, impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impact statement.
- (b) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact". The discussion must be supported by appropriate information sources. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to requests such as the proposed project.
- (c) The checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is: Potentially Significant, Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated, Less than Significant, or No Impact.
- (d) A "Potentially Significant" response is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant" entries when the determination is made, then an EIR is required.
- (e) A "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" response is appropriate where such incorporation of mitigation would reduce a potentially significant impact to a less than significant level. If there are one or more "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" entries when the determination is made, then a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared.

- (f) Supporting Information Sources: References and sources should be attached, including but not limited to, reference documents, special studies, other environmental documents, and/or individuals contacted.

13. ISSUE AREAS:

AESTHETICS

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

Existing Setting

The project site is surrounded by manufacturing/industrial development in a business park area centered around the Hollister Avenue/Coromar Drive intersection. Surrounding structures range from one to two stories, and this area of the City does not exhibit any particular architectural theme. The southern property line is lined with a tall podocarpus hedgerow that screens views of the building to the south and Hollister Avenue. The northern and eastern property lines are sporadically lined with landscaping that contributes to screening Cortona Drive and surrounding properties from development on site.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant aesthetic impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* instructs the project evaluator to assess visual/aesthetic impacts through a two step process. First, the visual resources of the project site must be evaluated including the physical attributes of the site, its visual uniqueness, and its relative visibility from public viewing areas. Of particular concern are visibility from coastal and mountain areas, as well as its visibility from the urban fringe and travel corridors. Secondly, the potential impact of the project on visual

resources located onsite and on views in the project vicinity which may be partially or wholly obstructed must be determined. This step includes an evaluation of the project's consistency with City and State policies on the protection of visual resources.

Project Specific Impacts

- a) Although more expansive views of the surrounding area from Hollister Avenue and Coromar Drive are limited due to existing development and landscaping in the vicinity of the project site, views of the Santa Ynez Mountains are available from many vantage points in the area. For instance, fairly expansive views of the Santa Ynez Mountains are available from the Hollister/Coromar intersection as illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1



The project would locate the proposed clean room and two story office addition to the eastern side of the existing building, which has a total height of 24'9," (General Plan policy VH-5.7(i) requires roof top equipment to be considered a part of the structure height. The existing mechanical equipment reaches of height of 24'9," and no new mechanical equipment will exceed this height). The clean room proposed as a part of Phase II would have a maximum height of 25' 8" (no rooftop equipment is proposed for this building). The height of the office addition proposed as a part of Phase III would have a maximum height of 31'4" (no rooftop equipment is proposed for this building). The maximum structure height in the M-RP zone district is 35.' Therefore, the proposed height of the additions are a less than significant impact.

Views to the south, east and west do not qualify as “scenic vistas” and have not been identified as such per the Visual and Historic Resources Element of the City’s General Plan, and therefore, would not be significantly affected by the proposed additions. The Visual and Historic Resources Element does however identify the view to the north from the Hollister Avenue/Cremona Drive intersection as a “scenic view to be protected.” Views from this intersection would experience some blockage, but due to the height of the existing podocarpus hedgerow along the property’s southern property line, the height of the existing two story building on the adjacent parcel to the south, and height and density of landscaping along Hollister Avenue such obstruction would not be considered significant. Given the fact that the proposed structure would not significantly project above the existing shrubbery line, and existing, adjacent development height from this location, project generated visual impacts on the Hollister Avenue/Cremona Drive scenic vista would be less than significant.

- b) The proposed project does not lie within, or affect any views from a scenic highway as designated by the State of California. As such, the project would not result in any impacts on scenic resources within a scenic highway viewshed.
- c) Existing development surrounding the project site is comprised of manufacturing/industrial buildings of both one (1) and two (2) stories. The proposed clean room addition (Phase II) would have a maximum height of 25’8,” and the proposed two story, office addition would have a maximum height of 31’4.” These proposed heights would be less than the maximum height allowed the M-RP zoning designation of 35-feet. Moreover, the project includes architectural detailing that will blend the proposed additions into the existing architectural theme of the existing building. This includes the continuation of the existing architectural accent band around the building, use of the same materials and colors for the proposed additions, and the use of parapet walls to match the existing parapet wall. If the proposed additions are not built in conformance with the existing project description, they could be visually obtrusive and create an adverse visual impact on the visual character and quality of both the project site as well as the surrounding neighborhood. Such visual impacts are considered potentially significant.

Project landscaping is an integral component of any development proposal to ensure minimization of adverse visual impacts and effects on neighborhood compatibility. The submitted preliminary landscape plan includes perimeter and parking area landscaping covering 31.8% of the lot area for Phase II and 33.7% for Phase III, both exceeding the M-RP zoning designation minimum amount of landscaping of 30% of the lot area. The existing, mature landscaping along the western and northern property lines will remain in place while the landscaping along the eastern and southern property lines will be slightly expanded and enhanced. Again, if the proposed additions are not built in conformance with the existing project description, they could be visually obtrusive and create an

adverse visual impact on the visual character and quality of both the project site as well as the surrounding neighborhood. Such visual impacts are considered potentially significant.

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

FIGURE 2



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

- d) Both Phases of the project would require exterior lighting to light first floor walkways and parking areas for safety purposes. If not properly shielded and directed, such light could expose neighboring development to unwanted night lighting and glare. Such night lighting impacts would be potentially significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Due to the potential project specific visual impacts posed by project night lighting, project contributions to cumulative visual/aesthetic impacts would also be considered potentially significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

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

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

2. To ensure installation and long-term maintenance of the approved landscape plan, the applicant shall enter into an agreement to install required landscaping and water-conserving irrigation systems as well as maintain required landscaping for the life of the project per the Design Review Board (DRB) approved final landscape plan. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The applicant shall sign the landscape installation and maintenance agreement prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. Performance securities for installation and maintenance for at least three (3) years shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall photo document installation prior to occupancy clearance and shall check maintenance as needed. Release of any performance security requires City staff signature.

3. All exterior night lighting shall be of low intensity/low glare design, and shall be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels. Exterior lighting fixtures shall be kept to the minimum number and intensity needed to ensure the public safety of employees, and visitors to the industrial/manufacturing center. All upward directed exterior

lighting shall be prohibited to protect night sky views of the stars. All exterior lighting fixtures shall be appropriate for the architectural style of the proposed structure and the surrounding area. The applicant shall develop a lighting plan incorporating these requirements and provisions for dimming lights after 10:00 p.m. **Plan Requirements:** The locations of all exterior lighting fixtures and an arrow showing the direction of light being cast by each fixture and the height of the fixtures shall be depicted on the preliminary/final lighting plan and shall be reviewed and approved by the DRB and City staff. **Timing:** The preliminary/final lighting plan shall be reviewed and approved by the DRB and City staff prior to LUP issuance.

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

4. 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 & Timing:** Prior to issuance of any LUP for the project, the applicant shall designate and provide to City staff the name and phone number of a contact person(s) to monitor construction trash/waste and organize a clean-up crew. Additional covered receptacles shall be provided as determined necessary by City staff. This requirement shall be noted on all plans. Trash control shall occur throughout all grading and construction activities.

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

5. The applicant shall submit a composite utility plan for DRB and City staff 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 & 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: City staff shall verify installation of all external/roof mounted mechanical equipment per the approved plans prior to the approval of any certificate of occupancy.

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

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

7. All new utilities on the subject property shall be installed underground. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** All composite utility plans for the project shall note this undergrounding requirement and shall be submitted for City staff review prior to LUP issuance.

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

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific and project contributions to cumulative aesthetic impacts would be considered less than significant.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				■	
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?				■	
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				■	

Existing Setting

The project site is located within a manufacturing/industrial business park, which has been developed as such for many years (the existing building on site was approved in 1964). Soils on site consist of primarily Camarillo Variant, fine sandy loam, Ca, and a small amount of Goleta fine sandy loam, GcA, which is considered prime soil.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

- a-c) A portion of the project site is sited as being comprised of the prime soil Goleta fine sandy loam, GcA (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, 1981. Soil Survey of Santa Barbara County, California South Coastal Part). However, this portion of the site was not conserved upon the initial manufacturing/industrial development of the site in the 1960's; therefore, the soil was converted at that time. As a result, the proposed project would not convert and any Prime Farmland. Furthermore, the proposed project would not convert any Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as mapped by the California Resources Agency. There are no agriculturally zoned properties or properties under a Williamson contract in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not result in any environmental changes that would involve the conversion of any farmland to non-agricultural uses and therefore the project would have no impact on agricultural resources in the area.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative impact on agricultural resources within the City of Goleta.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

No residual impacts (either project specific or cumulative) on agricultural resources would occur as a result of project implementation.

AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Unclassifiable
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		■			
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		■			
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)?			■		
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		■			
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			■		
Greenhouse Gases					
f. Emissions equivalent to or greater than 25,000 metric tons of CO ₂ from both stationary and mobile sources during long-term operations.					■

Existing Setting: Criteria Pollutants

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

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

Existing Setting: Global Climate Change/Greenhouse Gases

Emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) accumulate in the atmosphere, where these gases trap heat near the Earth's surface by absorbing infrared radiation. This effect causes global warming and climate change, with adverse impacts on humans and the environment. These impacts could result in reduced water supplies in some areas, ecological changes that threaten some species, reduced agricultural productivity in some areas, increased coastal flooding, and other effects.

