1. **PROJECT TITLE:** South Fairview Commercial Center Project; Case No. 01-SB-DP, CUP

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

3. **CONTACT PERSON and PHONE NUMBER:** Alan Hanson, Senior Planner; (805)961-7549

4. **APPLICANT:** John and Janna Price  
   PO Box 61106  
   Santa Barbara, CA 93102  

   **AGENT:** Harwood White  
   1553 Knoll Circle Dr  
   Santa Barbara, CA 93103

5. **PROJECT LOCATION:** 151 South Fairview Avenue; APN 073-080-019 within the Inland Area of the City.
6. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The project includes the following elements:

1) Final Development Plan (01-SB-DP) for a 16,216 square-foot, two-story mixed use structure. The building includes 8,757 square-foot of retail space on the first floor, 6,206 square feet of office space on the second floor, and two apartments totaling 1,253 square feet on the second floor. A tower separates the residential and office components and contains an elevator and stairs. The peak height of the structure would be 33 feet. The peak height of the tower element is 40 feet. Access to the site is proposed via two driveways. One is a two-way driveway located directly across from Fairview Avenue (minor). The other is a “right-in” only driveway, located just north of the adjacent tire store driveway. A total of 39 parking spaces and one delivery truck loading space are provided.

2) Minor Conditional Use Permit (01-SB-CUP) for two residential units located on the second floor of the structure.

7. **APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:** None

8. **SITE INFORMATION:**

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

Slope/Topography
The project site is gently sloping from the northwest (approximately 21 feet above sea level) to the southeast (approximately 13 feet above sea level) for an overall slope of 2.5% across the property.

Flora and Fauna and Surface Water Bodies
The subject property is currently vacant but was formerly the site of a Mobil service station. Per the Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (2006) there are no rare, endangered, or special status animal species onsite. To the west of the project site within the City of Santa Barbara Las Vegas Creek (and San Pedro Creek below its confluence w/Las Vegas Creek) traverse the neighboring golf course. Although this section of the creek would meet City of Goleta standards for classification as a riparian Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA), it has been channelized and is subject to periodic vegetation removal to maintain the channel’s hydraulic capacity. Due to such channelization and periodic vegetation removal, this section of the creek is not anticipated to support any significant wildlife populations. However, it can function as an important riparian link between the ecologically diverse Goleta Slough and the more viable riparian habitats of upper reaches of the watershed (Larry Hunt, 1996). No surface water bodies exist on the subject property. Vegetation onsite consists of remnants of the landscaping from the previous gas station along the southerly property line. No native plant or tree species exist onsite.

Cultural Resources
The project site lies within a significant archaeological/cultural resource site (CA-SBa-60) that is considered to potentially be the largest historic Chumash village site on the fringe of the Goleta Slough. The previous gas station onsite was constructed on over three (3) feet of fill material left over from construction of the Fairview Overpass across US Highway 101. Past remediation of hydrocarbon contamination resulting from the prior service station onsite involved the removal of approximately 12,000 cubic yards and excavation to a depth of 15 feet below the surface on the central and southern portions of the project site.

Surrounding Land Uses
The project site is bordered to the west by the Twin Lakes Golf Course within the City of Santa Barbara, to the south by a commercial tire retail outlet within the City of Santa Barbara, and to the north and east by Fairview Avenue and the surrounding commercial, industrial, and retail development within Old Town Goleta.

10. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hydrology
- Marine Resources
- Minerals
- Noise
- Solid Waste
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.
12. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

13. ISSUE AREAS:

AESTHETICS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

The project site is surrounded by a mix of commercial, retail, and lodging development in the area of the Hollister/Fairview intersection in Old Town Goleta. Surrounding structures range from one-story retail and commercial uses to the multi-story Super 8 Motel. This area of Old Town Goleta does not exhibit any particular architectural theme and existing development in the area includes only minimal landscaping. The perimeter of the project site along the southern and western property boundaries is lined with mature, non-native trees that screen views of the golf course and the adjacent tire retail outlet from Fairview Avenue as well as views from the golf course to the east.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) Although more expansive views of the surrounding area from Hollister Avenue and Fairview Avenue are limited due to existing development and landscaping in the vicinity of the project site, views of the Santa Ynez Mountains are available from many vantage points in the area. For instance, fairly expansive views of the Santa Ynez Mountains are available from the Hollister/Fairview intersection as illustrated in Figure 1.
The project site lies on the west side of Fairview Avenue, just north of the Fairview/Hollister intersection as illustrated in Figure 2 below.

The project would locate the proposed tower and southerly element of the two-story commercial center at the center of the project site with the northerly element of the two-story building oriented on a north/south axis from the center of the site to the northern property corner. The proposed tower element would sit roughly in the gap between the larger, taller clumps of eucalyptus that exist along the western property line as shown in Figure 2. Views to the north of the Santa Ynez Mountains from Hollister Avenue, the golf course, or Fairview Avenue would not be significantly affected by the proposed commercial center. Views to the west from Fairview Avenue of the existing tree line along the western property line would experience some blockage but due to the height of the surrounding tree line and limits on the height of the tower to 40 feet, such visual
obstruction in this view direction would not be considered significant. Views to the east from the golf course (as seen in Figure 3 taken from the first tee) would also experience similar blockage as views from Fairview Avenue to the west, but again in light of the height of the existing tree line, and the proposed structure (33 feet) and tower (40 feet) heights, the visual effect of the structure on such easterly views would be considered less than significant. Furthermore, views to the west from Fairview Avenue or views to the east from the golf course 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. Therefore, the project would not have any significant effect on any scenic vista within the City as identified in the General Plan.

Figure 3

The Visual and Historic Resources Element does however identify the top of the Fairview Avenue overpass as a “Scenic View to be Protected.” Scenic vistas from this public vantage point exist in all directions with views to the south of the More Mesa area and ridge line above the eastern portion of the Goleta Slough. Although the project site lies within this viewshed, it is currently screened by existing vegetation on the east side of Fairview Avenue south of the Highway 101 interchange as shown in Figure 4. In addition, this viewpoint lies at an elevation 25 feet higher than the proposed finished grade of the project site.¹

¹ Topographic data used in this analysis was taken from the City’s topographic maps based on the City’s Photomapper computer program.
Given the fact that the proposed structure, with its tower element limited to 40 feet in height would not project significantly above the existing tree line from this location, and the fact that the project site is already 25 feet lower in elevation than that of this scenic vista, project generated visual impacts on the Fairview Avenue Overpass Scenic Vista would be considered less than significant.

b) The 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 commercial development surrounding the project site is comprised primarily of one-story structures with the exception of the Super 8 Motel which stands three-stories high with a flat roof. None of the existing development in the vicinity exceeds C-2 zone district maximum height of 35 feet. The new commercial center would include a two-story building, 33 feet high, with a tower element housing the stairs and elevator serving the second story that is 40 feet high. The tower qualifies as an architectural projection under Section 35-276(1) of the Inland Zoning Ordinance (IZO) and is well below the allowed maximum height of 50 feet for such projections in this zone district. Therefore, the proposed structure and its architectural projection would not be out of character with the surrounding area or its architecture.

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 landscaping plan includes perimeter and parking area landscaping as required for the C-2 zone district along with ornamental trees and shrubs along the perimeter of the proposed structure. The preliminary landscape is compatible with existing landscaped areas in the vicinity and would not result in any significant, adverse visual impact.

No external signage is identified on the submitted plan sets. Under the City’s current sign regulations (Article I, Chapter 35 of the Municipal Code), signs in commercial zone 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. As such, the impact of future signage serving the proposed commercial center would be considered potentially significant.

Finally, the project may require both roof mounted 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 stories of the structure would require exterior lighting to light first floor walkways and parking areas as well as second floor decks 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 considered potentially significant.

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The permittee shall receive Preliminary and Final approval from the Design Review Board. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The review shall include site plan, floor plan, elevations, grading plan, landscape plan, and lighting plan consistent with the DRB submittal requirements. Additional materials shall be provided as required by the DRB to complete their review. Preliminary and Final approval shall be granted prior to issuance of an LUP.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

a) Type of irrigation;
b) All existing and new trees, shrubs, and groundcovers by species;
c) Size of all plantings; and
d) Location of all plantings.

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

Monitoring: Prior to final inspection, City staff shall site inspect to ensure that landscaping has been installed consistent with the final landscape plan.

7. The permittee shall enter into an agreement to install required landscaping and water-conserving irrigation systems as well as maintain required landscaping for the life of the project. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall sign the landscape installation and maintenance agreement, including at least a 3-year maintenance period, prior to LUP issuance. Performance securities for installation and maintenance shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance.

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

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

Monitoring: Prior to final inspection, City staff shall site inspect to ensure installation of the trash/recycling enclosure(s) according to the approved plan.

9. Construction and/or employee trash shall be prevented from blowing offsite. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Covered receptacles shall be provided onsite prior to commencement of any grading or construction activities. Waste shall be picked up weekly or more frequently as directed by City staff. The permittee 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 prior to LUP issuance. Trash control shall occur throughout all grading and construction activities.

Monitoring: City staff shall inspect periodically throughout grading and construction activities to verify compliance.
10. No signs of any type are approved with this action unless otherwise specified. All signs require a separate sign permit and Design Review Board (DRB) approval and shall comply with the City of Goleta Sign Regulations. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Future signage shall comply with the requirements of Article I, Chapter 35 of the Municipal Code prior to issuance of any Sign Certificate of Conformance. 

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance with this requirement.

11. An Overall Sign Plan shall be required pursuant to Article I (Sign Regulations) or any applicable subsequent sign regulations. The Overall Sign Plan and individual tenant signs shall be reviewed and approved by the DRB and City staff. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Overall Sign Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the DRB and City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. Individual tenant signs shall be reviewed and approved by the DRB and City staff prior to issuance of a Sign Certificate of Conformance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify that individual tenant signs are approved and installed according to the Overall Sign Plan.

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

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

**Residual Impact**

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

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

Would the project:

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

The project site is located within the commercial core of Old Town Goleta and has been developed for commercial use for many years. There are no agricultural or forest resources onsite.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a-e) The project would not convert any Prime Farmland, 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. There are no forest lands or resources onsite of in the vicinity of the project.

Cumulative Impacts

The project would not contribute to any cumulative impact on agricultural and/or forest resources within the City of Goleta.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

None.
AIR QUALITY

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

Existing Setting

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

Surface temperature inversions (0 to 500 feet) are most frequent during the winter, and subsidence inversions (1,000 to 2,000 feet) are most frequent during the summer. Inversions are an increase in temperature with height and directly related to the stability of the atmosphere. Inversions act as a cap to the pollutants that are emitted below or within them. The subsidence inversion is very common during the summer along the California coast, and is one of the principal causes of air stagnation. Poor air quality is usually associated with air stagnation (high stability/restricted air movement).
Air Quality Standards – Criteria Pollutants
The Federal Government and the State of California have established air quality standards and emergency episode criteria for various pollutants. Generally, State regulations have stricter standards than those at the Federal level. Air quality standards are set at concentrations that provide a sufficient margin of safety to protect public health and welfare. Air quality at a given location can be described by the concentration of various pollutants in the atmosphere. The significance of a pollutant concentration is determined by comparing the concentration to an appropriate Federal and/or State ambient air quality standard.

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

Criteria Pollutants
Criteria pollutants of primary concern include ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxide (NO₂), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM₂.₅). Although there are no ambient standards for volatile organic compounds/reactive organic gases (VOCs/ROCs) or nitrogen oxides (NOₓ), they are important as precursors to O₃.

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

The County currently violates the State 8-hour ozone and PM₁₀ standards. The County is in attainment of the Federal 8-hour ozone standard and the State 1-hour ozone standard. The APCD has adopted a Clean Air Plans (CAP) that demonstrates how the County will maintain and/or meet State and Federal air quality standards, including ozone and particulate matter standards.

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

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

- Interferes with progress toward the attainment of the ozone standard by releasing emissions which equal or exceed the established long-term quantitative thresholds for NOₓ and ROG; or,
- Equals or exceeds the State or Federal ambient air quality standards for any criteria pollutant (as determined by modeling).

A project is deemed to have a significant impact on regional air quality if emissions related to project operation exceed the significance thresholds, currently set at 25 pounds per day for NO\textsubscript{X} and ROG emissions for motor vehicle trips. Furthermore, if a project’s emissions exceed these thresholds, then the project’s cumulative impacts would also be considered significant.

The City’s thresholds also include criteria for conducting carbon monoxide (CO) emission modeling. However, due to the relatively low background ambient CO levels in Santa Barbara County, localized CO impacts associated with traffic at congested intersections are not expected to exceed the CO health-related air quality standards. Therefore, CO “Hotspot” analyses are not required anymore, unless a project results in more than 800 peak hour trips.

APCD no longer has quantitative emission significance thresholds for short-term construction activities because construction emissions from land development projects have been accounted for in the 2008 Clean Air Plan (CAP). Nevertheless, due to the fact that Santa Barbara County is not in compliance with State standards for airborne particulate matter (PM\textsubscript{10}), construction generated fugitive dust (50% of total dust) is subject to the City’s standard dust mitigation requirements.

It is noted that APCD has recommended that the City adopt two new thresholds: 240 lb/day for ROCs and NO\textsubscript{X} and 80 lb/day for PM\textsubscript{10}. While the City of Goleta has not yet adopted these new criteria, given the size and intensity of the proposed commercial center and associated volume of project generated traffic, long-term operational air emissions resulting from project implementation would be far below these levels.

**Project Specific Impacts**

The project would result in the construction of a 16,216 square-foot mixed use retail/office building with two apartment units on the second floor. The proposed project would involve 700 cubic yards of cut and 250 cubic yards of fill with the virtual entirety of the 0.80 acre site being graded for project construction over a several week period. Construction of the facility would result in short-term air quality impacts while long-term air quality impacts associated with both operational and vehicular sources would also occur as a result of project implementation.

The City’s methodology for quantifying criteria pollutant emissions relies upon the URBEMIS 2007 9.2 air quality modeling software for identifying short-term construction and long-term operational impacts for the pounds/day unmitigated condition. Actual estimates are based on a 2008 unmitigated condition.

**Short-Term Construction Impacts:**

a,b) Short term air quality impacts generally occur during project grading and consist of dust (PM\textsubscript{10}) and diesel equipment particulate emissions, as well as ROC and NO\textsubscript{X} emissions from heavy construction equipment operation. Preliminary earthwork quantities for project construction are currently estimated at 700 cubic yards of cut and 250 cubic yards of fill. As a result, construction of the proposed project is anticipated to generate 14.51 lbs/day of fugitive dust PM\textsubscript{10/2.5}. Short-term construction emissions of ozone precursors are preliminarily projected to be 21.72 lbs/day of ROCs and 52.81 lbs/day of
NO\textsubscript{X}. Neither the City nor the APCD have adopted any significance thresholds for construction generated ROC, NO\textsubscript{X}, or PM\textsubscript{10/2.5} dust. These emissions are believed to have been adequately incorporated into the 2004 CAP in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities. Therefore, impacts are considered adverse but not significant. However, given the fact that Santa Barbara currently violates the State 8-hour standard for particulate emission levels, APCD standard dust mitigation is required for construction of all discretionary projects.

d) Fine particulate emissions from diesel equipment exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the State of California. PM\textsubscript{10/2.5} diesel exhaust emissions for construction equipment involved in project construction are preliminarily estimated at 5¾ lbs/day. These short-term emissions would not constitute “substantial” concentrations of diesel particulate emissions and are considered adverse but less than significant.

e) Construction of new parking areas and drive aisles onsite would require application of aggregate concrete (AC aka asphalt) that could create objectionable odors for employees and visitors to the surrounding commercial/industrial uses and properties. Such odors would be temporary and localized and are considered less than significant. However, APCD Rule 329, a prohibitory rule governing the application of cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials in the County, would apply to all project paving activities.

**Long-term Operational Impacts:**

a,b) Using the screening table in the City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, operational, long-term air pollutant emissions for all criteria pollutants generated by the proposed mixed-use commercial center would be well below City thresholds for a potentially significant impact. To quantitatively confirm the findings from the screening table, staff prepared a long-term pollutant emission analysis for the project using the URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 air quality modeling software for the 2008 lbs/day unmitigated condition. Under that analysis long-term operational emissions for the proposed center are estimated at 4.95 lbs/day of NO\textsubscript{X}, 4 lbs/day of ROCs, and 5.48 lbs/day of particulate emissions (PM\textsubscript{10/2.5}). As such, long-term operational project impacts on air quality as well as the region’s ability to meet air quality attainment goals would be considered less than significant.

d,e) The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has developed land use guidelines designed to minimize sensitive receptor exposure to a variety of ambient hazardous compounds. For on-road vehicular emissions, these guidelines recommend a 500-foot setback from a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles per day, or rural roadways that carry 50,000 vehicles per day. These guidelines were derived from urban freeways carrying hundreds of thousands of vehicles per day. The US Highway 101 near the project site currently carries 92,000 average daily trips (ADT) (Table 3.13-2, City of Goleta *General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR*, September, 2006). The proposed project would be approximately 950 feet from US Highway 101 and approximately 750 feet from the railroad (also a generator of hazardous diesel particulate emissions). Based on the intervening distance between the project site and both the railroad and the freeway, health risks involving residents of the two proposed apartment units, employees, and visitors to the center are considered adverse but not significant.
The proposed project would be located within an existing mixed commercial/residential area of Old Town. The proposed office, retail, and residential development would not result in objectionable long term smoke, ash, or odors or expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of pollutants. Such potential air quality impacts would therefore be considered less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts**

c) Per the City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, a project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considered significant if the project’s total emissions of either NO\(_X\) or ROCs exceed the long term threshold of 25 lbs/day. The project’s long-term contribution to NO\(_X\) and ROCs emissions associated with project operations would be far less than this threshold, and therefore the project’s contribution to cumulative long-term air quality impacts involving NO\(_X\) and ROCs emissions would be considered less than significant. The project’s construction related contribution to cumulative NO\(_X\), ROCs, and PM\(_{10/2.5}\) dust would also be considered adverse but less than significant, because these emissions are believed to have been adequately incorporated into the 2004 Clean Air Plan in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities. However, as noted above, given the fact that Santa Barbara currently violates the State 8-hour standard for particulate emission levels, APCD standard dust mitigation is required for construction of all discretionary projects.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

1. Transport of all exported cut material from project construction shall be tarped from the project site to the point of storage. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be printed on all plans submitted for issuance of any LUP, building, or grading permit(s) for the project. The permittee shall designate one or more locations as deemed appropriate for the posting of a notice(s) to all drivers of vehicles transporting fill onsite this requirement. Such signs will be maintained in their approved location(s) during project construction. The location and information provided on the sign(s) shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

   **Monitoring:** The contractor constructing the proposed project shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with this requirement by all drivers transporting fill onsite. City staff shall respond to any violations and shall periodically inspect the site to verify compliance in the field.

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

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

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

   **Monitoring:** City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance.
Dust generated by construction and/or demolition activities shall be kept to a minimum with a goal of retaining dust on the site. **Plan Requirements:** The following dust control measures listed below shall be shown on all building and grading plans and 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 late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency shall occur whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour. If wind speeds increase to the point when such measures cannot prevent dust from leaving the site, construction activities shall be suspended.

c) Grading and scraping operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 20 mph.

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

e) Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.

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

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

The 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. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to City staff and the APCD and shall be posted in three locations along the project site’s perimeter for the duration of grading and construction activities. **Timing:** All requirements shall be noted on all plans submitted for LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

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

**Recommended Mitigation Measures**

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

a) All portable diesel-powered construction equipment shall be registered with the state’s portable equipment registration program OR shall obtain an APCD permit.
b) Fleet owners of mobile construction equipment are subject to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Regulation for In-use Off-road Diesel Vehicles (Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9, Section 2449).

c) Idling of heavy-duty diesel construction equipment and trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes; electric auxiliary power shall be used whenever possible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Timing:** The construction emission requirements shall be printed all plans prior to LUP issuance. Requirements shall also be printed on grading and building permits. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance in the field. APCD inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.

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

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

b) Diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds shall not use diesel-fueled auxiliary power units for more than five (5) minutes to power heater, air conditioner, or other ancillary equipment on any such vehicle.

c) The applicant shall designate one or more locations as deemed appropriate for the permanent posting of a notice(s) to all drivers of diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds of these limitations on vehicle idling in all areas of the property that may be frequented by such vehicles. Such signs will be maintained in their approved location(s) in perpetuity.
Timing: These requirements shall be printed all plans prior to LUP issuance. Requirements shall also be printed on grading and building permits. The location and information provided on the sign(s) shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance.

Monitoring: City staff shall periodically conduct site inspections to verify compliance.

Residual Impact

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project specific as well as project contributions to cumulative air quality impacts involving ROCs, NOₓ and PM₁₀/₂.₅ would be considered less than significant.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
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

As noted above, the subject property is currently vacant but was formerly the site of a Mobil service station. With the exception of perimeter landscaping, the entirety of the site was developed as either paved surface or structures. There are no rare or endangered animal species onsite (Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, Figure 4-1). To the west of the project site, Las Vegas Creek traverses the neighboring golf course until its confluence with San Pedro Creek just north of Hollister Avenue. This section of the creek lies within the City of Santa Barbara, has been channelized, and is subject to periodic vegetation removal to maintain hydraulic capacity to carry floodwaters to Goleta Slough. Although not in a pristine condition, the City of Santa Barbara has undertaken recent riparian restoration work in an effort to maintain and enhance the channel’s riparian corridor and wildlife habitat value. While these sections of Las Vegas and San Pedro Creeks are not anticipated to support any significant wildlife populations, the creek channel functions as an important riparian link between the Goleta Slough and the more ecologically important upper reaches of the watershed (Larry Hunt, 1996). Vegetation onsite consists of remnants of the landscaping for the previous gas station along the southern property line. There is a line of non-native landscaping and shade trees on the golf course property bordering the project site to the west. There are no native trees or plants onsite.

Thresholds of Significance

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

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

a) The 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 project site has been the long term location of a prior gas station (1961-1988) and no native plant or tree species exist onsite. The closest habitat of any biological value lies approximately 300 feet to the west along the riparian corridor of Las Vegas and San Pedro Creeks where they traverse the neighboring golf course. As such, impacts on any candidate, sensitive, or listed species are not anticipated as a result of project implementation.

b,c) The project would cover virtually the entire project site with impervious surface, including approximately 15,179 square feet of paved parking and driveway space. 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, as well as tailwater from landscape irrigation onsite, would surface flow to an onsite stormwater treatment system that includes the following elements prior to discharge into the gutter along Fairview Avenue:

- Permeable pavers at the driveway aprons;
- Two stormdrain systems within the landscaped planters along the Fairview Avenue sidewalk and southerly property line that discharge to the gutter on Fairview;
- Two subsurface “Stormtech” water retardation facilities underneath the parking area onsite that drain to one or the other stormdrains within the landscaped planters, and;
- Trench drains at the edge of the driveway aprons/parking area that discharge intercepted runoff into the subsurface retardation facilities;

Although neither the project description or project plans provide any details on what stormwater filtration provisions are incorporated into the retardation facilities and stormdrains located within the landscaped planters, 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 San Pedro Creek and ultimately Goleta Slough. Therefore, project impacts on surface water quality are considered potentially significant.

In addition, construction activities such as washing of concrete trucks, stucco equipment, 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 Fairview Avenue which flows directly into the City’s stormdrain system and San Pedro Creek. Such short term impacts would be considered potentially significant.
d-f) Due to surrounding urban development, existing vegetation on the golf course property, and intervening 300+ feet between the project site and the San Pedro/Las Vegas riparian corridors, the proposed commercial center, including exterior lighting, would not have any significant affect 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. There are no other 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.

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 commercial 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 project would result in a potentially significant contribution to water quality degradation and the resulting effects on riparian systems and wetlands associated with San Pedro and Las Vegas Creeks as well as Goleta Slough.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. To ensure adequate onsite filtration of all stormwater runoff prior to discharge into the City’s stormdrain system and ultimately San Pedro Creek/Goleta Slough, the permittee 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 and Timing: The specifications and engineering details of the required filtration elements 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.

2. To ensure that the City approved stormwater water quality protection improvements are adequately maintained for the life of the project, the permittee shall prepare a stormwater system maintenance program for review and approval by City staff. Plan Requirements and Timing: The required maintenance program shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. The Program shall include provisions for the submittal of an annual maintenance report to City staff outlining all system maintenance measures undertaken by the permittee 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 permittee shall maintain records of all yearly maintenance measures for review by City staff on demand for the life of the project.
3. 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.

3. 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. 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 and 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.

**Residual Impact**

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

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

**Existing Setting**

The project site is within the recorded archaeological boundary of CA-SBa-60 and the ethno-historic Chumash village of S’axpiliil, considered the largest of the four settlements located adjacent to the Goleta Slough when visited by Spanish explorers Portolá and Pantoja y Arriaga in 1769 (J. Johnson, in Gamble 1990). The precise archaeological site boundaries have not been defined, but have been assumed to extend from east of the Fairview Avenue/Hollister Avenue intersection westward as far as San Pedro Creek, and north as far as U.S. Highway 101.
(Dudek & Associates; Revised Final Extended Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation, 151 South Fairview Avenue Goleta, California, May, 2010). The prehistoric site was first recorded by Rogers (1929) based on surface distributions of shell debris, bone, and “flint chips.” Though Rogers did not excavate the site, he determined the deposit extended to a depth of 30 inches based on inspection of a railroad track cut along what is now the Union Pacific Railroad, south of U.S. Highway 101 (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010). Systematic excavations at CA-SBa-60 were first undertaken by McKusick in 1960 for salvage purposes prior to the construction of the Fairview Avenue Overpass. Since that time, a number of excavations associated with site boundary definition, significance assessment, and construction monitoring have been completed. No archaeological investigations have been undertaken at the proposed project site, though intact archaeological resources have been identified along Las Vegas Creek, over 400 feet to the southwest, and to the north, on the east side of the US 101/Fairview Overpass approximately 700 feet to the north (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010). Other investigations east of Fairview Avenue in previously developed areas have only recorded disturbed cultural contexts (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010).

The site as presently understood contains three periods of site occupation (Applied Earthworks; 2004):

- A late-Middle through early-Late Period occupation (1,145-650 years before present [B.P]), characterized by a relatively low density deposit;
- A Late Period occupation (825-420 B.P), characterized by a substantially denser and more diverse occupation density deposit; and,
- A Late Period through Protohistoric Period occupation (415 B.P.), characterized by a high density deposit.

CA-SBA-60 has been determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (Bowser and Stone 1994; Bowser and Woodman 1994; Levulett 1995; Woodman et al 1994). The California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurred in these determinations (Widell 1995a, 1995b). As the site has been deemed NRHP-eligible, it is also considered a significant archaeological resource under the State CEQA Guidelines.

The project site was subject to placement of fill when the Fairview Road/U.S. Highway 101 Overpass was constructed in the 1960s. As-built project plans indicate that over three (3) feet of fill was placed on the native ground surface as part of that project (Dudek, May, 2010). Remediation of leaking hydrocarbons from the former gas station’s underground storage tanks in 1994 resulted in the excavation of 12,000 cubic yards of soil to a depth of 15 feet below grade in the southern and central portions of the project site. Excavation of ten Extended Phase 1 geoprobes was conducted by Dudek & Associates in early 2010 and confined to the northern portion of the project site, outside of previously remediated areas. Intact soils cultural resources associated with CA-SBa-60 were identified through soils geomorphological analyses, buried below 3.8 and 10.6 ft of previous construction fill.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a-d) CA-SB-60 has been determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (Bowser and Stone, 1994; Bowser and Woodman, 1994; Levulett 1995; Woodman et al, 1994) (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010). The project site is also considered a significant archaeological resource under CEQA Section 15064.5. To address potential project impacts on archaeological/cultural resources that may be onsite, an Extended Phase I archaeological investigation was conducted by Dudek & Associates in early 2010. This investigation focused on the northerly ⅓ of the project site as the southerly ⅔ was previously disturbed to a depth of approximately 15 feet as a result of prior soil contamination remediation associated with the service station that had been located on the property previously. The Extended Phase 1 archaeological and geomorphological study objectives conducted by Dudek & Associates were two-fold:

1) Summarize the geomorphologic and geologic setting for the near-surface deposits observed in the proposed project area; and

2) Evaluate the depositional context and degree of disturbance of the deposits within the proposed project area containing cultural resources.

Detailed descriptions of archaeological site soils were obtained from 10 continuous-core “geoprobe” (direct push) borings excavated throughout the northern portion of the proposed project area. Due to the presence of CA-SBA-60 within the proposed project area, the spacing of geoproses was sufficiently close to evaluate the distribution of cultural materials and the depth. Spacing of the geoproses was approximately 33 ft (10 m) throughout the northern portion of the proposed project area. The borings were advanced in depth until the soils recovered included no archaeological deposits (generally the C soil horizon consisting of relatively unaltered geologic deposits) (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010). Soils containing prehistoric archaeological materials were dry-screened onsite through 1/8-inch mesh screen. All prehistoric archaeological materials were returned to the boring hole. After drilling was complete, the boring holes were backfilled with excavated soil and Bentonite. The excavations indicate that the construction fill located in the northern area of the project site generally increases northward, as was illustrated in as-built plans for the Fairview Avenue Overpass. They also indicated that intact archaeological soils exist slightly south into areas mapped as previously disturbed by remediation activities (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010).