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

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

Thresholds of Significance: Criteria Pollutants

A significant Air Quality impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* has identified a long term quantitative emission threshold of significance of 25 pounds/day (PPD) for ozone precursors nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and reactive organic gases (ROGs). In addition, the City's thresholds establish criteria for conducting carbon monoxide (CO) emission modeling. However, the Santa Barbara County APCD has indicated that due to the relatively low background ambient CO levels in Santa Barbara County, localized CO impacts associated with traffic at congested intersections are not expected to exceed the CO health-related air quality standards. As a result, "hotspot" analyses are no longer required. (Vijaya Jammalamadaka, SBCAPCD, 08/05/08)

Short term thresholds for NO_x and ROG emissions have not been established by the City due to the fact that such emissions generally result from construction activities. Under prior modeling by the County of Santa Barbara, such emissions were determined to account for only 6% of total NO_x and ROG emissions. However, due to the fact that Santa Barbara County is not in compliance with State standards for airborne particulate

matter (PM₁₀), construction generated fugitive dust (50% of total dust) is subject to the City's standard dust mitigation requirements.

Thresholds of Significance: Global Climate Change/Greenhouse Gases

Currently, neither the State of California or the City of Goleta have established CEQA significance thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions. However, the California Office of Planning & Research (OPR) has issued a Technical Advisory titled *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review* (dated June 19, 2008, available at the OPR website, www.opr.ca.gov). This advisory provides guidance to land use agencies in the interim period, until the state CEQA Guidelines are revised. The advisory states on page 4, in the third paragraph, "*Public agencies are encouraged but not required to adopt thresholds of significance for environmental impacts. Even in the absence of clearly defined thresholds for GHG emissions, the law requires that such emissions from CEQA projects must be disclosed and mitigated to the extent feasible whenever the lead agency determines that the project contributes to a significant, cumulative climate change impact.*" Furthermore, the advisory document indicates in the third bullet item on page 6 that "*in the absence of regulatory standards for GHG emissions or other scientific data to clearly define what constitutes a 'significant impact', individual lead agencies may undertake a project-by-project analysis, consistent with available guidance and current CEQA practice.*"

The City's methodology to address Global Climate Change in CEQA documents is evolving. The current methodology entails two steps: (1) quantification of the project's GHG emissions, or provide a qualified discussion where quantification is not yet feasible, and (2) identification of opportunities to reduce the project's GHG emissions. These two steps are addressed below; while step 3 is addressed in the Geology/Soils, Hydrology/Water Quality, and Public Services sections of this document. Wait for call back from Robin B. at CCC, then update this... and other sections accordingly.

Furthermore, the City has reviewed much of the available subject analysis including the CAPCOA paper on CEQA and climate change referenced above. Based on this review, the City believes the intent of the stakeholder agencies at this time is to target the larger sources of GHG emissions rather than every potential project with regards to CEQA analysis and subsequent impact discussion. To that end, until a good threshold is determined, the City believes it is safe to say that any project with GHG emissions (inclusive of construction and operational emissions as estimated by APCD's latest URBEMIS software program – URBEMIS 2007, Version 9.2.4) greater than the GHG reporting requirement required under ARB Resolution 07-54 (25,000 metric tons or more of CO₂ equivalent per year) should be considered significant.¹ Projects below these levels remain unclassifiable until more evidence becomes available.

¹ California Air Resources Board Resolution 07-54 establishes 25,000 metric tons of GHG emissions as the threshold for identifying the largest stationary emission sources in California

Project Specific Impacts

Short Term Construction Impacts

- a-d) Short term air quality impacts generally occur during project grading. Preliminary earthwork quantities for Phase II are estimated at 4,878 yd³ of cut and 3,860 yd³ of fill (1,018 yd³ of excess fill material to be removed from the site). Phase III preliminary earthwork quantities are estimated at 3,043 yd³ of both cut and fill with no excess fill material. As a result of this much proposed grading, and the air basin's current non-attainment of State PM₁₀ standards, any project generated fugitive dust would be considered to pose a potentially significant air quality impact associated with PM₁₀ emissions.

Although the City has not established short-term quantitative thresholds for NO_x and ROG emissions generated by construction equipment, fine particulate emissions from diesel equipment exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the State of California. As such, project specific impacts on air quality standards or existing air quality violations as well as project contributions to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations in the City as a result of construction activities would be considered potentially significant.

Furthermore, the project will involve demolition of existing structures which may release regulated 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, project specific impacts on air quality standards or existing air quality violations as well as project contributions to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations in the City as a result of construction activities would be considered potentially significant.

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

for purposes of requiring the annual reporting of emissions. This threshold is just over 0.005% of California's total inventory of GHG emissions for 2004.

- f) The proposed project would generate GHGs including water vapor, CO₂ and fluorocarbons which absorb infrared radiation in the atmosphere. Because different GHGs have varying levels of heat absorption, CO₂ is commonly used as a “reference gas” to relate the amount of heat absorbed to the level of GHGs emitted. As such, project generated levels of CO₂ would be considered the project’s contribution to cumulative GHGs & global climate change. Again, using URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4 air quality modeling software, it is anticipated that project generated CO₂ emission levels (vehicular & source) would be 1,788.35 PPD or 296.1 metric tons per year, and construction generated CO₂ emission levels would be 5,770.54 PPD or 955.4 metric tons per year. As both the project and construction generated CO₂ emission levels would be less than the City’s interim significance threshold for GHG’s of 25,000 metric tons per year, the project’s contribution to GHG emissions are not classifiable.

Long Term Operational Impacts

- a-e) Traffic from future use of the proposed clean room and office space would lead to a corresponding increase in vehicular emissions in the area. To determine whether vehicular emissions resulting the proposed project would likely exceed the City’s significance threshold of 25 PPD for stationary and mobile sources of reactive organic gases (ROGs) or nitrous oxides (NO_x), the APCD Land Use Screening Table (June 2008) was consulted. Based on such screening criteria, the proposed project falls below the thresholds identified in the table based on project size. APCD’s latest URBEMIS software program (URBEMIS 2007, Version 9.2.4) was also used to calculate long term emissions from both project generated motor vehicle trips and source emissions from the project itself (e.g. water heaters, space heaters, landscape maintenance, consumer products, architectural coatings, etc). Using this air quality modeling software (using trip generation numbers from the project’s traffic study), it is estimated that project generated vehicular emissions would be approximately 1.23 PPD of ROGs and 1.46 PPD NO_x, while source emissions would be 0.43 PPD of ROGs, and 0.91 PPD of NO_x for a total estimated project generated air emission load of 1.66 PPD of ROGs and 2.37 PPD of NO_x, well below the 25 PPD threshold for either ozone precursor. Furthermore, due to the relatively low background ambient CO levels in Santa Barbara County, localized CO impacts associated with traffic at congested intersections are not expected to exceed the CO health-related air quality standards.

However, the operation of R&D, manufacturing, and office uses would potentially generate long-term emissions from area sources, such as natural gas-fired space and water heaters, boilers, utility equipment used for maintenance and landscaping activities, and various process activities (such as solvent usage). As specific operational characteristics of the proposed R&D activities are presently unknown, process activity emissions cannot be estimated at this time. However, if these emissions were substantial, they would fall under the jurisdiction of the

APCD permit process, which would result in the application of standard mitigation measures and permit conditions, and/or emission offsets. Such an impact is considered potentially significant.

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

Cumulative Impacts

Per the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual*, a project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considered significant if the project's total emissions of either NO_x or ROG exceed the long term threshold of 25 PPD. The proposed project's contribution to overall emissions associated with buildout of the new clean room and office building would be less than this threshold, and therefore the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts involving NO_x and ROG would be considered less than significant. However, as noted above, the project's contribution to cumulative PM₁₀ emissions would be considered potentially significant as a result of the area's current non-attainment status regarding the State standard.

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

Required Mitigation Measures

1. If the construction site is graded and left undeveloped for over four weeks, the applicant shall employ the following methods immediately to inhibit dust generation:
 - a) Seeding and watering to revegetate graded areas; and/or
 - b) Spreading of soil binders; and/or
 - c) Any other methods deemed appropriate by City staff.

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

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

2. Dust generated by construction activities shall be kept to a minimum with a goal of retaining dust on the site. The following dust control measures listed below shall be implemented by the contractor/builder:
 - a) During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems are to be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.
 - b) During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the later morning and after work is completed for the day and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.
 - c) Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, containerized, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation in accordance with the property's Soil Management Plan to prevent emissions of chlorinated VOCs from the contaminated soils on site (reference the Hazardous and Hazardous Materials section of this document for further detail).

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

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

3. During all project grading and hauling, construction contracts must specify that construction contractors shall adhere to the requirements listed below to reduce emissions of ozone precursors and particulate emissions from diesel exhaust:
 - a. All portable diesel-powered construction equipment shall be registered with the state's portable equipment registration program OR shall obtain an APCD permit.
 - b. Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.
 - c. Diesel construction equipment meeting the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines

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

Plan Requirements & Timing: The construction emission requirements shall be printed all plans submitted for any LUP, building, or grading permits.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance with requirements for printing the aforementioned construction emission requirements on all plans submitted for any LUP, building, or grading permits. APCD inspectors shall verify compliance in the field.

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

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

5. Prior to the demolition or remodeling of any structure on site constructed before 1979, the applicant shall complete and submit an APCD Asbestos Demolition and Renovation Compliance Checklist. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** The aforementioned permit requirement shall be noted on all plans submitted for issuance of any building or grading permits for the project. At least ten (10) working days prior to commencing any construction activities, the applicant shall submit the aforementioned permit application to the APCD.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance with requirements for printing the aforementioned APCD permit requirements on all plans submitted for any building or grading permits. APCD inspectors shall verify compliance in the field.

Further mitigation measures to address exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations are described under the discussion of Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Recommended Mitigation Measures

6. The following energy-conserving techniques, that substantially exceed the minimum Title 24 energy conservation requirements, shall be incorporated unless the applicant demonstrates their infeasibility to the satisfaction of City of Goleta staff:
 - a) Use of water-based paint on exterior surfaces;
 - b) Use of passive solar cooling/heating;
 - c) Use of energy efficient appliances;
 - d) Use of natural lighting;
 - e) Installation of energy efficient lighting;
 - f) Use of drought-tolerant native or Mediterranean landscaping subject to Planning and Environmental Services staff and Design Review Board (DRB) approval to shade buildings and parking lots;
 - g) Encouragement of the use of transit, bicycling, and walking by providing infrastructure to promote their use;
 - h) Provision of segregated waste bins for recyclable materials; and

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

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

Residual Impact

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project specific as well as project contributions to cumulative air quality impacts involving ROG_s, NO_x and PM₁₀ would be considered less than significant. Project contributions to GHG emissions would be reduced through implementation of the recommended mitigation measures noted above.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
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?				■	
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?		■			
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 subject site is occupied by a manufacturing/industrial use building, hazardous materials storage shed, and associated parking, miscellaneous paving, and landscaping. No special-status wildlife or plant species were observed during a field reconnaissance survey, nor were any documented records found of sensitive species at or adjacent to the project area (Biological Assessment, 26 Coromar Drive, Watershed Environmental, July 11, 2006). The north side of the building faces Coromar Drive and is landscaped with turf grass, two Canary Island palm trees, and three Mexican fan palms. Asiatic jasmine and juniper have been planted near the front entrance to the building and in planters adjacent to the parking lots. Other landscape features include a Eugenia hedgerow along the eastern property line, a podocarpus hedgerow along the southern property line, and a Canary Island palm tree and a small picnic area adjacent to the parking lot on the east side of the building. The only portion of the property that is

not developed or landscaped is on the east side of the site. Weed abatement (mowing) is performed on an as-needed basis in this area by the facility landscape contractor for wildfire protection.

Thresholds of Significance

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

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

Project Specific Impacts

- a) Both Phases of the proposed project would not result in any direct affect on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species or modification to any habitat of such species. The existing building on project site has been used for the Renco Encoders manufacturing/industrial use since 1972. Only 12% of the existing landscaping on site consists of native species, and these species will be undisturbed during project construction, and are included with the site's proposed landscape plan. The parcels adjacent to the subject property are all developed with industrial facilities, with the exception to the property to the east, which has not been developed or landscaped. The nearest habitat of any biological value lies approximately 800-feet east of the subject property (Glen Annie Creek). As such, impacts on any candidate, sensitive, or listed species are not anticipated as a result of project implementation.
- b,c) Phase II of the proposed project would cover the project site with approximately 39.7% of the lot area with impervious surface, and Phase III will cover the site with 34.5% impervious surface. Most of these impervious surfaces would be comprised of a parking lot for employees on site. Runoff from large parking areas is often contaminated with a mix of petroleum products and other pollutants resulting from vehicular use. In addition, tailwater from landscape irrigation is often contaminated with fertilizers, pesticides, fungicides, and herbicides resulting from improper application methods and/or over-application. All such contaminants can pose potentially significant, adverse effects on sensitive riparian systems, surface water quality, and wetlands such as Goleta Slough.

As proposed, all stormwater runoff from the existing parking lot along the south side of the building will drain across the newly constructed permeable concrete parking stalls and then into a vegetated bio-swale before discharging to any inlets and leaving the site. The remainder of the new parking lot will be constructed with permeable concrete parking stalls and will drain through a pervious ribbon gutter before discharging to any inlets and leaving the site. The inlets include a bio-filtering mechanism prior to discharge off site: Such improvements, if properly designed and maintained, can provide for significant runoff filtration which could ensure that stormwater discharged into the City's stormdrain system would not pose a significant threat to water quality in Tecolotito Creek and ultimately Goleta Slough. However, if such improvements are not properly designed and/or implemented, project impacts on surface water quality would be potentially significant.

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

- d-f) Due to surrounding urban development, and the intervening, approximately 800-feet between the project site and the Glen Annie riparian corridor, the proposed commercial project, including exterior lighting, would not have any significant effect on 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.

The proposal is subject to compliance with the City's Stormwater Management Program Ordinance, and compliance with said program will be required. The only sensitive biological resources onsite (e.g. native trees, sensitive habitat types such as wetlands or native grasslands, or sensitive bird species nesting/roosting sites) that would be subject to City protective policies are *Ambrosia Psilostachya* 'western ragweed,' *Conyze Canadensis* 'horseweed,' and *Rumex Crispus* 'curly dock,' all of which will be undisturbed by the construction and implementation of the proposed project.

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

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required Mitigation Measures

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

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

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

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

3. To ensure that the City approved stormwater water quality protection improvements are adequately maintained for the life of the project, the applicant shall prepare a stormwater system maintenance program for review and approval by City staff. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** Said maintenance program shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the

project. The plan shall include provisions for the submittal of an annual maintenance report to City staff outlining all system maintenance measures undertaken by the applicant in the prior year reporting period for a period of five (5) years after issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the project. Subsequent to this five year reporting period, the applicant shall maintain records of all yearly maintenance measures for review by City staff on demand for the life of the project.

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

Residual Impact

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

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

Existing Setting

As provided in Section 3.5 *Cultural Resources* of the City's General Plan Final EIR, the city is known to contain prehistoric, ethnographic, historical and paleontological resources. The General Plan identifies areas where known archaeological resources exist. Figure 3.5-1 of the City of Goleta General Plan Final EIR shows areas containing sensitive historic/cultural resources, identifying 46 historic resource locations. The project site is not shown to contain significant archaeological, paleontological or historical resources.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

- a) The project site is not shown to contain significant archaeological, paleontological or historical resources (City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Figure 6-2). The nearest identified resource occurs approximately 350-feet to the southwest at the intersection of Hollister Avenue and Coromar Drive, which has been identified as the former entrance of the Glen Annie Ranch. This ranch encompassed the subject property and became the Bishop Ranch in 1890. Furthermore, a Phase 1 archaeological survey of the site was conducted by MacFarlane Archaeological Consultants in 2004, when the property was the subject of a previous development application. The study did not reveal any

cultural resources, and concluded that it is highly unlikely that any intact prehistoric or historical archaeological deposits exist on site.

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

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required Mitigation Measures

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

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

Residual Impact

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, the project's residual impacts on cultural resources would be less than significant.

GEOLOGY & SOILS

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

Existing Setting

The project site is gently sloping from the northwest to the southeast with contour lines ranging from 100 to 96. Based on lithologic information from soil borings drilled at the site beneath the existing building consists of approximately two feet of silty sand fill material, underlain by native silty sand to depths ranging from approximately five to nine feet bgs. Silt and sandy silt are present beneath the silty sand to depths ranging from 22 to 27 feet bgs. This silt zone is underlain by a relatively thick and continuous clay layer that is present to a minimum depth of 40 feet bgs and is of unknown thickness (Soil Management Plan Renco Encoders, Inc.; Prepared by LFR, Inc. April 30, 2007).

The soil on site consists primarily of Camarillo Fine Sandy Loam (Ca), which is only a few feet above sea level (1980 Soil Survey of Santa Barbara County, California: South Coastal Part). A smaller area of the site contains the Goleta fine sandy loam, GcA soil type, which is generally free from flooding, but could be occasionally flooded by overflow water from higher elevations. Historical studies on site dating back to 1991 document elevated soil and soil gas concentrations of trichloroethene (TCE), 1, 1, 1 trichloroethane (1,1,1-TCA), and trichlorofluoromethane (Freon 113) in shallow soil samples and soil gas samples collected from beneath the northeast and east portions of the facility. Maximum TCE concentrations in soil (8,000 micrograms per kilogram [$\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$]) were detected in the chemical storage area located on the eastside of the existing building on site. The maximum soil gas concentrations for TCE were also detected in this general area of the site (Remedial Action Plan Renco Encoders Site 26 Coromar Drive Goleta, California February 13, 2001 LFR 8031.00).