Seven of the 10 geoproses excavated as part of the investigation recovered prehistoric cultural material including predominantly shell fragments from intact, subsurface soil horizons below fill soils associated with construction of the Fairview Avenue overpass (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010). Importantly, Geoprobe 9 identified construction fill resting directly on top of the Bw subsurface horizon. The truncation of the natural soil profile, most likely during grading, has resulted in the removal of the natural topsoil A horizon and any associated archaeological deposits, if they were originally present at this location. Archaeological deposits present in these soil horizons appear to have been deposited on the ground surface and subsequently mixed into the soil. Except for some vertical bioturbation, the archaeological materials in the near-surface natural
deposits appear to be in place (in-situ), rather than having been transported by colluviation or other natural depositional process.

Such results are consistent with the results of previous excavations in the northern portion of CA-SBa-60 (Applied Earthworks; 2004) (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010). The estimated densities of shell fragments based on the geoprobes conducted by Dudek & Associates suggest that the cultural deposit could be of low to moderate density compared to other areas of the NRHP-eligible site (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010). Furthermore, the lack of other cultural materials associated with prehistoric occupation (i.e., bone fragments or chipped stone artifacts) within the geoprobe samples suggests that the portion of CA-SBa-60 within the boundaries of the project site was peripheral to the ethno-historic village of S’axpiliil where Chumash occupation was more intensive (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010).

These shellfish remains appear to have the ability to address important cultural/archaeological research questions regarding:

- Chronology (when the site was occupied);
- Changing subsistence strategies (food gathering) over time;
- Site functions and activities in comparison to other areas of the site previously investigated;
- Adaptations to changing environmental conditions over time;
- Changes in population (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010).

The development would utilize a foundation system that rests on concrete caissons that extend below recently imported fill soils to ensure seismic stability. The caissons will penetrate below the fill soils placed in the remediation areas that have been entirely disturbed, and the northern area of the project site in which buried intact archaeological resources associated with CA-SBa-60 were recovered (Dudek & Associates; May, 2010). A total of 12 caissons, each 18” in diameter, would be excavated within the intact portion of CA-SBa-60 that lies within the project site thereby impacting 41 square feet or less than 0.5% of the total approximately 8,600 square feet of intact CA-SBa-60 onsite (Dudek & Associates; May 2010). This use of caissons to support the structure’s foundation instead of excavated spread footings thereby limiting potential disturbance of in-place, significant archaeological/cultural resources to approximately 40 square feet would reduce associated impacts on such resources to the maximum extent feasible given seismic safety requirements for the proposed structure. All other ground disturbances associated with new utility trenching and soil preparation for paved areas will be confined with the top 2 feet of imported fill soils covering the area of intact CA-SBa-60 deposits which lie below the three (3) feet of existing fill in this area. However, as the intact portion of CA-SBs-60 within the northern ⅓ the project site is considered a significant archaeological/cultural resource, as well as eligible for listing on the NRHP, disturbance of the northern portion of the project site for construction of the proposed structure would constitute a potentially significant, archaeological/cultural resource impact.
Cumulative Impacts

Where a project poses potentially significant, project specific impact(s) to cultural/archaeological resources, it is also generally considered to result in a potentially significant contribution to cumulative impacts on cultural/archaeological resources due to the fact that such resources provide important information cumulatively on questions regarding chronology, subsistence strategies/intensification, settlement organization, cultural adaptations, population fluctuation, and exchange of goods during historic and prehistoric times.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The permittee shall complete the South Fairview Commercial Center, 151 Fairview Avenue, Goleta, CA; Phase 3 Data Recovery Mitigation Archaeological Resources Investigation Work Program; Revised May 13, 2010, prepared by Dudek & Associates, or shall provide an equivalent Phase 3 report prepared by a City-qualified archaeologist, **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The work program shall be completed and an Extended Phase 3 Archaeological Investigation Report shall be prepared and submitted to the City for staff review prior to the issuance of any LUP for the project. The submitted report shall be accompanied by written verification from the project archaeologist that all aspects of the work program have been successfully completed and that no other mitigation work pursuant to the project is required.

   **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance with all aspects of this mitigation up to and through completion of the Phase 3 Data Recovery Program.

2. A City-approved archaeologist and local Chumash observer shall monitor project implementation during the initial grading and excavation activities until such time as sufficient subsurface soil has been uncovered/excavated to ascertain that no additional prehistoric archaeological/cultural resources are located on the project site. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be printed on all plans submitted for any LUP, building, grading, or demolition permits. The permittee shall enter into a contract with a City approved archaeologist and Native American representative and shall fund the provision of onsite archaeological/cultural resource monitoring during initial grading, excavation, and/or demolition activities prior to LUP issuance. **Monitoring:** City staff shall conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground disturbing activities.

3. In the event additional archaeological resources are encountered during grading, work shall be stopped immediately or redirected until the City-approved archaeologist and local Chumash observer can evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigation standards set forth in the City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 2 shall be funded by the applicant. If resources are found to be significant, they shall be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 3 shall be funded by the permittee. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be printed on all plans submitted for any LUP, building, grading, or demolition permits.
Monitoring: City staff shall conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground disturbing activities and shall ensure preparation of any necessary Phase 2 and/or Phase 3.

Residual Impact

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project specific and project contributions to cumulative impacts on archaeological/cultural resources would be less than significant.

GEOLOGY and SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

The project site is gently sloping with a slope of 0-2% across the property. Underlying native soils onsite consist of Camarillo fine sandy loam with approximately six to ten feet of fill material imported onsite for construction of the prior gas station. The groundwater table in this location is relatively high and the liquefaction potential is characterized as moderate (Seismic Safety and Safety Element of the County of Santa Barbara’s Comprehensive Plan). The closest earthquake fault (the More Ranch Fault) lies approximately one mile to the south of the project site.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on geology/soils would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual assumes that a 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-d) 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, potential seismic risks are considered to be adverse but less than significant. Liquefaction is a state of almost complete failure of saturated sandy soil due to seismic shaking. The Seismic Safety and Safety Element of the County of Santa Barbara’s Comprehensive Plan identifies the project site as having a moderate potential for liquefaction. However, there is no known historic evidence of prior liquefaction in Santa Barbara County (Seismic Safety and Safety Element of the County of Santa Barbara’s Comprehensive Plan; 1980). As such, potential risks to people and structures due to the liquefaction potential are considered less than significant. Finally, due to the gently sloping topography of the project site, the potential for the occurrence of landslides is considered non-existent.

e) The project does involve 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 Hydrology and Water Resources below.

f,g) Soil and geologic conditions onsite are not of the type that pose a significant potential for becoming unstable as a result project implementation or would contribute to on or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Soils onsite are not sufficiently expansive to pose a substantial risk to life or property. Such potential impacts would be considered less than significant.

h) The project would be connected to the Goleta Sanitary District’s wastewater collection and treatment 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 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/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures to address erosion and sedimentation are described under the discussion of Hydrology and Water Resources. No other mitigation measures are required or recommended for project impacts on geologic processes and soil resources.

Residual Impact

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

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

The analysis provided in this section is derived from information available from various state agencies, boards, and associations. Sources include:

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Resolution No. 2010-06*, June 2010
Background

International and Federal legislation has been enacted to deal with climate change issues. The Montreal Protocol was originally signed in 1987 and substantially amended in 1990 and 1992. In 1988, the United Nations and the World Meteorological Organization established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to assess the scientific, technical, and socioeconomic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts, and options for adaptation and mitigation. The IPCC consists of 600 scientists from 40 countries. In February 2007, it issued a report on global climate change stating that they are about 90% certain that people are the primary cause of global warming. The report also states that global atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide have significantly increased since pre-industrial times (1750); that warming of the climate system is unequivocal; and that changes in climate are now affecting physical and biological systems on every continent.

The IPCC’s best estimates are that the average global temperature rise between years 2000 and 2100 could range from 0.6 degrees Celsius (1.08 degrees Fahrenheit) with no increase in GHG emissions above 2000 levels, to 4.0 degrees Celsius (7.2 degrees Fahrenheit) with a substantial increase in GHG emissions (IPCC, 2007). Large increases in global temperatures could have massive deleterious impacts on the natural and human environments.

According to the EPA, a GHG is any gas that absorbs infrared radiation in the atmosphere. This absorption traps heat within the atmosphere creating a greenhouse effect that is slowly raising global temperatures. California state law defines GHG to include the following: carbon dioxide ($CO_2$), methane ($CH_4$), nitrous oxide ($N_2O$), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride (Health and Safety Code, Section 38505g). Many human activities add to the levels of most of these naturally occurring gases. $CO_2$ is released into the atmosphere when solid waste, fossil fuels (oil, natural gas, and coal), and wood and wood products are burned. $N_2O$ is emitted during agricultural and industrial activities, as well as during combustion of solid waste and fossil fuels. $CO_2$ and $N_2O$ are the two GHGs released in greatest quantities from mobile sources burning gasoline and diesel fuel. Methane, a highly potent GHG, results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills, as well as other sources.
Climate change could impact the natural environment in California in the following ways, among others:

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

These changes in California’s climate and ecosystems could occur at a time when California’s population is expected to increase from 34 million to 59 million by the year 2040 (California Energy Commission, 2005). As such, the number of people potentially affected by climate change, as well as the amount of human-related GHG emissions, is expected to significantly increase. Similar changes would also occur in other parts of the world, with regional variations in resources affected and vulnerability to adverse effects.

Worldwide, California is estimated to be the 12th to 16th largest emitter of CO₂ and is responsible for approximately 2% of the world’s CO₂ emissions. California is the second largest emitter of GHG emissions in the United States (behind Texas). In 2004, California’s gross GHG emissions were 492 million metric tons (MMT) of CO₂ equivalent (CO₂e) (California Energy Commission, 2006).

Evolving Regulatory Setting

In 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger issued California Executive Order S-3-05 establishing the following emission targets for California: 1) reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels by 2010; 2) reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020; and 3) reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Executive Orders are binding on State agencies. Accordingly, S-3-05 will guide State agencies’ efforts to control and regulate GHG emissions but will have no direct binding effect on local efforts.

In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 establishes regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions and a cap on statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 also includes guidance to institute emission reductions in an economically efficient manner and conditions to ensure that businesses and consumers are not unfairly affected by the reductions. AB 32 demonstrates California’s commitment to reducing the rate of GHG emissions and the State’s associated contribution to climate change, without intent to limit population or economic growth. Although AB 32 did not amend CEQA, it identifies the
environmental problems in California caused by global warming (Health and Safety Code, Section 38501a).

Senate Bill (SB) 97, enacted in 2007, amends the CEQA statute to establish that GHG emissions and their effects are a prominent environmental issue that requires analysis under CEQA. This bill directed OPR to prepare, develop, and transmit to the California Natural Resources Agency (Resources Agency) guidelines for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHG emissions by July 1, 2009. The Natural Resources Agency is required to certify or adopt those guidelines by January 1, 2010. On April 13, 2009, OPR submitted to the Resources Agency proposed amendments to the state CEQA Guidelines for GHG emissions. These proposed CEQA Guideline amendments provide guidance to lead agencies regarding the analysis and mitigation of the effects of GHG emissions in CEQA documents.

As an interim step toward development of required guidelines, OPR published a technical advisory entitled, CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act Review, in June 2008. OPR recommends that lead agencies make a good-faith effort, based on available information, to estimate the quantity of GHG emissions that would be generated by a proposed project, and to mitigate the impacts where feasible. OPR acknowledges in this document that the most difficult part of the climate change analysis will be the determination of significance. OPR also asked the California Air Resources Board (CARB) technical staff to recommend a method for setting thresholds which would encourage consistency and uniformity in the CEQA analysis of GHG emissions throughout the state.

In October 2008, the CARB published its Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan, which is the State's plan to achieve GHG reductions required by AB 32. The Proposed Scoping Plan contains the main strategies California will implement to achieve a reduction of 169 million metric tons (MMT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e), or approximately 30% from the State’s projected 2020 emission level of 596 MMT of CO₂e under a business-as-usual scenario. The Proposed Scoping Plan states that land use planning and urban growth decisions will play an important role in the State’s GHG reduction efforts since local governments have primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit how land is developed to accommodate population growth and the changing needs of their jurisdictions. The CARB further acknowledges that decisions on how land is used will have large impacts on the GHG emissions that will result from transportation, housing, industry, forestry, water, agriculture, electricity, and natural gas emission sectors. The Proposed Scoping Plan was approved by the CARB on December 11, 2008.

In addition to the Proposed Scoping Plan, the CARB has also released the Preliminary Draft Staff Proposal: Recommended Approaches for Setting Interim Significance Thresholds for Greenhouse Gases under the California Environmental Quality Act (CARB Draft Staff Proposal). The CARB Draft Staff Proposal includes potential interim performance standards for project types and emissions sources including construction, energy, water use, waste, transportation, and total mass GHG emissions. Specific thresholds and performance criteria for these categories have yet to be developed.

SB 375 was signed in September 2008 and aligns regional transportation planning efforts, regional GHG reduction targets, and land use and housing allocation. SB 375 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or Alternative Planning Strategy (APS), which will prescribe land use allocation in that MPO’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). It also establishes new streamlining opportunities
for compatible projects under CEQA. SB 375 will likely take several years to become fully implemented due to the complex relationship between state, regional, and local agencies. First, the State must develop the modeling guidelines and the GHG regional reduction targets, then regional agencies must develop their sustainable community’s strategies. Only after the State and regional agencies accomplish their SB 375 responsibilities will cities and counties be required to bring their housing elements into conformity and be able to take advantage of the new CEQA streamlining tools.

Thresholds of Significance

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32, Health and Safety Code Section 38500 et. seq.) requires reduction of California’s GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The California Air Resources Board has established this 1990 level at 427 million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent emissions as an attainment goal. Pursuant to AB 32 and other related legislation, various actions have established plans and regulations that identify emission limits and reduction measures.

On December 30, 2009, the Secretary for Natural Resources adopted amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines that address greenhouse gas emissions. On February 16, 2010, the Office of Administrative Law filed the amendments with the Secretary of State. The amendments are effective as of March 18, 2010.

Establishment of thresholds at the State and/or local level has been a point of discussion and analysis by various agencies and boards (i.e., OPR, CARB, CAPCOA [California Air Pollution Control Officers Association]). Information has been presented on various scenarios including no thresholds, a zero threshold, and a non-zero threshold. Values for a non-zero threshold vary and include the factoring in of performance standards as well as a quantitative threshold in determining significance.

The CARB has been requested by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research to make recommendations for GHG-related thresholds of significance. Consistent with this request, the CARB released a Preliminary Draft Staff Proposal in October 2008 (Draft Staff Proposal), which represents the first step toward developing recommended statewide interim thresholds of significance for GHGs that may be adopted by local agencies for their own use. The Draft Staff Proposal focuses on common project types, including industrial, residential, and commercial projects. The collective greenhouse gas emissions from these sectors, together with the transportation sector, represent approximately 80% of the statewide greenhouse gas emissions inventory in 2004. CARB staff believe that thresholds in these important sectors would advance climate objectives, would streamline project review, and would encourage consistency and uniformity in the CEQA analysis of GHG emissions throughout the State.

A significant effect on the environment means a substantial, or potentially substantial, change in the environment cause directly or indirectly by the project. The incremental effect of a project can be significant when it is cumulatively considerable; that is, when the effect is added to that of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects that also contribute to the problem (State CEQA Guidelines, 2009).