The nearest earthquake fault, an un-named, inferred fault lies approximately 445-feet to the south of the project site. The nearest, known, active fault (the More Ranch Fault) is approximately .7-miles to the south (USGS California Preliminary Geologic Map of the Santa Barbara Coastal Plain Area; Santa Barbara County (2006) by Scott A. Minor, Karl S. Kellogg, et al.).

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

- a,b) There are no Alquist-Priolo mapped earthquake faults or zones within the City of Goleta (Safety Element of the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan; 2006). Due to the distance between the project site and the nearest, known, active fault (the More Ranch Fault approximately .7-miles to the south) potential seismic risks are considered to be adverse but less than significant.
- c,d,f,g) Soil and geologic conditions onsite are of the type that pose a significant potential for becoming unstable as a result project implementation and could contribute to on or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. This is due to the classification of soils on site as highly compressible (City of Goleta GP/CLUP EIR Figure 3.6-3). Therefore, soils onsite are considered to be sufficiently expansive to pose a substantial risk to life or property, and hence, such potential impacts are considered potentially significant.
- e) The proposed project does involve some grading and excavation which could result in erosion and sediment loss from stockpiled soils and graded areas onsite. Mitigation to address such potentially significant geologic impacts is discussed in detail under the Hydrology & Water Resources section.
- h) The proposed project would be connected to the Goleta Sanitary District's central sewage effluent collection system and would not involve the use of any onsite septic system, therefore no such impacts would occur as a result of the project.

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The project shall comply with the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Study prepared by Pacific Materials Laboratory of Santa Barbara, Inc. dated August 31, 2000. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** Said plan must be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department and Planning and Environmental Services Department prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit for the project.

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

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

City of Goleta
Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration
Renco Encoders Addition
May 1, 2009

Residual Impact

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

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		■			
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?		■			
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				■	
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and , as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		■			
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?				■	
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?				■	
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				■	
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?				■	

Existing Setting

The site has been used by Renco Encoders since 1972, and operations on site currently include the designing and manufacturing of rotary optical encoders for a wide variety of electronic instrument applications.² The site's historical operations used and stored limited quantities of chemicals at the site. Chlorinated solvents were used during metal cleaning and plating processes and the waste stream generated during the

² Health and Safety Plan for Soil Excavation Activities at Renco Encoders, Inc.

cleaning process was directed through floor drains to underground sumps. These activities resulted in the release of chlorinated solvents to soil and groundwater. In compliance with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements, a Remedial Action Plan was prepared by LFR, Inc. (Renco Encoders consultant) dated February 13, 2001. The primary purpose of the plan is to remediate residual soil contamination that can contribute to prolonged groundwater degradation and to remediate the dissolved-phase groundwater plume on site.

Previous cleanup activities include the removal of 13-tons of contaminated soil from the suspected source area (sump) for chlorinated solvents. To remove additional chlorinated solvents in the soil, LFR, Inc. initiated remediation with the injection of a specialty reagent (Hydrogen Release Compound®, a food grade polymer) at the site and on a portion of the adjacent downgradient property (the Nexxus property), southeast of the site in September of 2001. This biodegradable reagent enhanced anaerobic biodegradation, reduced chemical concentrations, and improved soil and groundwater quality (California Regional Water Control Board Central Coast Region Public Notice of Amendment to Remedial Action Plan Renco Encoders, Inc.).

Beginning in February of 2002, LFR, Inc. operated a soil vapor extraction and treatment systems (SVETS) under the direction of the Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District to remove Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) from shallow soil beneath and immediately surrounding the Renco building. The SVETS operated continuously from February, 2002 through July, 2002. Commencing in August of 2002, LFR performed several pulse-mode operation events of the SVETS to evaluate whether rebound of VOCs would occur. In general, no significant rebound in vapor concentrations was detected following the shut-down periods. The SVETS was shut down in June of 2004 (Health and Safety Plan for Soil Excavation Activities at Renco Encoders, Inc.). While SVETS removed CVOCs from the soil, it still contains significant contamination and the lack of rebound does not indicate that contamination has been fully remediated. (Paul McCaw, SBCFD; 03/05/09).

From September of 2002 through April of 2003, LFR, Inc. conducted a pilot study that included injection of three different enhanced in-situ bioremediation products (HRC-X®, WILClear™, and LactOil) to evaluate and compare their effectiveness as well as determine the design parameters of a full-scale application of the chosen substrate. Based on the results of the pilot study, LFR installed an HRC-X® treatment fence downgradient from the site facility during January of 2004. Then, in July and August of 2006, LFR, Inc. performed an injection of EOS® and EHC™ substrates to enhance anaerobic biodegradation of VOCs in groundwater beneath the site. Groundwater monitoring has occurred on a quarterly basis since. Laboratory results and chemical parameters measured in the field during the most recent (first quarter 2008) groundwater monitoring event indicated successful reductive dechlorination in soil and groundwater. However, while there has been some reduction in COVCs concentration in groundwater, additional remediation may be required.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

- a-b) The proposed additions to the existing manufacturing/industrial use development would involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials including , omegaclean, acetone, micro 90, Kodak accumax rapid access developer and replenisher, Kodak glacial acetic acid, Kodak rapid fixer and replenisher, chrome etch CE-8001-N, microposit 351 developer, microposit remover 112 A, waste solids (wipes, swabs, etc.), waste vignon / omegaclean mixture, waste shipley development mixture, waste Kodak development mixture, waste chrome etchant, waste acetone and waste safety cool 130 and trip sol. The use of these materials is under the jurisdiction of the Santa Barbara County Fire Department's Fire Prevention Division, which has approved a hazardous materials business plan for the site. Nonetheless, the routine transport, use, or disposal of these hazardous materials pose a significant potential for the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment, and therefore, poses a potentially significant public health risk and/or environmental impact.

Moreover, soils and groundwater on site are contaminated with residual VOCs. Potential chemicals of concern include 1,1-Dichloroethane, 1,2 Dichloroethane, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, 1,2 Dichloroethylene, 1,1,1 Trichloroethane, Freon 113 (1,2,2-Trifluoroethane), Trichloroethylene, and Trichlorofluoromethane. Grading of these soils would expose construction workers, Renco employees as well as employees at nearby sites to inhalation of airborne contaminants, direct skin contact with contaminated materials and incidental ingestion of affected media³. This would also pose a potentially significant public health risk and/or environmental impact.

The proposed project would not result in any additional water quality violations, and the site's soil and groundwater contamination will continue to be monitored by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) under the existing, approved Remedial Action Plan. Furthermore, the project would not result in any

³ Health and Safety Plan for Soil Excavation Activities at Renco Encoders, Inc., April 25, 2007

wastewater discharge violating any State or Federal water quality standards or requiring Wastewater Discharge Requirement Orders (WDRs) from the RWCQB. All sewage effluent would be handled via connection to the Goleta Sanitary District's central sewer system. It is unlikely that the grading activities would require soil dewatering, but in the case that it does, it would result in a potentially significant impact.

- c) The proposed additions would not result in hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school as there is not a school within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the project site. Hence, the project would pose no impact related to hazardous emissions near schools.
- d) As noted above, the project site contains VOC soil and groundwater contamination as a result of chlorinated solvent waste streams that were directed through floor drains of the building to underground sumps. Since 1992, remediation work has been undertaken with ongoing monitoring of groundwater and soil vapors. According to CRWQCB staff (Katie DiSimone, 04/09/09), an Amendment to the Remedial Action Plan – Updated Scope of Work for the Renco Encoders Site, was approved on February 13, 2009. This Amendment defines the scope of work to address the groundwater plume from the Renco site on down gradient properties. This work will improve understanding of the nature of migration of chemicals from the affected upgradient ground water, as well as better delineate the geologic formations to facilitate future remedial design and implementation through reagent application. As the continued presence of residual volatile organic compound contamination in the soils and groundwater in the area still exist, the project poses a potentially significant public health and environmental risk.
- e,f) Although the project site does lie within two miles of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, it is located well to the northwest of the main runway Approach Zone and well west of the secondary N/S runway approach zone. As such, the proposed project poses no safety risk or hazard resulting from its proximity to the airport for employees, residents, or visitors to the 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 proposed project would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Due to its location within the urban core of the City, and well outside of the wildland fire hazard area (City of Goleta General Plan/Local Coastal Plan Figure 5-2), the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Cumulative Impacts

Project specific risks associated with the residual presence of volatile organic compound contamination in the area would represent a potentially significant contribution to the cumulative exposure of people to such hazardous wastes.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. A detailed plan shall be submitted to the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division and the City of Goleta for the installation of a chemical vapor barrier that is to be placed beneath the footprint of the proposed building additions. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** Said plan must be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department and the City of Goleta prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit for the project.

Monitoring: Santa Barbara County Fire Department and City staff shall inspect the vapor barrier prior to placement of any additional material on top of it.

2. The applicant shall continue to comply with the most up-to-date Regional Water Quality Control Board Remedial Action Plan for the site. In the event that soil dewatering is required, the applicant shall comply with discharge requirements pursuant to RWQCB regulations. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** This requirement shall be noted on all grading and building plans.

Monitoring: City staff and a qualified and properly trained LFR staff member (as determined by the SBCFD) shall site inspect during grading to monitor soil conditions.