CARB staff believe that for the sectors evaluated in the Draft Staff Proposal, non-zero thresholds can be supported by substantial evidence. Zero thresholds are not recommended.
because: 1) some level of emissions in the near term and at mid-century would still be consistent with climate stabilization; and 2) current and anticipated regulations and programs apart from CEQA, will proliferate and increasingly reduce the GHG contributions of past, present, and future projects.

Any non-zero threshold must be sufficiently stringent to make substantial contributions to reducing the State’s GHG emission peak, to causing that peak to occur sooner, and to putting California on track to meet its interim (2020) and long-term (2050) emissions reductions targets. CARB staff believe that the preliminary interim approaches outlined in their Draft Staff Proposal are consistent with these objectives. The approach relies on an industrial project meeting performance standards (or equivalent mitigation) for construction-related and transportation-related emissions, and with mitigation, emissions of no more than 7,000 metric tons of CO$_2$e/year from non-transportation sources. Residential and commercial projects would also be required to meet performance standards (or equivalent mitigation) for construction-related and operations-related emissions with performance standards or equivalent mitigation emitting no more than an amount of CO$_2$e/year that is still being developed (CARB, Draft Staff Proposal, 2008).

CAPCOA’s CEQA and Climate Change, 2008 looked at options for GHG thresholds. Quantitative thresholds were studied based on capture of 90% or more of likely future discretionary development emissions. The objective was to set the emission threshold low enough to capture a substantial fraction of future residential and non-residential development that will be constructed to accommodate future statewide population and job growth, while setting the emission threshold high enough to exclude small development projects that would contribute a relatively small fraction of the cumulative statewide GHG emissions. A 900 metric tons/year threshold was selected based on an analysis that included data from four diverse cities (Los Angeles, Pleasanton, Dublin, and Livermore). This threshold would apply to industrial, residential, and commercial projects, but it is noted that any adoption of such a threshold would require further investigation. The CAPCOA document also looked at other possible thresholds, including zero thresholds, CARB reporting thresholds, and efficiency-based thresholds, among others. CAPCOA notes that this document is considered a “white paper” and is intended as a resource and not a guidance document. In June 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) became the first regulatory agency in the nation to approve guidelines that establish thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. Thresholds are set at 1,100 metric tons per year for non-stationary sources and 10,000 metric tons per year for stationary sources (BAAQMD; June, 2010).

OPR indicates that a lead agency should make a good faith effort, based on available information, to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. While numerous threshold options have been discussed in various publications, at this time, neither the State of California, nor the Santa Barbara County APCD, nor the City of Goleta have established or adopted CEQA significance thresholds/screening tables for GHG emissions.

Project Specific and Cumulative Impacts

a,b) There are a number of modeling tools that can be used to estimate GHG emissions associated with various project types. The most consistently used model for estimating a project’s direct impacts is the Urban Emissions Model (URBEMIS). URBEMIS is
designed to model emissions associated with development of urban land uses and attempts to summarize criteria air pollutants and CO₂ emissions that would occur during construction and operation of new development. This model is publicly available and widely used by CEQA practitioners and air districts, including the CARB. Use of this model would ensure consistency statewide in how CO₂ emissions are modeled and reported from various project types (CAPCOA, 2008).

The URBEMIS model does not contain emission factors for GHGs other than CO₂, except for methane from mobile sources, which is converted to CO₂e. This may not be a major problem since CO₂ is the most important GHG from land development projects (CAPCOA, 2008). It also constitutes approximately 84% of all GHG emissions in California and is considered a “reference gas” for relating the amount of heat absorbed to the level of GHGs emitted.

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

Project Short-term Construction Emissions

Project construction activities, especially those associated with heavy equipment operations for grading, would contribute to cumulative GHGs and global climate change. The use of heavy trucks, excavators, graders, and smaller equipment as well as unnecessary idling of that equipment, and the transportation of construction workers and materials during the work week to and from the site over months would result in emission of combustion related GHG pollutants. For the proposed project it is anticipated that project construction generated CO₂ emission levels (unmitigated) would be 4,535.73 lbs/day or 2.06 metric tons per day (equivalent to a yearly emission rate of 751.9 metric tons per year). As such, project construction would temporarily contribute to GHG emissions and climate change.

Project Long-term Operational Emissions

Emission of combustion related pollutants would occur during project operation from such sources as project-generated traffic, consumption of fossil fuels for water and space heating systems, and other activities such as landscape maintenance and HVAC system leaks. Direct long-term operational CO₂ emissions for the proposed project are estimated at 2,590.09.74 lbs/day or 1.17 metric tons/day (427.051 metric tons per year).

Indirect long-term emissions associated with the project would include energy consumed offsite in order to service the project (such as at utility providers associated with the project’s energy and water demands). For projects of this scale, these indirect emissions are expected to be minor and incremental, would not require the construction of any new utility facility, and would not conflict with programs that utility providers have adopted in order to reduce GHG contributions.
Project Significance
The project’s short-term construction and long-term operational GHG emissions would be a small percentage of California’s GHG emissions, which were estimated at 492 million metric tons of CO₂e in 2004 (California Energy Commission; 2006). The project’s emissions are also substantially less than any of the previously noted threshold values identified at the State level (CARB; 2008, CAPCOA; 2008, BAAQMD; June, 2010). The project would also not conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions (OPR; Draft CEQA Amendments, 2009) as a result of imposition of preliminary recommended mitigation measures that could be applied to the project permit as conditions of approval (see below). Therefore, project specific and cumulative impacts associated with climate change/greenhouse gases are considered less than significant.

Recommended Mitigation Measures

1. Energy conservation measures shall be included in the project. All new residential and commercial buildings must comply with City Ordinance No. 10-06, “Reach Code”, which requires energy savings measures that exceed 2008 State of California Title 24 Energy Requirements by 15% and with the 2010 State of California CALGreen Code. In addition, all residential and commercial additions exceeding 500 square feet must comply with ordinance No. 10-06. Plan Requirements: The following energy conservation measures shall be included in the plans unless the permittee demonstrates their infeasibility to the satisfaction of City staff:

a) Use of photovoltaic systems;
b) Passive cooling strategies such as passive or fan aided cooling plan designed into the structure and/or a roof opening for hot air venting or installation of underground cooling tubes;
c) High efficiency outdoor lighting and/or solar powered lighting;
d) Installation of Energy Star roofs, furnaces, and appliances;
e) Use of water-based paint on exterior surfaces;
f) Use of solar-assisted water heating for swimming pools and tankless hot water on demand systems if their energy efficiency is demonstrated to exceed that of a central storage tank water heating system;
g) Use of passive solar cooling/heating;
h) Use of natural lighting in lieu of artificial lighting;
i) Installation of energy efficient lighting;
j) Use of water-efficient landscapes; water-efficient irrigation systems and devices; and use of reclaimed water (if available);
k) Installation of cool pavements
l) Provision of segregated waste bins for recyclable materials;
m) Zero waste/high recycling standards.

Timing: These requirements shall be shown on plans prior to LUP and/or building permit issuance.
**Monitoring:** Staff shall verify compliance prior to final inspection.

Residual Impact

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would further reduce the project’s residual contribution to cumulative greenhouse gas emissions generated in California.

**HAZARDS and HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project: Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document
---|---|---|---|---
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 project site was previously developed as a gas station that operated as an Exxon/Mobil franchise from 1967 to 1989. In 1989 the station was demolished and the underground storage tanks (USTs) removed. Between 1990 and 1994 the property owners conducted an environmental assessment and clean-up of the site that included remediation of approximately 12,000 cubic yards of hydrocarbon contaminated soil, sampling from six groundwater monitoring wells, and treatment of over 400,000 gallons of contaminated groundwater. Soil samples collected from the bottom of the onsite excavations upon completion of onsite contaminated soil remediation indicated that either hydrocarbons were not detectable or remnant concentrations were less than pre-cleanup levels (Holguin, Fahan, & Associates Inc, January 26, 2004). In May of 1994, the consultant conducting the cleanup effort submitted a closure report to the County Leaking Underground Fuel Tank (LUFT) Program [currently administered by the County Fire Department’s Fire Prevention Division (FPD)] who subsequently cancelled its hold on the issuance of building permits but continued to require additional offsite monitoring to assess movement of contaminated groundwater. When monitoring and remediation costs exceeded State Underground Storage Tank Clean-up Fund (USTCF) expense limits, the responsible parties for the property ceased further remediation and monitoring efforts. In 1996, the County LUFT Program issued a Notice of Violation and in 1997 they notified Exxon/Mobil that a health risk assessment would be required as a condition for future mixed-use development of the property. Exxon/Mobil agreed to install additional monitoring wells as a co-responsible party and submit groundwater monitoring reports but refused to prepare the required health risk assessment since according to them that was a condition for future development of the property and not a requirement for site closure. In 2009, Exxon/Mobil reported the findings of soil, groundwater and soil vapor assessment conducted in 2008 on the site and neighboring properties. The results of this assessment confirmed the presence of residual hydrocarbons in soil vapor on site, and the persistence of gasoline contamination in soil south of the site.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact with regard to hazards and hazardous materials would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual 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. Since the project is not a hazardous materials facility, the City’s risk based thresholds are not particularly applicable. However, for the purposes of this analysis, the project would be considered to pose a significant impact if it results in the exposure of people to a variety of hazards or hazardous materials as listed above.

Project Specific Impacts

a-c) The project would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, pose a significant potential for the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment, or 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 since the use of such materials onsite is not proposed nor is there a school within ¼ mile of the project site.

d) As noted above, the project site was formerly a gas station where hydrocarbon contamination of soils and groundwater occurred as a result of leaking underground gasoline storage tanks. Based on input from the County LUFT Program, clean-up and remediation work was undertaken between 1990 and 1994 with ongoing monitoring of groundwater. According to LUFT Program staff, residual hydrocarbon contamination has been detected in soil, groundwater, and soil vapor samples taken on site and in the surrounding area. As such, the continued presence of residual hydrocarbon contamination in the area poses a potentially significant public health risk.

e,f) Although the project site does lie within two miles of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, it is located well to the north of the main runway Approach Zone and well east of the secondary north/south 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 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 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 hydrocarbon contamination in the area due to the prior gas station would represent a potentially significant contribution to the cumulative exposure of people to such hazardous wastes.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The permittee shall comply with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department Conditions for Redevelopment of the Site pursuant to the letters from County Fire dated December
Plan Requirements and Timing: Prior to the issuance of any land use or building permits, the permittee shall provide written verification from the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division that all conditions for site redevelopment pursuant to the Fire Department’s letters of December 1, 2010 and January 16, 2008 have been complied with and that the permittee has clearance from County Fire to commence project construction.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance with this requirement prior to issuance of any LUP or building permit(s) for the project.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or offsite?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or offsite?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
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 existing project site lies vacant and without any onsite water quality or stormwater runoff control facilities. When subject to sufficiently intense storm events, runoff from the property flows to the gutter on Fairview Avenue where it is conveyed by the City stormdrain system to San Pedro Creek and ultimately Goleta Slough. The entirety of the project site lies within the 100-year floodplain and the southerly \( \frac{1}{3} \) of the site lies within the regulatory floodway. The base flood elevation (bfe) for the 100-year event as mapped by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is at 17 feet above mean sea level (msl) across the entirety of the project site. While the southerly \( \frac{1}{3} \) of the property lies within the floodway, the property would be hydraulically isolated from floodwater flows during storm events due to the presence of a masonry wall along the west and south property lines. The wall ranges in height from 1½ feet at the NW property corner where the wall meets existing grade to a height of 7½ feet at its highest point to a height of 4 feet at the SW property corner. The corresponding elevations above msl range from 16 feet at the SW property corner to 22½ feet at the NW property corner. Photodocumentation submitted by the applicant indicates that this wall was constructed for the former gas station and before the original FEMA mapping of the floodplain in 1973.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on hydrology and water quality would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual assume that a significant impact on hydrology and water quality...
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,b) 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 Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB). All sewage effluent would be handled via connection to the Goleta Sanitary District’s central sewer system.

c) The project would involve 700 cubic yards of cut and 250 cubic yards of fill with the virtual entirety of the 0.80 acre site being graded for project construction 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 San Pedro Creek and Goleta Slough. Such impacts would be considered potentially significant.

d,g-i) The virtual entirety of the project site lies within the 100-year floodplain and the southerly ⅓ of the project site lies within the regulatory floodway of Las Vegas/San Pedro Creeks as mapped by FEMA. The 100-year floodplain is the area subject to inundation during the 100-year storm event (a storm with a 1% probability of occurring at any given time). The City’s Floodplain Management Ordinance (Chapter 15 of the Municipal Code) allows structural development within the 100-year floodplain if the finished floor elevation is raised at least two feet above the bfe. The regulatory floodway is defined as the portion of a floodplain designated for passage of the 100-year flood without increasing the elevation of floodwaters by more than one-foot. Section 35-213(1) of the City’s Inland Zoning Ordinance (IZO) prohibits development within the floodway unless offsetting improvements per Federal Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD) requirements are provided. The primary purpose of this prohibition is to ensure that development that could restrict flows within the floodway, and thereby increase the bfe and exacerbating flooding of the surrounding area, as well as subjecting people and structures to flooding hazards, is avoided.

As discussed above, the project site includes a masonry wall of varying height along the west and south property lines. This wall was constructed before the floodplain of Las Vegas/San Pedro Creeks was mapped by FEMA and as such, contributed to the baseline flooding condition within this drainage. The wall ranges in height from 1½ feet to 7½ feet with top-of-wall elevations ranging from 19½ to 23½ feet above msl. The bfe for the entirety of the project site is at 17 feet above msl. Even though the southerly portion of the site is mapped within the floodway and lies at a lower elevation than the bfe in this location, the wall physically isolates the project site from the area to the west that would actually be within the flowing water course of the 100-year storm event along Las Vegas and San Pedro Creeks. Therefore, as long as the existing wall remains in its current location and condition, or a new replacement wall is constructed in the same location and height as the existing wall, development to the east of the wall would have
no effect on the regulatory floodway. However, if the wall were to be removed, expanded, relocated, or altered in a manner that could affect the flow of flood waters (e.g. lowering the wall so that floodwaters can flow across the project site), the existing baseline condition would change, potentially affecting the floodway and possibly exposing people and structures onsite to increased flood hazards. As currently proposed, the existing wall would be replaced with a new, split-face concrete block wall along the westerly and southerly property lines. As such, if not designed so as to ensure that the new wall would have no effect on the hydrology of the area, could result in a heightened flooding potential and exposure of people and structures to an increased flooding threat in the area. Such impacts would be considered potentially significant.

In addition, the first floor elevation of the commercial center would be at 17.5 feet above msl. As noted above, the bfe for the 100-year event in the vicinity of San Pedro and Las Vegas Creeks is 17 feet above MSL and under the City’s Floodplain Management Ordinance (Section 15A.16(3)), all new construction must have a first floor elevation of at least two feet above the bfe to prevent the flooding of habitable structures during the 100-year event. However, adjustments to these requirements are available for cause if the City’s Director of Community Services finds that the specific circumstances of a project warrant a variance to this standard. In this particular instance, the applicant applied for such a variance. Due to the existing conditions of the site, the presence of the wall along the western property line that hydrologically isolates the property from the floodplain and floodway, and the fact that raising the site by two feet to meet the 19-foot first floor elevation requirement pursuant to the ordinance would in effect result in a greater displacement of water within the floodplain under flooding conditions, the Director of Community Services granted a variance to the requirements of the City’s Floodplain Management Ordinance to allow for a 17.5-foot first floor elevation instead of 19 feet on November 30, 2007. However, until the first floor elevation is verified during project construction, the flood exposure risk for both people and property would be considered potentially significant.

e,f) A large percentage of the project site would be impervious with 43.5% (approximately 15,200 square feet) consisting of paved parking and driveways. As proposed, the project includes permeable paving of the driveway aprons, trench drain interceptors where the parking area abuts the driveway aprons, subsurface stormwater retardation facilities underneath the paved parking area, and a system of stormdrains with inlets within the landscaped planters along the east and south property lines of the project site 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. In addition, 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 subsurface retardation facilities and landscape planter stormdrains before being discharged into the gutter along Fairview Avenue and ultimately conveyed to San Pedro 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. However, if not installed and maintained per approved plans, resulting project impacts on water quality would be considered potentially significant.
j) As noted in the Seismic Safety and Safety Element (1980) of the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive 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 and 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 San Pedro Creek and the Goleta Slough, would be considered potentially significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The permittee shall either revise the project elevations and site plan to eliminate any and all improvements, modifications, or changes to the existing masonry wall along the western and southern property lines that separates the project site from the rest of the regulatory floodway of San Pedro and Las Vegas Creeks, or provide detailed engineering plans and a floodway encroachment study prepared by a licensed engineer that demonstrates that the new wall would have no potential to alter floodway capacity to be reviewed and approved by the Director of Community Services. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Any such modifications to the existing wall shall be noted in detail on all project plans and shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Community Services, the DRB, and Planning and Environmental Services staff prior to issuance of any LUP or building/grading permits.

   **Monitoring:** City staff shall ensure compliance with this condition prior to issuance of any LUP or building/grading permits.

2. The permittee shall have the first floor elevation surveyed to verify that it is at an elevation of 17.5 feet above msl per the requirements of the variance to the City’s Floodplain Management Ordinance approved by the Director of Community Services. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** All plans submitted for any LUP, building, or grading permit(s) shall include this condition. The required survey shall be conducted by a California licensed surveyor and submitted to City staff for review and approval prior to the first concrete pour for the structure’s foundation.

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

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

4. The permittee 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 and Timing:** The permittee shall submit proof and City staff shall review and approve documentation prior to LUP issuance.

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

5. The permittee shall prepare a final stormwater quality protection plan that identifies all Best Management Practices (BMPs), including the underground stormwater detention facility identified in the *Preliminary Drainage Analysis* prepared by Flowers & Associates and dated May 6, 2010 as well as described in the approved project description. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The final stormwater quality protection BMPs plan shall be prepared by a licensed engineer and submitted to City staff for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to LUP issuance. City staff shall verify that all stormwater protection/BMPs have been constructed/installed per the approved final drainage plan prior to any final inspection.

6. **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to LUP issuance. City staff shall verify that all stormwater protection/BMPs have been constructed/installed per the approved final drainage plan prior to any final inspection.

7. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The final drainage control plan shall be prepared by a licensed engineer and identify all drainage control improvements to be incorporated into the project design, including the proposed underground infiltration system. The required plan shall include a final drainage analysis that provides final estimates on pre/post development stormwater runoff volumes, required storage capacity, and specifications on all elements of the drainage control system. The submitted final drainage control plan shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

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

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. City staff shall verify compliance with the provision of the agreement periodically and respond to instances of non-compliance with the agreement.

**Residual Impact**

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

**LAND USE and PLANNING**

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

**Existing Setting**

The project site lies at the NW corner of the Hollister/Fairview intersection in the western portion of the Old Town Revitalization Area. It is surrounded by commercial development both within the City of Goleta as well as the City of Santa Barbara. 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 Old Town Revitalization Plan.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) The project would be constructed on a vacant parcel that formerly was the site of a gas station. It would not divide nor introduce an incompatible use within the already existing commercial development in the area. No such associated impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

b) General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan

Land Use Element- Standards for Density and Building Intensity

The Recommended Standards for Building Intensity for the C-OT land use classification includes a structural height limitation of 30 feet. The project includes a building peak height of 33 feet and a tower element peak height of 40 feet. Exceptions to the height limitation may be made if a Good Cause Finding can be made. Good Cause Finding criteria include the following:

The good cause finding is a finding of public or community necessity, e.g., a better site or architectural design that will result in better resource protection, will provide a significant community benefit, and/or does not create an adverse impact to the community character, aesthetics, or public views. Standards for analysis include:

a) Conceptual drawings (basic site plan and elevations) of the proposal that meet the standards in the land use tables for review by the DRB and the Planning Commission;

b) At the discretion of the DRB and/or Planning Commission, conceptual plans may be requested for one (1) other version of the project that comes closer to meeting the standard(s) in the tables;

c) At the discretion of the DRB and/or Planning Commission, story poles and/or visual simulations may be requested, including those that reflect the proposal that meets the standard; and

d) The use proposed should meet a public or community need or goal, e.g., senior affordable or other affordable housing, recreational facilities open to the public, non-profit facilities that serve the public, preservation or restoration of an historic structure or resource, and/or projects that have negligible impacts and do not require significant use of public and/or natural resources.

A final determination as to whether or not the proposed structure at heights exceeding the recommended standard meet the criteria for good cause and/or provide for significant public benefit will be made by the Planning Commission when it completes its
consideration of the project. Preliminarily, City staff is in support of findings for good cause for the proposed exceedence of the General Plan’s recommended height limit for Old Town due to the following circumstances:

1) The tower architectural projection is a necessary component of the project’s design to accommodate the elevator that is needed to serve the second floor of the proposed structure.

2) The elevation of the tower has already been lowered and would not be high enough to accommodate the needed elevator if further lowered, especially if its height were reduced to 30 feet.

3) The tree line along the western property line is sufficiently high so that the proposed tower and screening roof parapet would not extend beyond it thereby allowing the tower element and roofline to blend in to the tree line.

4) The building and its tower element in its proposed location would not block any significant public views to either the east or west.

5) The project site is well below the elevation of the Fairview Overpass, a protected scenic resource pursuant to the General Plan, such that the proposed tower and roofline would not impact public views from this vantage point.

6) The roof of the structure includes a screening parapet wall that would be 33’ above finished grade, three (3) feet higher than the recommended standard. However, as this parapet is intended to screen roof-mounted mechanical equipment and other roof-mounted extensions (vents, flues, etc) from public view, and given that the structure height represents only a minimal exceedence of the recommended standard, the overall visual benefits of providing for effective screening of potentially unsightly roof-mounted equipment far outweighs any possible adverse visual impact of a parapet wall that is only three feet higher than the recommended standard.

Housing Element Policy HE 3.2
This policy requires mitigation of employee housing impacts associated with non-residential development. The project is estimated to generate up to 30 new employment opportunities in Old Town. The project is however, a mixed-use development and would provide two new residential units. Provision of these two new units would satisfy the requirements of HE 3.2.

Inland Zoning Ordinance

Development Standards
The project complies with all development standards of the C-2 zone district under the Inland Zoning Ordinance (IZO) including maximum building height (35 feet), and setbacks. With regards to set backs, the C-2 zone district has a 30’ from centerline/10’ from ROW line front setback, no side yard setback, and a 10’ rear yard setback. As this is a triangular shaped lot with the eastern property line abutting Fairview, (i.e. the front property line), there is discretion in the selection of which of the two remaining property lines is designated as side and rear. In this instance the project is designed based on the west property line as the side property boundary and the south property line as the rear property boundary. Given these designations, the project as currently designed meets all three zone district setback requirements.
Long Term Parking

The proposed project would provide 28 standard, non-residential parking spaces (9’ x 16½’), six (6) compact spaces (8’ x 14½’), three (3) standard residential spaces (8½’ x 16½’) and two (2) handicapped spaces (minimum of 14’ x 16½’) for a total of 39 parking spaces. One loading dock space (10’ x 30’) would also be provided to support the retail component of the project. This meets the Inland Zoning Ordinance’s (IZO’s) minimum parking requirements for the project (39 spaces), the IZO’s minimum requirement for off-street loading facilities for commercial uses, the IZO’s requirement that compact spaces do not exceed 30% of the total number of spaces required, and the General Plan’s requirement that compact parking in commercial developments represents no more than 20% of the total required parking.

In addition, the IZO requires that a minimum drive aisle width of 43½ feet measured from the front of one parking space to the rear the opposing space when such spaces are at 90° from the drive aisle itself to ensure adequate vehicle backing space to safety enter and exit such spaces with a minimum of turning movements. Under the revised plans dated May 6, 2010, all drive aisle segments meet this minimum width requirement. Therefore, under the current site plan for the project adequate drive aisle width is maintained in all areas of to ensure that the interior vehicular circulation and parking plan is fully functional.

b) 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.

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 recommended or required.

Residual Impact

None.
MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

There are no known mineral resources onsite.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

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

Cumulative Impacts

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

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

None.
NOISE

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

Existing Setting

The project site lies within the 60+ to 65 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise exposure contour within the City. Noise exposure contours map points of equal average noise levels in the same way that topographic contours map points of equal elevation. The primary sources of noise in the area are vehicular traffic on Hollister and Fairview Avenues, including the Fairview/Highway 101 interchange, aircraft operations at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, neighboring commercial operations such as the adjacent tire store, and to a lesser extent rail traffic along the railroad, and golf course operations/maintenance at the neighboring Twin Lakes Golf Course.

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

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

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

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

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant noise impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*. The City's adopted thresholds assume that outdoor CNEL noise levels in excess of 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+ to 65 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 proposed residential uses to such noise levels would be considered an adverse but less than significant impact.

b,f) The 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) As a mixed use, retail, office, and residential project, this development would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. No such impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of project implementation.

d) The project site is located within close proximity to three sensitive noise receptors, the Super 8 Motel across Hollister at Fairview, the adjacent Twin Lakes Golf Course, and the residential neighborhood across Fairview in the Mandarin Drive/orange Avenue area. Noise associated with heavy equipment operation and construction activities can average as high as 95 dB or more measured 50 feet from the source. At a point source
attenuation rate of 6 dB for each doubling of distance from the source, construction equipment noise levels at 95 dB would not decrease to below the 65 dB threshold for sensitive receptors until the distance between the source and receptor reaches 1,600 feet. Since the golf course, motel, and residential units to the east of the project site all lie within a 1,600 foot radius of the project site, construction noise would be considered to pose a potentially significant impact on sensitive receptors in the area.

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 potentially significant cumulative noise impacts on sensitive receptors along the Hollister Avenue corridor.

Required Mitigation Measure

1. Construction activity for site preparation and for future development shall be limited to the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. No construction shall occur on State holidays (e.g. Christmas, Thanksgiving, Memorial Day, 4th of July, Labor Day). Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (in the event of an emergency, for example) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Environmental Services. **Plan Requirements:** Two signs stating these restrictions shall be provided by the permittee 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.

Residual Impact

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

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

Existing Setting

The project site lies within the commercial/business corridor along and near to Hollister Avenue in Old Town. It is currently zoned C-2, (retail commercial) and designated as Old Town Commercial per the Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The project site was previously the location of an Exxon/Mobil gas station up to about 1990.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) The project includes 8,757 square feet of retail space, 6,206 square feet of office space, and two residential units. To assess potential changes to employment levels in Old Town resulting from project implementation, staff used the City’s parking standards to create a worst case employment estimate. Specifically, for office space the parking standard is one-space/300 square-feet\(^2\) and for retail one-space/500 square feet. In recognition of the fact that retail related parking includes both employees and customers, staff assumed that \(\frac{1}{2}\) of the required parking would serve employees and \(\frac{1}{2}\) would serve customers resulting in a retail employment factor of one-employee/1,000 square-feet of floor area. Applying these two employment generation factors based on the square-footage of both office and retail space, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate 30 new employment opportunities in Old Town. With average occupancy rate of 2.7 individuals/housing unit (City of Goleta Housing Element Technical Appendix, 2011).

\(^2\) The estimate of one-employee/300 ft\(^2\) of office space is consistent with the project specific employment generation factors provided by the applicant for the Montecito Bank & Trust proposed final MND (10-MND-001).
June, 2009), the anticipated increase in residential population resulting from the proposed project would be six or less residents. A six person increase in residents and 30 employee increase in employment in Old Town would have no measurable impact on population growth in the area and would not necessitate construction of any new roads or infrastructure. As such, impacts resulting from potential inducement of population growth in the City would be considered less than significant.

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

Cumulative Impacts

The project’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

None.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project: Potentially Significant Impact
|
---|---|---|---|---|---|
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: | | | | |

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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 County Sheriff’s Department under contract to the City and the Santa Barbara County Fire Department. School aged children living
in the two residential units, if any, would attend the Goleta Union School District for elementary and junior high school and the Santa Barbara School and High School District for high school. Residents and employees of the center could avail themselves of a variety of parks and other public services such as the Goleta Public 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 project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual includes thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools. Specifically, under these thresholds any project that would generate enough students to generate the need for an additional classroom using current State standards, would be considered to result in a significant impact on area schools.3

Project Specific Impacts

a) The increase in the number of residents and employees living and 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 14 on Los Carneros Road, north of U.S. Highway 101. The County Fire Station on Calle Real just west of Patterson Avenue 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 closest existing fire hydrant to the project site is approximately 250 feet to the northeast at the corner of Fairview Avenue (minor) and Mandarin Drive. In light of the distance between this existing hydrant and the project site, and the fact that hoses would have to be laid across the street for firefighting purposes, at least one new fire hydrant at the project site would be required to ensure adequate fire protection for the proposed project (Jim Michalak, Inspector, Fire Prevention Division, Santa Barbara County Fire Department, January 25, 2006). The current project plans now include a new fire hydrant to be installed in the sidewalk at the SE corner of the project site. As this new hydrant is the only firefighting improvement needed to support the proposed project, and installation of such a hydrant would not result in any physical change to the environmental or significant environmental effect, resulting impacts associated with the provision of necessary firefighting improvements would be considered less than significant.

b-e) The increase in the number of residents and employees living and working in the area would have no impact on the County Sheriff Department’s ability to adequately serve the citizens of the City. The number of school aged children to potentially live in one or both of the proposed apartment units, if any, would have no adverse impact on enrollment in either the Goleta Union or Santa Barbara School and 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. Therefore, no new police, school, parks, or

3 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
other public facilities whose construction could have a significant environmental effect would occur and associated impacts would be considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The project would not result in a significant contribution to cumulative impacts on fire or police protective services or the demand for parks and other public facilities and services. The applicant would be subject to payment of City required Development Impact Fees at the time of either LUP issuance or occupancy clearance however.