3. The contaminated soils generated during construction must be managed per the Santa Barbara County Fire Department's Fire Prevention Division (SBCFD) approved Final Soil Management Plan (January 28, 2009). Workers involved in these activities shall have appropriate Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) training/certifications (e.g., 40-hour HAZWOPER); Access to the site shall be maintained to allow for on-going assessment/remediation activities as required by the SBCFD. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be noted on all grading and building plans.

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

4. All grading, construction and landscaping activities on site shall comply with the project's Soil Management Plan as well as the project's Health and Safety Plan for Soil Excavation Activities at Renco Encoders, Inc. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** These requirements shall be noted on all plans submitted for issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: City staff, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, and Santa Barbara County Fire Department shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance.

The Geology Section of this document contains applicable mitigation measures involving compliance with the conclusions and recommendations in the site's Geotechnical Study prepared August 31, 2000 by Pacific Materials Laboratory of Santa Barbara, Inc.

Residual Impact

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be less than significant.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		■			
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)?				■	
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?		■			
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?		■			
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?		■			
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		■			
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?				■	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				■	
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?				■	
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			■		

Existing Setting

The site is located approximately two-miles from the Pacific Ocean and surface water runoff in the area is largely controlled by an engineered drainage system, which empties into Tecolotito Creek. Tecolotito Creek empties into the nearby Goleta Slough, which in turn drains to the Pacific Ocean (CRWQCB Public Notice of Amendment to Remedial Action Plan). As stated above under the “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” section of

this document, the groundwater on site is contaminated with volatile organic compounds resulting from waste streams draining from the existing building into underground sumps on site. Hence, chlorinated solvents were released into the soil and groundwater. The clean-up activities associated with this contamination are regulated by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, whom has implemented groundwater monitoring conducted at the site on a quarterly basis under a Remedial Action Plan.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

- a) As described in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section, the proposed project would not result in any additional water quality violations as long as there are not any accidental releases. The site's soil and groundwater contamination will continue to be monitored by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) under the existing, approved Remedial Action Plan. Furthermore, the project would not result in any wastewater discharge violating any State or Federal water quality standards or requiring Wastewater Discharge Requirement Orders (WDRs) from the RWCQB. All sewage effluent would be handled via connection to the Goleta Sanitary District's central sewer system. It is possible that the grading activities would require soil dewatering. If soil dewatering is necessary or if there are any accidental releases of hazardous materials, the project would pose a potentially significant impact.
- b) The project development would result in an increase of impervious surfaces, which would reduce infiltration on-site of rainwater. However, the site does not significantly contribute to groundwater basin recharge, and as such, the project would not create an impact related to groundwater recharge. Furthermore, the proposed project does not draw any water from any wells (all water supplied to the site is obtained from the Goleta Water District); therefore, the proposed project would not create any impacts related to groundwater supply.
- c,d) The existing drainage pattern of the site and area will remain the same upon project implementation with the exception of the addition of permeable concrete

and ribbon gutter, a vegetated bio swale, landscape features, and sidewalk drain pipes that will allow for the overland escape from possible flooding to go under the sidewalk and not sheetflow over the sidewalk. Also, the site is not within the 100-year flood zone. Preliminary earthwork quantities for Phase II are estimated at 4,878 yd³ of cut and 3,860 yd³ of fill (1,018 yd³ of excess fill material to be removed from the site). Phase III preliminary earthwork quantities are estimated at 3,043 yd³ of both cut and fill with no excess fill material. Grading activities for project construction are estimated to occur over a several week period. If construction activities extend into the rainy season, the project site could generate a significant amount of sediment laden stormwater runoff. The discharge of sediment laden runoff from the project site could result in substantial site erosion and siltation of downstream receiving waterbodies such as Tecolotito Creek and Goleta Slough. Such impacts would be considered potentially significant.

- e,f) A large percentage of the project site would be impervious with 34.5% (approximately 53,611 ft²) consisting of paved parking and driveways. As proposed, the project includes permeable concrete and a ribbon gutter, a vegetated bio swale, landscape features, one bio-filtered stormwater catch basin and two catch basins located in landscaped areas for natural bio-filtration to treat and control stormwater runoff prior to discharge into the City's stormdrain system. As noted in the discussion under Biological Resources of this document, large parking and driveway areas are prime sources for the introduction of petroleum and other vehicular pollutants to stormwater runoff while landscape irrigation tailwaters can potentially be contaminated with fertilizers, herbicides, insecticides, etc. Under the proposed project, all stormwater runoff and irrigation tailwater discharged from the property would first flow through the bio-filtered catch basin and landscape planter catch basins before being discharged into the gutter along Cortona Drive and ultimately conveyed to Tecolotito Creek and Goleta Slough. As noted in the previous discussion, such a stormwater quality/control system has the potential to provide for significant filtration of runoff, if properly designed and maintained. Therefore, project impacts on water quality are considered potentially significant.
- g,h,i) The project does not propose any housing and the site is not within the 100-year flood hazard area and will not place any structures into the 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows. Moreover, there are no levees or dams that, if failed, would flood the site. Hence, it is very unlikely that this project will have an impact related to flood hazards.
- j) As shown on Figure 5-2 of the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, the area around Goleta Slough and the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is subject to a moderate threat of exposure to tsunamis. However, only one tsunami has ever been well documented (1927) and only one other event (1812) is even noted in any records of the area (although poorly documented). Furthermore, due to

topography of the ocean floor in the Santa Barbara Channel, presence of the blocking offshore Channel Islands, and lack of any near-shore oceanic trench that facilitates tsunami wave heights in other regions of the world (abrupt shallowing of coastal waters), tsunami wave heights are not expected to be significant in this area. Based on the very low frequency of previously recorded tsunamis as well as the limited potential for tsunamis of large height in this area, potential risks posed by future tsunamis on property and people in the vicinity of the project site is considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required Mitigation Measures

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

Monitoring: City staff shall verify construction of all drainage/hydrology facilities per the final drainage and hydrology study prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy.

2. To ensure adequate onsite filtration of all stormwater runoff prior to discharge into the City's stormdrain system and ultimately Tecolotito Creek/Goleta Slough, the applicant shall provide engineering details on the stormwater filtration elements of the proposed stormwater control system (stormdrains in landscaped planters and subsurface retardation facilities) as well as capacity specifications for such improvements for review and approval by City staff. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** Said specifications and engineering details shall be

submitted to the City for staff review and approval prior to any LUP issuance for the project.

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

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

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

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

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

Further mitigation measures to address continued groundwater remediation/monitoring and soil dewatering if groundwater is encountered during grading are described under the discussion of Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts would be considered less than significant.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Physically divide an established community?				■	
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?				■	
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				■	

Existing Setting

The project site lies at the SE corner of the Coromar/Cortona intersection in the central business district of the City, and is surrounded by other similar manufacturing/industrial development. The project site is subject to the goals, policies, and objectives of the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan as well as the Article III of the City of Goleta Municipal Code (the Inland Zoning Ordinance).

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

- a) The proposed project would be constructed on the north side of the existing manufacturing/industrial building. It would not divide nor introduce an incompatible use within the already existing manufacturing/industrial development in the area. No such associated impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.
- b) The proposed project complies with all development standards of the Industrial Research Park M-RP zone district under the Inland Zoning Ordinance (IZO) as well as the development standards (floor area ratio, max lot coverage, minimum open space, & minimum lot size) or applicable policies for land designated as "Business Park" under the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. As such, no policy inconsistency impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

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

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is either required or recommended.

Residual Impact

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

MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
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?				■	
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?				■	

Existing Setting

There are no known mineral resources onsite of any significance. The project site has been developed with the existing, main, industrial/manufacturing building on site, and prior to that, was a part of the Glen Annie/Bishop Ranch..

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

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

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

The proposed project would not result in any residual impacts on mineral resources.

NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			■		
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				■	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		■			
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		■			
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?			■		
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?				■	

Existing Setting

The project site lies within the 60dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise exposure contour within the City. Noise exposure contours map points of equal average noise levels in the same way that topographic contours map points of equal elevation. The primary sources of noise in the area are vehicular traffic on Cortona, Coromar and Hollister Avenues, aircraft operations at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, and to a lesser extent train traffic on the Union Pacific railroad and vehicular traffic along U.S. Highway 101 (located approximately 1,110 and 1,150-feet to the north, respectively).

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

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

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

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

Thresholds of Significance

A significant noise impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual*. The City's adopted thresholds assume that outdoor CNEL noise levels in excess of 64 dB are considered to pose significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors.

Project Specific Impacts

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

- b,f) The proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. There are no private airports or airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. Such impacts are not anticipated as a result of this project.