Recommended Mitigation Measures

1. The composite utility plan to be prepared by the permittee shall include the installation of at least one fire hydrant to serve the proposed project meeting all applicable Santa Barbara County Fire Department requirements. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The composite utility plan identifying the location and specifications of the required fire hydrant shall be submitted for review and approval by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department as well as City staff and the DRB prior to LUP issuance. The required fire hydrant 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 DBR 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 these mitigation measures, residual project specific impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant. All other residual project specific and project contributions to cumulative impacts on public services would be less than significant.

**RECREATION**

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

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

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) The project would increase the population of Old Town by two residential units (up to six individuals) and as many as 30 employees as noted under the discussion of Population/Housing above. Such minimal population increases would incrementally increase demand for recreational facilities in the area but would not trigger the City’s threshold for a significant, project specific impact. Such project specific impacts on existing recreational facilities would therefore be considered adverse but less than significant.

b) The project does include an employee break area at the northern corner of the property that would not result in any adverse environmental effects. No other recreational facilities are proposed or required. As such, no environmental effect would occur as a result of recreational facility construction associated with the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts

Although the project would not result in any project specific, significant effects on recreational facilities or demand for new such public amenities, the resulting incremental increase in the population of the Old Town neighborhood from the development of two residential units and approximately 15,000 square feet of retail/office space would represent an adverse but less than significant contribution to cumulative impacts on recreational facilities and the demand for such amenities in the area.
**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

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

**Residual Impact**

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

### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

Existing Setting

The property lies west of Fairview Avenue and north of Hollister Avenue within a developed commercial area. The site is adjacent to a retail tire store to the south, the Twin Lakes Golf Course to the west/northwest, and several fast food restaurants and office/retail uses to the east on the opposite side of Fairview Avenue. The street network generally affected by the project is bounded by Calle Real to the north, Hollister Avenue to the south, and Fairview Avenue to the east.

Access to the site is proposed via one two-way driveway, proposed to be 30 feet wide and located directly across from Fairview Avenue (minor), and a right-in only driveway at the south end of the project site, adjacent to the existing tire store driveway. The southerly driveway is proposed to be 16 feet wide. Left-turn lanes currently exist in both directions on Fairview Avenue (major) at the proposed northerly driveway. A sidewalk and bike lane providing pedestrian and bicycle access already exist along the project frontage on Fairview Avenue. Parking for the proposed project would be provided in 39 vehicle parking spaces, plus one delivery truck loading space at the southwest corner of the property.

Thresholds of Significance

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

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

65
LEVEL OF SERVICE  
(including the project)     INCREASE IN V/C  
(greater than)  

A  .20  
B  .15  
C  .10  

OR THE ADDITION OF  

D  15 trips  
E  10 trips  
F  5 trips  

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

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

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) To facilitate assessment of potential traffic impacts resulting from project implementation, the applicant’s consulting traffic engineer (Penfield & Smith) prepared and submitted a traffic study dated June 13, 2002. That study was reviewed by City staff (Community Services Department, Jim Biega, City traffic engineer) who subsequently prepared a scope-of-work for a revised traffic study. Using the City prepared scope-of-work, Penfield & Smith submitted a revised traffic study dated July 1, 2004. That study was again reviewed by the City with requests for further revisions. The study was again revised and resubmitted on November 19, 2004 with a final version dated October 3, 2005 submitted in response to further staff comments on the November, 2004 study. Per this traffic study, morning and afternoon peak hour trips were distributed and assigned to the local street network based on discussions between City staff and the consulting traffic engineers, existing land uses in the area, and consultant/City staff knowledge of current traffic flows and patterns. The resulting trip distribution projection is shown in Table 1.
Table 1  
Project Trip Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/Direction</th>
<th>Percentage of Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue (east)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue (west)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Avenue (north of Calle Real)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Avenue (south)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 101 (north)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 101 (south)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calle Real (east)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calle Real (west)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Traffic</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source, Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005

Roadway segments expected to be affected by the proposed project include Hollister Avenue both east and west of Fairview Avenue and Fairview Avenue both north and south of Hollister Avenue. Existing roadway traffic volumes for each of these road segments is shown in Table 2 (Penfield & Smith, Traffic Impact Study, 151 S. Fairview Avenue, October 3, 2005).
As shown in Table 2, all of the roadway segments likely to be affected by the proposed project currently operate at acceptable levels of service and the addition of 476 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.

To assess the project’s impact on various intersections within its affected travelshed, five different intersections along Fairview Avenue were evaluated. To identify operating conditions at the study intersections, a level of service (LOS) ranking scale was used. This scale identifies impacts of traffic volumes versus intersection capacity and assigns a letter value to this relationship. The letter scale ranges from A to F with LOS A representing free flow conditions and LOS F representing highly congested (gridlock) conditions. These level of service criteria are included in this document as Attachment D of this document. Based on this analysis, existing service levels at these five intersections are shown in Table 3 (Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005).

---

* Defined as 80% of Design Capacity  
Source: Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005

---

4 In order to determine the signalized intersection levels of service, the Intersection Capacity Utilization Methodology (ICU) was used and the results are shown as a volume to capacity ratio. For the unsignalized intersection at Fairview (major)/Fairview (minor) the LOS was determined based on an average delay per vehicle as calculated from field observations.
Table 3

Existing Peak Hour Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour w/RTOR Adjustment</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour w/RTOR Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview /Hollister</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.67/ LOS B</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>0.67/ LOS B</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview (major)/Fairview (minor)</td>
<td>One-way stop</td>
<td>7.7/ LOS A*</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>12.1/ LOS B*</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Hwy 101 SB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.85/LOS D</td>
<td>0.66/ LOS B</td>
<td>0.64/LOS B</td>
<td>0.54/LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Hwy 101 NB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.63/ LOS B</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>0.76/ LOS C</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Calle Real</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.83/LOS D</td>
<td>0.81/ LOS D</td>
<td>0.87/LOS D</td>
<td>0.84/LOS D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LOS calculated based on observed delay (seconds)

Source: Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005

Per Table 3, the Fairview/Calle Real intersection currently operates at LOS D during both the AM and PM peak hours and the Fairview/SB 101 ramps operate at LOS D during the AM peak hour if no adjustment for right turns on red lights (RTOR) is incorporated into the analysis. However, given the fact that RTOR turn movements are available and used by a significant number of drivers at the Fairview/SB 101 intersection (Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005), the actual AM peak hour level-of-service at this intersection is LOS B.

The change in intersection operations at the five intersections within the project’s travelshed resulting from project generated traffic volumes with and without adjustments for RTOR turning movements are noted in Table 4.
Table 4
Peak Hour Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service (AM and PM) with and w/o RTOR Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM LOS Existing + Project (as noted by V/C or delay in seconds)</th>
<th>Change in AM LOS (as noted by change in V/C, project-added trips, or seconds of delay)</th>
<th>PM LOS Existing + Project (as noted by V/C or delay in seconds)</th>
<th>Change in PM LOS (as noted by change in V/C, project-added trips, or seconds of delay)</th>
<th>Significant Impact (per the City’s Thresholds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Hollister</td>
<td>LOS B (V/C = 0.67)</td>
<td>ΔV/C = 0.00</td>
<td>LOS B (V/C = 0.67)</td>
<td>ΔV/C = 0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview (major)/Fairview (minor)/Project driveway</td>
<td>LOS A* (Delay = 11.1 sec)</td>
<td>Δ Delay = 3.4 sec</td>
<td>LOS C (Delay = 15.1 sec)</td>
<td>Δ Delay = 3.0 sec</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Hwy 101 SB Ramps</td>
<td><strong>LOS B</strong> (V/C = 0.66)</td>
<td><strong>Δ V/C = 0.00</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Yes (AM peak hour w/o ROTR adjustment)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Hwy 101 NB Ramps</td>
<td>LOS B (V/C = 0.63)</td>
<td>Δ V/C = 0.01</td>
<td>LOS C (V/C = 0.76)</td>
<td>Δ V/C = 0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Calle Real</td>
<td>LOS D (V/C = 0.83)</td>
<td>Δ Trips = 5</td>
<td>0.87/LOS D (V/C = 0.87)</td>
<td>Δ Trips = 7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LOS measured in seconds of delay calculated based on field observations
Source: Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005

Based on this analysis, project specific impacts on intersection operations at the Fairview/101 SB ramps would be considered significant without adjustment for ROTR turning movements. However, after adjusting the analysis to include RTOR turning movements at this intersection, the actual effect of project generated traffic on peak hour intersection operations at Fairview/SB 101 would be well below the City’s threshold of significance. Therefore, project specific impacts on all intersection and roadway operations within the project travelshed would be considered adverse but less than significant.

b,d) 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 City’s 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Added Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>10 trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this particular instance, additional traffic volumes resulting from the proposed project would be below the City’s initial screening levels for all but the Fairview/SB 101 intersection. When the availability of RTOR turning movements is incorporated into level-of-service calculations for this intersection, the resulting level-of-service remains at LOS B. Therefore, the project’s addition of 21 AM peak hour trips to Fairview/SB 101 would not be considered to pose either a project specific, significant impact or significant contribution to cumulative impacts on the City’s CMP system.

c,h) Transportation Element Policy TE 4.2 establishes modified LOS standards for specific intersections at planned capacity in the City. Pursuant to Table 7-1 and Policy TE 4.2, planned capacity for the Fairview/Calle Real intersection is LOS C (V/C = 0.80). Current AM peak hour LOS at Fairview/Calle Real is at LOS D (V/C = 0.83) and the proposed project would add an additional five (5) AM peak hour trips to this intersection (ATE, November 29, 2004). Current PM peak hour LOS at Fairview/Calle Real is also at LOS D (V/C = 0.87) and the proposed project would add an additional seven (7) PM peak hour trips to this intersection (ATE, November 29, 2004). While the Fairview/Calle Real intersection does not meet its applicable LOS standard pursuant to TE 4.2, the number of peak hour trips added to the intersection, either during the AM or PM peak would be well below the project specific threshold of 15 trips or the cumulative contribution threshold of a change in V/C of 0.02. As such, in the absence of either a significant project specific, or project contribution to cumulative traffic impacts at this intersection, the project would be considered to pose an adverse, but less than significant effect on implementation of the City’s intersection LOS standards pursuant to the General Plans Transportation Element.

As noted above, the only other City intersection within the project’s travelshed whose LOS would conflict with the modified LOS standards of TE 4.2 would be the Fairview/U.S. Highway 101 south-bound ramps. However, as already discussed, this apparent conflict is eliminated when the ability of motorists to make a RTOR traffic movement is included in the LOS calculations for that intersection.

Finally, the project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation or otherwise decrease the performance or safety or such facilities and/or services. The project would not adversely affect any existing or
planned bus stops in the area, lies in close proximity to bus service along the Hollister corridor making public transportation access to the project substantially more feasible for both residents and employees, and would include two bike racks for people using bicycles for commuting to and from the site.

e) The project site lies outside of any airport approach or clear zone and would have no impact on air traffic patterns at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.

f) Access to the project site from Fairview Avenue would be provided via two driveways, the northerly most a two-way driveway located directly across from Fairview Avenue (minor) and the other, a right in only driveway at the south end of the project site, just north of the tire store driveway. The southerly driveway would be restricted to right-in only turning movements for the following reasons:

✓ Left exiting movements onto Fairview Avenue would force exiting vehicles to cross a south-bound right-turn pocket, a south-bound Class II bike lane, two south-bound through lanes, two south-bound turn lanes onto east-bound Hollister Avenue, two north-bound through lanes, and the beginning of a north-bound left turn pocket off Fairview Avenue to enter the project site at its northerly driveway entrance;

✓ Right-out (exiting) movements onto Fairview Avenue would have to occur only 30 feet north of the current tire shop entrance from Fairview Avenue creating a significant potential for conflicting turning movements and exacerbating existing traffic hazards in the area;

✓ Both right and left turn exiting movements would occur within 100 feet of the Fairview/Hollister intersection which does not allow for sufficient distance to avoid conflicting turning/through movements at one of the City’s busiest intersections.

Turning Movements
Four turning pockets are currently striped on Fairview Avenue along the project frontage and include; 1) a southbound left turn pocket (50 feet long) onto Fairview Avenue (minor) from Fairview Avenue (major), 2) a right turn pocket (30 feet long) providing access to Fairview Avenue (minor) from northbound Fairview Avenue (major), 3) a northbound left turn pocket (30 feet long) providing access to the northern project driveway from Fairview Avenue (major), and 4) a southbound left turn pocket (30 feet long) providing access to the McDonald’s driveway from Fairview Avenue (major). The turn pockets are illustrated in Figure 5.
Delay studies conducted at the Fairview (major)/Fairview (minor) intersection during both the AM and PM peak hours indicate that even though high volumes exist on Fairview Avenue (major), gaps in traffic at sufficient intervals do occur to allow vehicles to turn into and out of Fairview Avenue (minor) at acceptable levels of service (Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005). The maximum observed queue at any one time in the southbound Fairview Avenue (major) left turn lane onto Fairview Avenue (minor) was five vehicles. This queue exceeds the existing capacity of this turn pocket (Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005) by approximately 30 feet or two vehicles. The existing left turn pocket into the project site from northbound Fairview Avenue (major) provides sufficient storage for one vehicle which should be adequate to serve the project given the low peak hour left turn volumes expected at this location as a result of project implementation.\(^5\) It should also be noted that based on field observations by the applicant’s consulting traffic engineers, the existing left turn pocket from Fairview Avenue (major) into McDonalds was of sufficient length to accommodate all peak hour turning movements from south bound Fairview Avenue (major).\(^6\)

\(^5\) Per the October, 2005 traffic study, no more than four (4) left turn PM peak hour turning movements into the project site from northbound Fairview (major) during that one-hour period would occur as a result of project implementation.

\(^6\) Based on field observations, peak hour left turns from SB Fairview (major) into McDonalds did not exceed eight (8) vehicles during a one hour period (Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005).
The addition of the project’s primary driveway as the fourth leg of the Fairview Avenue major/minor intersection would increase the number of potentially conflicting vehicle turning movements at this location, especially those vehicles turning left from the project site onto northbound Fairview Avenue (major) and those turning southbound onto Fairview Avenue (major) from Fairview Avenue (minor). Per the traffic study, the proposed project would add between five and 20 left turns out of the primary driveway onto northbound Fairview Avenue (major) during the AM and PM peak hours respectively. Those would conflict with left turn movements from Fairview Avenue (minor) onto southbound Fairview Avenue (major). California Highway Patrol collision records show of the 725 average daily left-turns made out of Fairview Avenue minor, only two collisions occurred there between 2001 and 2003. This represents a virtually incident free turning movement based on the number of left-turns/day experienced at this intersection (P&S, 2005). All other project generated turning movements would only contend with a single direction of traffic and would have a dedicated lane to merge into the traffic flow. However, the proposed right in only driveway at the southern end of the project could experience drivers attempting to exit at this location in conflict with the project’s overall circulation plan.

Sight Distance
The minimum required stopping sight distance per Caltrans’ design standards for a posted speed of 35 miles per hour is 250 feet. This is the posted speed limit along Fairview Avenue where the proposed project driveways enter/exit Fairview. Drivers exiting both project driveways would have unobstructed visibility to the north of 700 feet or more, well in excess of this standard. Views of southbound traffic on Fairview Avenue for drivers exiting the neighboring tire store via the driveway immediately south of the proposed project would have to look across the project’s parking lot, at a distance of 300+ feet and then again at a distance of approximately 245 feet as noted in Figure 6 (Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005). Two existing ornamental trees (one African fern pine and a smaller evergreen) planted as part of the former gas station’s landscaping. Under the proposed landscaping plan, these existing trees would be removed and replaced with groundcover and/or 36” box acacia trees with a minimum canopy height from finished grade to be maintained at eight (8) feet. If the canopy of the proposed acacia’s is maintained at a minimum height of eight feet above finished grade, exiting drivers from the adjoining driveway to the south of the project site would be provided acceptable sight distance to the north on south-bound Fairview Avenue. However, if the canopies of these trees are allowed to grow lower than eight feet, blockage of needed sight distance could occur.
Short Term Construction Parking

Vehicular access to the project site for construction activities and workers is only available from Fairview Avenue (major). Due to the presence of high traffic volumes along this section of Fairview Avenue fronting the project site, two lanes of south bound through traffic with a posted speed limit of 35 mph, a Class II bike lane, and the fact that Fairview Avenue is descending from the 101 interchange to the Fairview/Hollister intersection, there is no available vehicular parking along Fairview Avenue. Because construction activities often conflict with onsite construction vehicle parking, such vehicles may have to be parked offsite for significant periods of time. While offsite parking in the near vicinity is available, it is not on land owned by the applicant.

Therefore, traffic safety hazards posed by the project as a result of the lack of off-roadway construction parking, existing design and alignment of the Fairview Avenue major/minor, Fairview/McDonalds driveway, and Fairview/Hollister intersections as well as the configuration and location of the project driveways would be considered potentially significant.

As noted in the discussion of fire protection services under the section on Public Services of this document, the northerly two-way driveway would need to maintain a minimum width of 30 feet, the internal circulation aisle widths would have to maintain a minimum width of 20 feet, and the southerly right-in only driveway would have to
maintain a minimum width of 16 feet (Michalak, SBCoFD, January, 2006). As noted above, all of these requirements are met by the proposed project site plan.

Cumulative Impacts

Per the traffic study, under cumulative + project added traffic conditions, the Fairview Avenue major/minor intersection degrades from LOS B to LOS C during the PM peak hour. No other intersections within the project’s travelshed would experience a significant change from cumulative to cumulative + project conditions as a result of project implementation as noted in Table 5. The project’s contribution to cumulative traffic impacts in the City would be addressed by payment of the required traffic development impact mitigation fees. As such, under the City’s thresholds, project contributions to cumulative traffic conditions at area intersections would be considered to be less than significant.

Table 5
AM and PM Peak Hour Cumulative + Project Intersection Level of Service
*LOS calculated based on observed delay in seconds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Cumulative + Project LOS (as noted by V/C or delay in seconds)</th>
<th>Change in AM LOS (as noted by change in V/C, project-added trips, or seconds of delay)</th>
<th>PM Cumulative + Project LOS (as noted by V/C or delay in seconds)</th>
<th>Change in PM LOS (as noted by change in V/C, project-added trips, or seconds of delay)</th>
<th>Significant Impact (per the City’s Thresholds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Hollister</td>
<td>LOS B (V/C = 0.69)</td>
<td>(\Delta V/C = 0.00)</td>
<td>LOS B (V/C = 0.70)</td>
<td>(\Delta V/C = 0.00)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview (major)/Fairview (minor)/Project Driveway</td>
<td>LOS B (Delay = 11.7 sec)</td>
<td>(\Delta) Delay = 1.5 sec</td>
<td>LOS C (Delay = 16.2 sec)</td>
<td>(\Delta) Delay = 2.1 sec</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Hwy 101 SB Ramps With RTOR adjustment</td>
<td>LOS D (V/C = 0.89)</td>
<td>(\Delta V/C = 0.00)</td>
<td>LOS B (V/C = 0.68)</td>
<td>(\Delta V/C = 0.00)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Hwy 101 NB Ramps</td>
<td>0.69/LOS B (V/C = 0.69)</td>
<td>(\Delta V/C = 0.00)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Calle Real</td>
<td>0.66/LOS B (V/C = 0.66)</td>
<td>(\Delta V/C = 0.00)</td>
<td>LOS D (V/C = 0.82)</td>
<td>(\Delta V/C = 0.00)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS D (V/C = 0.84)</td>
<td>(\Delta V/C = 0.00)</td>
<td>LOS D (V/C = 0.87)</td>
<td>(\Delta V/C = 0.00)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LOS measured in seconds of delay calculated based on field observations
Source: Penfield & Smith, October 3, 2005
Required Mitigation Measures

1. The Fairview Avenue (major) southbound left turn pocket at the Fairview Avenue major/minor intersection shall be relocated ten (10) feet to the north and the northbound left turn pocket five (5) feet to the south in order to facilitate simultaneous left turns out of the project’s main driveway and Fairview Avenue minor. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The engineering plans for this required intersection realignment shall be submitted for review and approval by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify completion of the left turn pocket adjustments per the approved plans prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy for the project.

2. The Fairview Avenue (major) southbound left turn pocket onto Fairview Avenue (minor) shall be re-striped to extend this pocket from its current length of 50 feet to 125 feet. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Engineering plans for the required re-striping of this left turn pocket shall be prepared by the permittee and reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify that the left turn pocket in question has been re-striped per this requirement prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy for the project.

3. The permittee shall be required to sign a landscaping agreement to maintain the landscaping per the DRB approved final landscaping plan for the life of the project. The agreement shall include a provision requiring the property to maintain a minimum canopy height measured from finished grade of eight (8) feet for all trees planted along the project’s frontage on South Fairview Avenue. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall execute the landscape maintenance agreement for the life of the project prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance through periodic site inspections.

4. The permittee shall prepare a plan for signage for the proposed right in only driveway at the southern end of the project to advise drivers against attempting to exit at this location. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The design of this directional signage shall be reviewed and approved as part of the Overall Sign Plan for the project by City staff and the DRB prior to LUP issuance. These signs shall be installed at approved locations prior to occupancy clearance. **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify installation of the required directional signage prior to occupancy clearance.

5. The permittee shall prepare a construction vehicle parking plan. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The plan shall include provisions for construction personnel parking and construction equipment/materials staging, for both on and offsite locations in the vicinity of the project site that precludes the need for any construction related parking or equipment/materials staging on either Fairview Avenue or Hollister Avenue. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.
Monitoring: City staff shall periodically monitor in the field to verify compliance throughout all construction activities.

Residual Impact

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

UTILITIES and SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

Existing Setting

Sewage Disposal
The Goleta Sanitary District (GSD) provides sewer service to the Old Town neighborhood via a system of gravity flow and pressurized lines (where required due to the area’s topography). The District’s wastewater treatment plant has a current capacity of 9.7 million gallons per day (MGPD) with a RWQCB permitted treatment capacity of 7.64 MGPD and a current throughput of 5.5 MGPD (City of Goleta General Plan FEIR, September 2006). The plant currently operates
under a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency with concurrence by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Major GSD customers include the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD), UCSB, and the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.

Water Supply
The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water purveyor for the City of Goleta. The GWD operates under the Wright Judgment which prohibits overdrafting of the Goleta Groundwater Basin (GGWB) and mandated a return of the basin to a hydrologically balanced condition in 1998. The District draws its water supply from Lake Cachuma (9,322 acre feet/year or AFY), the State Water Project (4,500 AFY), the GGWB (2,350 AFY), and wastewater reclamation (3,000 AFY) for a total yearly supply of 19,172 AFY for a normal rainfall year (Goleta Water District Water Supply Assessment, May 22, 2008). Average current demand for GWD water (2007) is 15,554 AFY (GWD Water Assessment, May 22, 2008).

Stormwater Control Facilities
Stormwater runoff in the area is collected via gutters along Hollister and Fairview and conveyed to two drop inlets (DIs) located at the NE and NW corner of the Hollister/Fairview intersection. These DIs are connected to an existing system of stormdrains that discharge collected runoff into San Pedro Creek below its confluence with Las Vegas Creek. These stormdrain facilities would also serve the proposed project without further modification.

Solid Waste
Solid waste generated in the City is collected by BFI, Marborg, and Allied Waste and transported to the Tajiguas Landfill 20 miles to the west of Goleta on the Gaviota Coast. The County has received approval from the RWQCB and the State Integrated Waste Management Board to expand 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 (City of Goleta City of Goleta General Plan FEIR).

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

Project Specific Impacts
a,e) Using the wastewater generation factors from the Old Town Revitalization Plan EIR for commercial uses (96-EIR-005) and the current GSD wastewater generation factors for residential uses (Reyes, 2005), estimated wastewater generation for the project would be as follows:

Residential Units—2.7 people/unit * 2 units * 203 gallons/person = 1,096 GPD
Retail Space—100 gpd/1,000 ft² * 8,757 ft² = 876 GPD
Office Space—100 gpd/1,000 ft² * 6,206 ft² = 621 GPD

Based on the application of these wastewater generation rates, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate approximately 2,593 GPD of wastewater. This represents approximately 0.1% of the remaining available treatment capacity under the GSD’s operating permit from the RWQCB. While this level of estimated demand would have no potential to increase wastewater volumes conveyed to the GSD’s sewage treatment plant in excess of the District’s current operating permit from the RWQCB, the applicant has yet to provide an Intent to Serve letter from the District. Until such a commitment is given by the GSD, a final determination as to the availability of central sewer service by the GSD to serve the proposed project cannot be made. As such, the project poses a potentially significant impact on the availability and adequacy of central sewage disposal service.

b,c) The project would not necessitate any new construction or expansion of existing wastewater or domestic water treatment facilities. Corresponding environmental impacts normally associated with such facility construction and/or expansion would not occur as a result of this project. The existing stormdrain system in the area is sufficient to convey stormwater flows from the surrounding area to San Pedro 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, no corresponding environmental impacts normally associated with such facility construction and/or expansion would not occur.

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

Residential Units—0.13 AFY/unit * 2 units = 0.26 AFY
Retail Space—0.13 AFY/1,000 ft² * 8,757 ft² = 1.14 AFY
Office Space—0.15 AFY/1,000 ft² * 6,206 ft² = 0.93 AFY
Landscaping—0.03 AFY/1,000 ft² * 5,559 ft² = 0.17 AFY

Applying these water duty factors, it is estimated that the proposed project would consume 2.5 AFY of GWD water. This represents less than 0.06% of the GWD’s remaining available water supply under current entitlements. While this level of estimated demand would have no potential to increase consumption of GWD water to levels necessitating any new entitlements, resources, or requiring expansion of any existing entitlements, the applicant has yet to provide a Can and Will Serve/Intent to Serve letter from the District. 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,g) As noted above, projects that are estimated to generate 196 tons/year or more of solid waste, after receiving a 50% credit for source reduction, recycling, and composting, are considered to pose a significant, project specific impact. Based on the solid waste generation factors noted in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, solid waste generation for the proposed project would be as follows:
Residential Units—2.7 people/unit * 2 units * 0.95 tons/year/person = 5.13 tons/year 
Retail Space—0.0057 tons/year/ft² * 8,757 ft² = 49.91 tons/year 
Office Space—0.0013 tons/year/ft² * 6,206 ft² = 8.06 tons/year

Based on the application of these solid waste generation rates, it is estimated that the project would generate a total of 63.1 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 31.55 tons. As such, project specific impacts on the solid waste flow into the Tajiguas Landfill would be considered adverse but less than significant.

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 permittee shall obtain a current Connection Permit from the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD). **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Connection Permit 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 permittee shall obtain a Can and Will Serve letter from the Goleta Water District (GWD). **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Can and 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. The permittee shall develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Program. The program shall identify the amount of waste generation projected during processing of the project. The program shall include the following measures, but is not limited to those measures:

   **General**

   a) Provision of at least 50 square feet of space and/or bins for storage of recyclable materials within the project site.

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

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

b) Implementation of a program to purchase materials that have recycled content for project construction and/or operation (i.e., plastic lumber, office supplies, etc.). The program could include requesting suppliers to show recycled materials content. To ensure compliance, the permittee shall develop an integrated solid waste management program, including recommended source reduction, recycling, composting programs, and/or a combination of such programs, subject to City staff review and approval prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy.

Plan Requirement and Timing: The permittee shall submit the Solid Waste Management Program to City staff for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. Program components shall be implemented prior to occupancy clearance and throughout the life of the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall site inspect during construction and prior to occupancy to ensure solid waste management components are established and implemented.

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. Timing: Materials shall be recycled as necessary throughout construction. All materials shall be recycled prior to occupancy clearance.

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

Residual Impact

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

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

### 14. PREPARERS OF THE DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, CONTACTS, AND REFERENCES

This document was prepared by City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Services Department staff.

**Contributors and Contacts:** The following individuals participated in the analysis of the proposed project or otherwise furnished information vital to preparation of this document.

City of Goleta
Steve Wagner, Director of Public Works
Patricia Miller, Planning Manager
Marti Schultz, Senior Engineer
Jim Biega, Contract Traffic Engineer
Public Agencies
   Caltrans
   Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
   Goleta Sanitary District
   Goleta Water District
   Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District
   Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
   Santa Barbara County Fire Department

References:  The following documents were consulted during preparation of this document and form the basis of the relevant findings and conclusions:

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Resolution No. 2010-06, June 2010.


CAPCOA – California Air Pollution Control Officers Association; CEQA and Climate Change; January 2008.

CARB – California Air Resources Board (ARB); Recommended Approaches for Setting Interim Significance Thresholds for Greenhouse Gases Under the California Environmental Quality Act, Preliminary Draft Staff Proposal; October 24, 2008.


City of Goleta, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, 2006

City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR (2006)

City of Goleta Stormwater Management Plan, February, 2010

County of Santa Barbara, Department of Resource Management, Negative Declaration, June 7, 1989

Department of Justice, Office of the California Attorney General; Global Warming Measure, December 9, 2008

DesignArc Architectural and Site Plans, May 6, 2010

Dudek & Associates Revised Final Extended Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation, 151 South Fairview Avenue, Goleta, California dated May, 2010

Dudek & Associates South Fairview Commercial Center, 151 Fairview Avenue, Goleta, CA Phase 3 Data Recovery Mitigation Archaeological Resources Investigation Work Program, Revised May 13, 2010

Earthform Design, Landscaping Plan, May 4, 2010
Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Pam for Santa Barbara County, California (Panel 1362 of 1835; Map Number 06083C1352F), September 30, 2005.