- c) The proposed clean room and office additions to the existing manufacturing/industrial use would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. However, the project would increase the amount of mechanical equipment on site, which would increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Such an impact would be considered potentially significant.
- d) As the project site does not have any sensitive receptors within ~2,000' feet of the project site (PhotoMapper), 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 not be considered to pose a potentially significant impact on sensitive receptors in the area. However, the construction noise could affect employees of Renco Encoders and employees located at adjacent and nearby buildings. Hence, construction noise would be considered a potentially significant impact.
- e) Although the project site does lie within the area of influence of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport as defined by the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan, it is outside of any airport noise contour of greater than 65 dB. As such, noise impacts from airport operations on the proposed project would be considered less than significant

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required Mitigation Measures

1. Construction activity for site preparation and for future development shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. No construction shall occur on State holidays (e.g. Christmas, Thanksgiving, Memorial Day, 4th of July, Labor Day). Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (in the event of an emergency, for example) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Environmental Services. **Plan Requirements:** Two signs stating these restrictions shall be provided by the applicant and posted on site prior to commencement of construction. **Timing:** The signs shall be in place prior to beginning of and throughout all grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits.

Monitoring: City staff shall spot to verify compliance and/or respond to complaints.

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

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

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

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

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

Residual Impact

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

POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

Existing Setting

The project site lies within a manufacturing/industrial area centered around the Coromar Drive/Cortona Drive intersection. The property is zoned Industrial Research Park M-RP, and designated as Business Park per the Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The project site has been the location of Renco Encoders since 1972.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

- a) The proposed additions would not create any new residential units, but the additions would contribute the City’s General Plan/Local Coastal Plan projected buildout of the City (General Plan/Local Coastal Plan FEIR Population and Housing Element), and hence, the increase in employment opportunities as well. The anticipated increase in employees resulting from the proposed project would be so minimal that no measurable impact on population growth in the area would occur. No new roads or infrastructure that could support other new development would be required. As such, impacts resulting from potential inducement of population growth in the City would be considered less than significant.
- b,c) The proposed project would not displace any existing housing units or require the displacement of any people thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no such impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required/ Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

Residual impacts on population growth and the area's housing supply, as well as the project's contribution to such cumulative impacts would be less than significant (population) or non-existent (housing).

PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
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:					
a. fire protection?		■			
b. police protection?				■	
c. schools?				■	
d. parks?				■	
e. other public facilities?				■	

Existing Setting

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

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Public Services would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* includes thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools. Specifically, under these thresholds any project that would generate enough students to generate the need for an additional classroom using current State standards, would be considered to result in a significant impact on area schools.⁴

⁴ Current State standards for classroom size are as follows:

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

Project Specific Impacts

- a) Fire Department emergency vehicle access requirements for the project include a minimum width of 20 feet minimum width for all driveways and interior drive aisles, with the exception of the driveway and interior drive aisle along the northwest side of the property, which are both 15 feet in width. (Johnson, September 16, 2008). Therefore, all driveways and interior drive aisles comply with these requirements, and as such, adequate emergency and fire vehicle access is provided for the proposed project.

The minimal increase in the number of employees working at the project site would not generate the need for any additional fire fighting facilities and/or fire fighting personnel in the City. The primary responding County Fire Station for the proposed project would be Station 11 on Storke Road. Also, county fire station 14 at 320 North Los Carneros Road is also in close proximity to the project site. Response times from both stations are within County Fire Department guidelines (five minutes or less). The existing fire hydrant infrastructure in the area is also substandard and does not meet the 300' spacing requirement for commercial areas. Three new fire hydrants and upgrades to the two existing fire hydrants at the project site would be required to ensure adequate fire protection for the proposed project (Martin Johnson, Captain, Fire Prevention Division, Santa Barbara County Fire Department, September 16, 2008). If the fire hydrants are not installed per Fire Department requirements, the project would pose a potentially significant impact to fire services.

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

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The composite utility plan to be prepared by the applicant shall include the installation of three fire hydrants and the upgrading of the existing two fire hydrants on site to serve the proposed project meeting all applicable Santa Barbara County

Fire Department requirements. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** The composite utility plan identifying the location and specifications of the required fire 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 occupancy clearance.

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

Residual Impact

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

RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
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?			■		
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?			■		

Existing Setting

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

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

There are no park facilities proposed as a part of this project. 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. Given the available supply of recreational facilities and the small number of employees added to the area as a result of the proposed project, the project's recreation impacts are considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

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

Residual Impact

The proposed project's residual recreation impacts would be less than significant.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
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)?			■		
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				■	
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				■	
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			■		
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?		■			
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?		■			
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				■	

Existing Setting

The site is bound on the north by Cortona Drive, to the south by a commercial/industrial facility, to the east by a vacant field, to the northeast by a commercial/industrial use, and to the west by Coromar Drive. Access to the site is proposed via an existing two-way driveway off of Coromar Drive on the western side of the site, an existing two-way driveway off of Cortona Drive on the northeastern side of the site, and an existing one-way driveway (enter only) on the northwestern side of the site. Access to the site will not change as a result of the proposed project. The drive aisle between the western

and northeastern driveways would be a 28-foot wide, and the drive aisle beyond the enter only driveway at the northwestern end of the project site is 15-foot wide. Both exiting two-way driveways on site allow both left and right turns onto Coromar and Cortona Drives, respectively. A sidewalk providing pedestrian access already exists along the project frontage on Coromar Avenue; however, there is no sidewalk along the Cortona Drive project frontage. Parking for the proposed project would be provided on site in 98 parking spaces, plus three (3) loading spaces in Phase II and 104 spaces, plus three (3) loading spaces in Phase III.

Thresholds of Significance

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

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

<u>LEVEL OF SERVICE (including the project)</u>	<u>INCREASE IN V/C (greater than)</u>
A	.20
B	.15
C	.10
<u>OR THE ADDITION OF</u>	
D	15 trips
E	10 trips
F	5 trips

- 2) Project access to a major road or arterial road would require a driveway that would create an unsafe situation or a new traffic signal or major revisions to an existing traffic signal.
- 3) Project adds traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g. narrow width, road side ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or receives use which would be incompatible with a substantial increase in traffic (e.g. rural roads with use by farm equipment, livestock, horseback riding, or residential roads with heavy pedestrian or recreational use, etc.) that 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) To facilitate assessment of potential traffic impacts resulting from project implementation, the City of Goleta's consulting Traffic Engineer (Jim Biega) prepared and submitted a traffic study dated August 20, 2007. That study was reviewed and approved by the applicant. Per this traffic study, project trip generation was developed by considering estimation techniques contained in Trip Generation (7th Edition) prepared by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Project trip generation is shown in Table 1.

Roadway segments expected to be affected by the proposed project include Storke Road Avenue both north and south of Hollister Avenue, Hollister Avenue both east and west of Los Carneros Avenue, and Los Carneros both north and south of Hollister Avenue. Existing roadway traffic volumes for each of these road segments is shown in Table 2.

Table 2 indicates that all of the roadway segments likely to be affected by the proposed project currently operate at acceptable levels of service and the addition of 148 new ADTs to this roadway network would not result in traffic volumes that exceed design capacity or degrade existing levels of service significantly. As such, project specific impacts on roadway operations within the project travelshed would be considered less than significant.

Intersection traffic signal warrant evaluations were conducted for the Coromar Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection and the Cortona Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection. Figures 4 and 5 (contained within the traffic study) show the peak hour traffic signal warrants for these intersections. The peak hour traffic signal warrant is not satisfied under existing or existing plus project conditions at the Coromar Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection. The peak hour traffic signal warrant is barely satisfied under existing and existing plus project conditions at the Cortona Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection. The peak hour traffic signal warrant is projected to be satisfied under cumulative and cumulative plus project conditions at both intersections. Motorists accessing Hollister Avenue from each of these intersections under existing conditions were observed to experience relatively minor delays.

In consideration of the lack of a project-specific impact, and in consideration of the signal warrant and delay information listed above, the project is not to be responsible for any modifications to the Coromar Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection or the Cortona Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection. The existing side-street stop control should be maintained at the Coromar Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection and the Cortona Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection until the contribution of cumulative projects traffic to the intersections justify a modification to the intersections. It should also be noted that the project's contribution to the City's GTIP fee could be used toward intersection improvements such as striping modifications or signal installations if more strongly warranted in the future. Therefore, it is found that the project's effect on intersections is less than significant.