Flowers & Associates, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plans, May, 2010

Goleta Water District *Goleta Water District Water Supply Assessment*, May 22, 2008

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, *Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, Assembly Bill 32, Health and Safety Code Section 38500 et. seq*

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, *California Executive Order S-3-05, 2005*

Governor’s Office of Planning and Research; *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act Review*, June 2008

Governor’s Office of Planning and Research; *OPR Proposed CEQA Guidelines Amendments*, April 2009

Governor’s Office of Planning and Research; *Senate Bill 97, 2007*

ICF Jones and Stokes; *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Supplemental Environmental Impact Report*, July 2009

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: [http://www.ipcc.ch/](http://www.ipcc.ch/)


*Old Town Revitalization Plan EIR* (1995)

Penfield & Smith, *151 South Fairview Mixed Use Building Traffic Impact Study, October 3, 2005*

Penfield & Smith *151 South Fairview Avenue Mixed-Use Building Traffic Impact Study, November 29, 2004*

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District; *CEQA Guide*, June 2009

Santa Barbara County, Air Pollution Control District, *Clean Air Plan, 2008: http://www.sbcapcd.org/cap.htm*

Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, *Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan*, Revised 1996

*Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, Seismic Safety and Safety Element, 1980*

State of California, Air Resources Board, *Preliminary Draft Staff Proposal Recommended Approaches for Setting Interim Significance Thresholds for Greenhouse Gases under the*
City of Goleta
Final Mitigated Negative Declaration
South Fairview Commercial Center Project
March 4, 2011

California Environmental Quality Act, 2008:
http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/localgov/ceqa/meetings/102708/prelimdraftproposal102408.pdf

State of California, California Energy Commission: http://www.energy.ca.gov/

US Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Santa Barbara County, South Coastal Part

US Department of Energy, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Global Fossil Fuel CO₂ Emissions, 2003

15. ATTACHMENTS:

A. Project Plans (8½” x 11” reductions)
B. LOS Criteria
C. SB Co Fire Department letter of January 16, 2008
D. SB Co Fire Department letter of December 3, 2010
ATTACHMENT A
Project Plans (8½” x 11” reductions)
All design ideas and plans indicated or represented by these drawings are owned by and are the property of DesignARC and were created and developed for use in connection with the specified project. None of such ideas, designs, or plans shall be used for any purpose whatsoever without the written permission of DesignARC.
All design ideas and plans indicated or represented by these drawings are owned by and are the property of DesignARC and were created and developed for use in connection with the specified project. None of such ideas, designs, or plans shall be used for any purpose whatsoever without the written permission of DesignARC.

© DesignARC Inc.

**Exterior Elevations**

---

**North Elevation**

- Standing seam metal roofing
- Horizontal fiber cement siding
- Exterior plaster
- Columns

---

**East Elevation**

- Standing seam metal roofing
- Exterior plaster painted
- Metal awnings/fascias

---

Exterior Elevations North & East

---

**REVISED**

- DRB Submittal 1.22.07
- Planning Revisions 12.27.07
- Planning Revisions 5.06.10

---

**Scales**

- Scale: 1/16" = 1'-0"
## ATTACHMENT B

### Intersection Level of Service Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Signalized intersections (V/C Ratio)</th>
<th>Unsignalized intersections (Sec. of delay)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&lt; 0.60</td>
<td>≤ 10</td>
<td>Conditions of free unobstructed flow, no delays, and all signal phases sufficient in duration to clear all approaching vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.61 – 0.70</td>
<td>&gt; 10 and ≤ 15</td>
<td>Conditions of stable flow, very little delay, and a few phases are unable to handle all approaching vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.71- 0.80</td>
<td>&gt; 15 and ≤ 25</td>
<td>Conditions of stable flow, delays are low to moderate, and full use of peak direction signal phases is experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.81 – 0.90</td>
<td>&gt; 25 and ≤ 35</td>
<td>Conditions approaching unstable flow, delays are moderate to heavy, and significant signal time deficiencies are experienced for short durations during the peak traffic period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.91 – 1.00</td>
<td>&gt; 35 and ≤ 50</td>
<td>Conditions of unstable flow, delays are significant, signal phase timing is generally insufficient, and congestion exists for extended duration throughout the peak period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt; 1.00</td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>Conditions of forced flow, travel speeds are low and volumes are well above capacity. This condition is often caused when vehicles released by an upstream signal are unable to proceed because of back-ups from a downstream signal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 16, 2008

Mr. Alan Hanson
Planning and Environmental Services
City of Goleta
130 Cremona, Suite B
Goleta, California 93117

Dear Mr. Hanson:

Subject: Site Status and Conditions for Site Redevelopment

The Santa Barbara County Fire Department’s, Fire Prevention Division (FPD) has been notified by the City of Goleta that the applicant is proceeding with redevelopment of the referenced site for mixed commercial and residential use. Due to the potential presence of residual hydrocarbons in soil and groundwater, FPD is providing this status of site activities and list of conditions that must be fulfilled prior to providing clearance for redevelopment of the site.

Site Status
(1) Recent reports submitted for this site depict the dissolved contaminant plume entirely under the adjacent property to the south. However, the groundwater monitoring wells used to define the plume are submerged, meaning that they may not be providing accurate data. Additionally, the groundwater monitoring wells, which define the limits of the plume, are spaced out far apart, meaning that the plume may extend further in each lateral direction. In the absence of groundwater monitoring wells located closer to the perceived plume boundary, a more specific plume depiction cannot be determined. The defining groundwater monitoring wells range from 75 feet to 200 feet from the center of the plume.

(2) In a directive dated December 26, 2007 (attached), FPD directed ExxonMobil Oil Corporation to submit a workplan for the installation of properly screened wells and re-installation of MW-4 closer to the center of plume for better definition of the plume.

(3) The deadline for the workplan submitted above is February 18, 2008.

(4) Until the data is reviewed from the new groundwater monitoring wells, the actual plume boundaries remain unknown.

Conditions for Redevelopment of the site

(1) The applicant shall provide FPD with documentation of the current site conditions, including summaries of existing soil and groundwater data, along with plan view and cross-section figures depicting residual soil and groundwater contamination at the site relative to the proposed building footprint. The groundwater data shall be based on the properly screened wells required in the attached directive and from the groundwater assessment described below.
(2) Since no groundwater data have been collected on-site in several years and due to the dynamic nature of groundwater and dissolved-phase contaminant migration, FPD will require that a limited groundwater assessment be performed to document the current conditions beneath the site. If necessary, FPD may also require collection of additional soil data as well. Prior to performing assessment work, the applicant shall submit a site assessment work plan for review and approval by FPD. The purpose of this additional assessment is to identify the potentially complete human health exposure pathways associated with the proposed redevelopment.

(3) A human health risk assessment for residential exposure to chemicals in soil and groundwater shall be completed. The risk assessment shall take into account site-specific conditions while adhering to standard risk assessment protocol for a residential property as described in ASTM’s Risk-Based Corrective Action guidance, Cal-EPA’s Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Manual or other commonly accepted guidelines. In order to facilitate completion and review of the risk assessment, FPD will require submittal of a risk assessment work plan prior to performance of the actual risk assessment. If vapor intrusion is identified as a potentially complete pathway, then a soil vapor survey shall be completed per the Department of Toxic Substances Control and California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Los Angeles Region Advisory on Active Soil Gas Investigations. A workplan for the soil vapor survey shall be submitted to FPD for review and approval. If the only pathway for exposure to human health is determined to be through vapor intrusion, the applicant may have a chemical vapor barrier installed with the building foundation in lieu of the human health risk assessment. The chemical vapor barrier shall be engineered for the contaminants associated with this LUFT site and shall be approved by FPD.

(4) FPD may have additional conditions and requirements for development based on the risk assessment results or other factors.

(5) Currently one groundwater monitoring well is located on the 151 South Fairview property. The attached directive requires the installation of additional groundwater monitoring wells, which may be located on the 151 South Fairview. The planned development shall allow for access to all groundwater monitoring wells located on 151 South Fairview.

FPD requests that the City of Goleta add appropriate permit conditions reflecting these requirements.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at 805-686-8146. Submit all written correspondence to me at the Fire Prevention Division, 195 West Highway 246, Buellton, California, 93427 or via Fax at 805-686-8183.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Andrea S. Murphy, MESM, REA
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

50506 Condition Letter 2 1.08

pc: Mr. Lee Hanley, ExxonMobil (w/out attachments)
Mr. James Anderson, Environmental Resolutions, Inc. (w/out attachments)
December 26, 2007

Mr. Lee W. Hanley
ExxonMobil Oil Corporation
1464 Madera Road, Suite 265
Simi Valley, CA 93065

Dear Mr. Hanley

Subject: 151 South Fairview Avenue
Goleta, California
LUFT Site #50506

The Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division (FPD) Leaking Underground Fuel Tank (LUFT) Program has reviewed the following reports submitted by Holguin, Fahan and Associates, Inc., titled: First Quarter 2007 Groundwater Monitoring and Progress Report (First Quarter Report) dated April 12, 2007 and Third Quarter 2007 Groundwater Monitoring and Progress Report (Third Quarter Report) dated October 11, 2007. The reports summarize the results of semi-annual groundwater monitoring at the site. After a careful review of the First Quarter Report and Second Quarter Report, FPD has the following comments and directives:

- The GEO-WELL data for the Third Quarter Report was not submitted to the GeoTracker database. Upload this data no later than January 31, 2008.
- A review of the First Quarter Report and Third Quarter Report indicates that the well screens in MW-04, MW-05 and MW-06 are submerged. MW-07, MW-09 and MW-10 have “unknown” well screen intervals.
- A review of the First Quarter Report and Third Quarter Report indicate that the primary contaminant of concern in groundwater is benzene.
- FPD requires properly screened wells to evaluate the concentrations of gasoline constituents in groundwater at this site. Except for MW-04, properly screened wells shall be installed adjacent to submerged wells, which shall be abandoned. MW-04 shall be re-installed further south to better define the northern boundary of the plume. Submit a workplan for the well installations and abandonments to FPD by February 18, 2008. The workplan shall include the wells with “unknown” screen intervals or a scope of work for determining the screen intervals.
Once appropriately screened wells are installed and sampled, FPD wishes to move forward with additional remediation, to progress the site forward towards obtaining closure.

Due to recent activities in our office to reorganize and streamline our tasks, your case has been assigned to me. Please ensure that all correspondence (both written and verbal) regarding this site is directed to my attention and any calls are directed to (805) 686-8146. Submit all written correspondence to me at the Fire Prevention Division, 195 West Highway 246, Buellton, California, 93427 or via Fax at 805-686-8183.

Sincerely,

Andrea S. Murphy
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

pc: Mr. John Mijares, RWQCB
Mr. James Anderson, Environmental Resolutions, Inc.
December 3, 2010

Mr. Alan Hanson
Planning Department
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

Dear Mr. Hanson:

SUBJECT: APN: 073-080-019; Permit #: 06GPC-01-SB-DP
Site: 151 South Fairview Avenue, Goleta
Project Description: New Mixed Use Building, Commercial/Residential

This Development Letter Supersedes the Previous Incomplete Development Letter Dated January 25, 2006

The above project is located within the jurisdiction of the Santa Barbara County Fire Department. To comply with the established standards, we submit the following with the understanding that the Fire Protection Certificate application may involve modifications, which may determine additional conditions.

GENERAL NOTICE

1. A Fire Protection Certificate will be required.

2. Stop work immediately and contact the County Fire Department, Hazardous Materials Unit if visual contamination or chemical odors are detected while implementing the approved work at this site. Resumption of work requires approval of the HMU.

3. Refer to attached copy of letter dated December 1, 2010, from Nathan West, Hazardous Materials Specialist for information concerning conditions for site redevelopment.
PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION
THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE MET

4. All access ways (public and private, road and driveways) shall be installed and made serviceable.
   • The northern driveway entrance shall have a minimum 30-foot width for access and egress.
   • Interior drive aisles through the parking lot shall have a minimum unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet.
   • One-way access shall be a minimum of 16 feet wide.
   • Site plans shall be to scale and show all parking space and access dimensions.
   • Access plans shall be approved by the fire department prior to any work being undertaken.
   • Access ways shall be unobstructed and extended to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of any building.
   • Dead-end access exceeding 150 feet shall terminate with a fire department approved turnaround.
   • A minimum of 13 feet, 6 inches of vertical clearance shall be provided and maintained for the life of the project for emergency apparatus access.

5. One new fire hydrant shall be installed. The fire hydrant shall be located per fire department specifications and shall flow 1500 gallons per minute at a 20 psi residual pressure. Plans shall be approved by the fire department prior to installation.


PRIOR TO OCCUPANCY CLEARANCE
THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE MET

7. Santa Barbara County automatic fire sprinkler requirements shall be met.

8. Santa Barbara County Fire Department fire or emergency alarm system requirements shall be met.

9. Portable fire extinguishers are required.

10. Recorded addresses are required. The fire department shall determine and assign all address numbers and shall issue such numbers to property owners and occupants.

11. Building address numbers shall be posted as required by fire department.

12. A Knox key vault entry system shall be installed.
13. Payment of development impact fees is required. The fees shall be computed on each new building, including non-habitable spaces.

Fees will be calculated as follows:

- Mitigation Fee at $.10 per square foot for structures with fire sprinkler systems
- Goleta Fees

**ADVISORY**

14. Permits for the use and storage of hazardous materials / hazardous wastes are required prior to operation.

These conditions apply to the project as currently described. Future changes, including but not limited to further division, change of occupancy, intensification of use, or increase in hazard classification, may require additional mitigation to comply with applicable development standards in effect at the time of change.

As always, if you have any questions or require further information, please telephone 805-681-5523 or 805-681-5500.

In the interest of life and fire safety,

[Signature]

Glenn Fidler, Captain
Fire Prevention Division

GF:mkb

Attachments: Copy of letter dated December 1, 2010
December 1, 2010

Mr. Alan Hanson
Planning Department
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

Dear Mr. Hanson:

SUBJECT: APN: 073-080-019; Permit #: 06GPC-01-SB-DP
Site: 151 South Fairview Avenue, Goleta
Project Description: New Mixed Use Building, Commercial/Residential

The Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division (FPD) Leaking Underground Fuel Tank (LUFT) Program has been notified by the City of Goleta that the applicant is proceeding with redevelopment of the referenced site for mixed commercial and residential use. In correspondence dated January 16, 2008 (enclosed), FPD provided a list of conditions to be fulfilled prior to providing clearance or redevelopment of the site. FPD’s January 16, 2008 correspondence superseded previous development conditions dated July 20, 2005.

This is to confirm that condition #2 (groundwater assessment) of the January 16, 2008 letter has been satisfied and no longer applies.

Please direct all correspondence regarding this site to: Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division, 4410 Cathedral Oaks Road, Santa Barbara, CA 93110. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (805) 681-4045 if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

Nathan P. West
Hazardous Materials Specialist
LUFT Program

Enclosure

c: GeoTracker database
   Mr. Lee Hanley, ExxonMobil Oil Corporation