Table 1
Project Trip Distribution

ITE 7th Edition Trip Generation Rates

Site Plan Land Use Descriptions	Land Use Category	Unit	AM Peak Hour Rate			PM Peak Hour Rate			ADT Rate
			Inbound %	Outbound %	Rate	Inbound %	Outbound %	Rate	
Renco Encoders	Office	1 Thousand Square-Feet	88%	12%	1.55	17%	83%	1.49	11.01
Renco Encoders	Manufacturing	1 Thousand Square-Feet	77%	23%	0.73	36%	64%	0.74	3.82

Proposed Project Site Land Use Trip Generation

Proposed Project Site Descriptions	Proposed Project Site Land Uses	Amount	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			ADT
			Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total	
Renco Encoders	Office	10.4 Thousand Square-Feet	14	2	16	3	13	15	115
Renco Encoders	Manufacturing	8.8 Thousand Square-Feet	5	1	6	2	4	7	34
TOTAL (Proposed Project Site Land Use Trips)			19	3	23	5	17	22	148

Table 2
Existing Roadway Levels of Service

Roadway Segment	Roadway Classification	Count Year	ADT Traffic Count	Arterial Threshold LOS C	Level of Service
Storke north of Hollister	Major Arterial	2005	40,000 ADT	34,000 ADT	LOS C
Storke south of Hollister	Major Arterial	2005	15,800 ADT	14,300 ADT	LOS C
Hollister east of Los Carneros	Major Arterial	2005	15,700 ADT	34,000 ADT	LOS C
Hollister west of Los Carneros	Major Arterial	2003	23,000 ADT	34,000 ADT	LOS C
Los Carneros north of Hollister	Major Arterial	2005	28,000 ADT	34,000 ADT	LOS C
Los Carneros south of Hollister	Major Arterial	2005	20,500	14,300	LOS C

- b) To assess the project's impact on various intersections within its affected travelshed, the traffic study evaluated thirteen different intersections by comparing existing conditions to cumulative plus project conditions. Signalized Intersection Level of Service (LOS) was calculated utilizing the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) methodology in TRAFFIX software, which generates a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio that is then correlated to a specific level of service. Stop-controlled intersection LOS was calculated using the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology contained in TRAFFIX software, which related delay (seconds/vehicle) to a specific LOS. The resulting LOS's for the intersections studying are shown in Tables 3 and 4. (Jim Biega, Renco Encoders Traffic Evaluations, August 20, 2007). These tables indicate that the project will not exceed the City thresholds (above) and hence, will not cause any project-specific or cumulative impacts during the AM and PM peak hours.

Per the Santa Barbara County Association of Government's (SBCAG) Guidelines, a Congestion Management Analysis should be conducted to identify potential impacts to the Congestion Management Program (CMP) system if total trip generation exceeds 50 peak hour trips or 500 daily trips. A significant impact to the CMP system may occur if:

- i. any roadway or intersection currently operating at LOS A or B decreases operational levels by two levels of service as a result of project added traffic;
- ii. any roadway or intersection operating at LOS C for which project added traffic results in LOS D or worse;
- iii. intersections on the CMP system with existing congestion experience the following as a result of project implementation:

<u>LOS</u>	<u>Added Peak Hour Trips</u>
D	20 trips
E	10 trips
F	10 trips

As shown in Tables 3 and 4, project specific impacts do not exceed these standards as the AM and PM peak trips generated by the project are not concentrated to one intersection, and hence will not add enough trips to any CMP intersection to result in an A or B intersection to decrease by two levels of service or cause a LOS C intersection (there are no LOS D intersections) to worsen to a LOS D intersection. Hence, the project will not cause any project-specific impacts during the AM and PM peak hours.

**Table 3
Existing A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service**

Exhibit 4A - Renco AM LOS Table	2007 AM - Renco			2007 + Project AM - Renco			Project Specific Impacts			2030 AM - Renco			2030 + Project AM - Renco			Project Cumulative Impacts						
	LOS	Avg Del (sec)	Crit V/C	LOS	Avg Del (sec)	Crit V/C	Avg Del (sec)	Crit V/C	Change	Total Project Trips	Crit V/C	Avg Del (sec)	Crit V/C	LOS	Avg Del (sec)	Crit V/C	Change	Total Project Trips	Crit V/C	Avg Del (sec)	Cumulative Impact?	Avg Del Change
#1 Glen Arnie Road/US-101 NB Ramps	B	24.2	0.688	B	24.2	0.689	37.9	0.001	2	No	0.1	0.1	C	25.2	0.723	42.5	0.001	2	No	0.1	No	0.1
#2 Storke Road/US-101 SB Ramps	C	11.4	0.706	C	11.4	0.706	20.7	0	5	No	0.1	0.1	E	18.9	0.92	94.7	0.001	5	No	0.1	No	0.1
#3 Storke Road/Hollister Avenue	B	22.5	0.636	B	22.5	0.638	25.8	0.001	7	No	0	0	D	26.3	0.814	31.1	0.001	7	No	0.1	No	0.1
#4 Cortona Drive/Hollister Avenue	B	1	0.224	B	1	0.226	1	0.002	7	No	0	0	C	2.3	0.394	2.3	0.002	7	No	0	No	0
#5 Coronar Drive/Hollister Avenue	C	0.6	0.22	C	0.6	0.22	0.6	0	7	No	0	0	F	16.1	0.518	16.1	0.001	7	No	0.5	No	0.5
#9 Los Cameros Road/US-101 NB Ramps	A	16.6	0.548	A	16.6	0.55	16.6	0.002	8	No	0	0	C	20.4	0.747	20	0.003	8	No	146.2	No	146.2
#10 Los Cameros Road/US-101 SB Ramps	B	40.6	0.666	B	41.4	0.668	16.2	0.003	10	No	0	0	D	116.8	0.843	26.2	0.003	10	No	0.2	No	0.2
#11 Los Cameros Road/Calle Koral	A	9.7	0.482	A	9.6	0.484	4.4	0.002	10	No	-0.1	-0.1	B	11.3	0.677	6.1	0.002	10	No	0	No	0
#14 Los Cameros Road/Castilian Drive	A	4.5	0.398	A	4.8	0.406	5.6	0.008	12	No	1.1	1.1	B	7.2	0.613	7.7	0.004	12	No	0.1	No	0.1
#15 Los Cameros Road/Hollister Avenue	A	20.6	0.488	A	20.6	0.487	20.8	0.001	3	No	0	0	B	23.8	0.654	25.3	0.001	3	No	0	No	0
#17 Los Cameros Way/Hollister Avenue	A	10.3	0.392	A	10.2	0.393	12.8	0.001	2	No	0	0	A	11.2	0.488	14.9	0	2	No	0	No	0
#305 Marketplace Dr/Hollister Ave	A	3.4	0.432	A	3.4	0.432	4.3	0	2	No	0	0	A	4.2	0.523	5	0.001	2	No	0	No	0
#307 Storke Rd/Marketplace Dr	A	13.8	0.373	A	13.8	0.373	16.7	0	1	No	0	0	A	16.6	0.522	16.9	0.001	1	No	0	No	0

**Table 4
Existing P.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service**

Exhibit 4B - Renco PM LOS Table	2007 PM - Renco			2007 + Project PM - Renco			Project Specific Impacts			2030 PM - Renco			2030 + Project PM - Renco			Project Cumulative Impacts					
	Avg Del (sec)	Crit V/C	Avg Crit Del (sec)	LOS	Avg Del (sec)	Crit V/C	Avg Crit Del (sec)	LOS	Avg Del (sec)	Crit V/C	Avg Crit Del (sec)	LOS	Avg Del (sec)	Crit V/C	Avg Crit Del (sec)	LOS	Crit V/C Change	Total Project Trips	Cumul Impact?	Avg Crit Del Change	
#1 Glen Annie Road/US-101 NB Ramps	21.3	0.661	25	B	21.5	0.662	25.1	B	0.001	4	No	0.1	C	24.5	0.762	31.9	C	0	4	No	0
#2 Storke Road/US-101 SB Ramps	6.8	0.727	15.1	C	6.8	0.727	15.1	C	0	4	No	0	D	10.9	0.887	24.4	D	0	4	No	0
#3 Storke Road/Hollister Avenue	26.5	0.774	29.6	C	26.5	0.776	29.7	C	0.002	6	No	0.1	E	35.7	0.946	42.4	E	0.001	6	No	0.1
#4 Cortona Drive/Hollister Avenue	0.9	0.348	0.9	C	0.9	0.35	0.9	C	0.002	7	No	0	F	232.9	0.805	232.9	F	0.001	7	No	1.9
#5 Coronar Drive/Hollister Avenue	0.7	0.326	0.7	C	0.8	0.33	0.8	C	0.004	7	No	0.1	F	OVERFL	1.006	OVERFL	F	0.004	7	No	#####
#6 Los Cameros Road/US-101 NB Ramps	18.1	0.563	35.4	A	18.1	0.563	35.5	A	0	3	No	0.1	B	18.4	0.602	41.2	B	0	3	No	0.1
#10 Los Cameros Road/US-101 SB Ramps	6.1	0.712	15.7	C	6.1	0.716	15.9	C	0.004	9	No	0.2	E	15.9	0.918	23	E	0.003	9	No	0.4
#11 Los Cameros Road/Calle Koral	12.4	0.766	15.3	C	12.4	0.768	15.3	C	0.002	10	No	0	D	14.2	0.828	17.3	D	0.002	10	No	0
#14 Los Cameros Road/Castilian Drive	16.7	0.589	16.6	A	17	0.594	16.7	A	0.005	13	No	0.1	C	23.3	0.737	33	C	0.005	13	No	0.4
#15 Los Cameros Road/Hollister Avenue	25.4	0.697	27.6	B	25.4	0.697	27.6	B	0	2	No	0	D	30.4	0.841	34	D	0	2	No	0
#17 Los Cameros Way/Hollister Avenue	5	0.54	7.1	A	5	0.54	7.1	A	0	1	No	0	A	5.1	0.584	7.1	A	0	1	No	0
#305 Marketplace Dr/Hollister Ave	12.6	0.537	17.7	A	12.6	0.537	17.7	A	0	1	No	0	A	13	0.573	18.1	A	0	1	No	0
#307 Storke Rd/Marketplace Dr	22.8	0.577	26.4	A	22.8	0.577	26.4	A	0	1	No	0	B	23.1	0.63	23.6	B	0	1	No	0

- c) The proposed project lies outside of any airport approach or clear zone and would have no impact on air traffic patterns.
- e) As noted in the discussion of fire protection services under the section on Public Services of this document, Fire Department emergency vehicle access requirements for the project include a minimum width of 20 feet minimum width for all driveways and interior drive aisles, with the exception of the driveway and interior drive aisle along the northwest side of the property, which are both 15 feet in width. (Johnson, July 2008). Per the proposed site plan, all driveways and interior drive aisles comply with these requirements, and as such. However, if the project is not built to the aforementioned driveway and drive aisle width specifications, the project would present a potentially significant impact to fire protection services.

f) *Long Term Parking*

Phase II of the proposed project would provide 92 standard, non-residential parking spaces (9' x 16½'), which includes six (6) handicapped spaces (minimum of 14' x 16½'), and three loading spaces (10' x 30') for a total of 92 parking spaces, plus three loading spaces. Phase III of the proposed project would provide 110 standard, non-residential parking spaces (typical size proposed is 9' x 17'), including six (6) handicapped spaces (minimum of 14' x 16½'), and three (3) loading spaces (10' x 30') for a total of 110 parking spaces, plus three (3) loading spaces. Phase II parking exceeds the City's minimum parking requirements for the project (89 spaces) and meets the City's minimum requirement for off-street loading facilities for commercial uses. Phase III parking meets the City's minimum parking requirements for the project (110 spaces) as well as the minimum requirement for off-street loading facilities for commercial uses.

In addition, the City's Inland Zoning Ordinance requires minimum drive aisle widths on site to ensure adequate vehicle backing space to safely enter and exit parking spaces with a minimum of turning movements. The minimum width of the drive aisle on the south and southwest side of the property (in accordance with the City's Inland Zoning Ordinance) is 60.5-feet measured from the front of one parking space to the front the opposing space as such spaces are 90⁰ from the drive aisle itself. The minimum width of the drive aisle on the east side and north sides of the property are 43.5-feet and 46-feet, respectively. The project as proposed is in conformance with these minimum drive aisle widths which ensures that the interior vehicular circulation and parking plan is fully functional. However, the current plans are conceptual and if the project is not built as currently proposed, the project could pose a potentially significant impact on parking.

Short Term Construction Parking

Vehicular access to the project site for construction activities and workers is available from both Cortona and Coromar Drives (both classified as local streets and roads in the City's GP/CLUP Figure 7-2). However, because construction activities often conflict with onsite construction vehicle parking, such vehicles may have to be parked offsite for significant amounts of time. While offsite parking in the near vicinity is available, it is not on land owned by the applicant. As such, demand for construction related vehicle parking either on or offsite is considered to pose a potentially significant, short term parking impact.

- g) The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project would not adversely affect any existing or planned bus stops in the area, lies in close proximity to bus service making public transportation access to the project substantially more feasible for employees, and would provide seven (7) 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

There are no cumulative impacts related to level of service conditions on nearby roadways and the project's contribution to peak hour traffic signal warrants is less than significant. The project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts in the City would be addressed by payment of the required traffic development impact mitigation fees.

Required Mitigation Measures

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

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

Mitigation regarding preliminary and final review by the Design Review Board to ensure a complete site plan is included in the Aesthetics section of this document.

City of Goleta
Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration
Renco Encoders Addition
May 1, 2009

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative traffic impacts would remain less than significant.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

Existing Setting

Sewage Disposal

The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) provides sewer service in the project area. Sewage travels along gravity fed collection sewers to a main trunk line. The trunk line terminates at the GWSD pump house located on the UCSB campus Lot 32, at which point the waste is transferred via a pressurized line running parallel to the Santa Barbara Airport, to the Goleta Sanitary District's (GSD) treatment plant located on William Moffet Place next to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. treatment of wastewater collected by GWSD is provided through a contract with the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD). The GSD treatment plant has a capacity of 9.7 million gallons per day (based on average daily flow) but is currently limited to 7.64

million gallons per day under a National Pollutant discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the US environmental Protection Agency with concurrence from the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Disposal of treated effluent is by ocean outfall offshore from Goleta Beach under its agreement with GSD. GWSD is allocated 40.78 percent of the capacity at the sewage treatment plant, which equates to about 3.12 million gallons per day. GWSD currently generates approximately 1.71 mgd of sewage that is treated at the GSD plant, resulting in about 1.41 mgd of remaining capacity in the GWSD's existing system. (Citrus Village Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, August 15, 2008).

Water Supply

The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water purveyor for the City of Goleta. The GWD currently has four sources of water: surface water from the Lake Cachuma Project; surface water from the State Water Project; ground water from the Goleta basin; and recycled water. These sources delivered an estimated 15,300 AFY to the GWD in 2005 and together are expected to be able to provide approximately 17,672 Acre Feet per Year (AFY) to the GWD through the year 2030. The Lake Cachuma Project provides approximately 9,320 AFY, the State Water Project provides approximately 4,500 AFY, ground water sources provide approximately 2,350 AFY, and recycled water facilities provide up to 1,500 AFY. The GWD rights to ground water were adjudicated in a lawsuit that was filed in 1973 *Wright v. Goleta Water District* and finally settled in 1989. "The Wright Judgment" stipulated a safe ground water yield from the ground water basin of 3,410 AFY and gave the GWD rights to 2,350 of that amount based on a ten-year average. (Citrus Village Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, August 15, 2008).

Stormwater Control Facilities

Stormwater runoff from the property is collected from one, bio-filtered catch basin and two catch basins within landscaped areas for natural bio-filtration. This runoff is then directly connected to the City's stormdrain under Cortona Drive, which discharges its confluence into Tecolotito Creek. These stormdrain facilities would serve the proposed project without further modification.

Solid Waste

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

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on utilities and service systems would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, under the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual*, a project that would generate 196 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) The project site is served by the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) with only a collection system. The GWSD wastewater is then sent to the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD) for treatment and disposal services. Using the wastewater generation factors for commercial uses from the City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR, estimated wastewater generation for the project would be evaluated at 100 gallons per day per 1,000-square feet of habitable building space. Based on the application of these wastewater generation rates, it is estimated that the proposed additions would generate approximately 1,920 GPD of wastewater. This represents approximately 0.1% of the remaining available collection capacity under the GWSD's operating permit from the RWQCB, and approximately 0.1% of the remaining available 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 Districts current operating permit from the RWQCB, the applicant has yet to provide a Can & Will Serve/Intent to Serve letter from the GWSD. As such, the proposed project poses a potentially significant impact on the availability and adequacy of central sewage disposal service.

- b,c) The proposed project would not necessitate any new construction or expansion of existing wastewater or domestic water treatment facilities. Corresponding environmental impacts normally associated with such facility construction and/or expansion would not occur as a result of this project. The existing stormdrain system in the area is sufficient to convey stormwater flows from the surrounding area to Tecolotito Creek and Goleta Slough, even with buildout of the project area. Therefore, the project would not require the construction of any new stormwater facilities and as such, corresponding environmental impacts normally associated with such facility construction and/or expansion would not occur.

- d) The project also would not contribute to groundwater overdraft as no wells are proposed onsite. Projects served by the GWD would not cause or contribute

to groundwater basin overdraft pursuant to the requirements of the Wright vs. Goleta Water District judgment.

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

$$\text{Research Park MRP}—0.14 \text{ AFY}/1,000 \text{ ft}^2 * 19,200 \text{ ft}^2 = 2.69 \text{ AFY}$$

Applying these water duty factors, it is estimated that the proposed project would consume 2.69 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 0.015 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 year). Given these projections, the GWD has sufficient supply to service this project. However, the applicant has yet to provide a Can & Will Serve letter from the GWD. Until such a commitment is given by the GWD, a final determination as to the availability of central water service by the GWD to serve the proposed project cannot be made. As such, the proposed project poses a potentially significant impact on the availability and adequacy of central water service.

- f) 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 & Guidelines Manual*, solid waste generation for the proposed project would be as follows:

$$\text{Manufacturing Space}—0.0026 \text{ tons/year}/\text{ft}^2 * 19,200 \text{ ft}^2 = 49.92 \text{ tons/year}$$

Based on the application of these solid waste generation rates, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate a total of 49.92 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 24.96 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 proposed project would not result in the generation of any solid waste in violation of any Federal, State, or local solid waste regulations or statutes.

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required Mitigation Measures

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

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

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

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

Recommended Mitigation Measure

3. A Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan (WRRP) shall be submitted to the Community Services Department for review and approval. Said plan shall indicate how a 50% diversion goal shall be met during construction including but not limited to the following:
 - a. Demolition and/or excess construction materials shall be separated onsite for reuse/recycling or proper disposal (e.g., concrete asphalt).
 - b. During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials and brush shall be provided onsite.
 - c. The applicant/property owner shall contract with a City approved hauler to facilitate the recycling of all construction recoverable/recyclable material. (Copy of contract to be provided to the City.) Recoverable construction material shall include but not be limited to asphalt, lumber, concrete, glass, metals, and drywall.

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

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

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

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

Residual Impact

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

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		■			
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?				■	
c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			■		
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			■		