CITY OF GOLETA

FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

for the

MARIPOSA @ ELLWOOD SHORES ASSISTED LIVING FACILITY PROJECT

April 13, 2012
1. **PROJECT TITLE:** Mariposa at Ellwood Shores Assisted Living Facility; Case No. 07-217-RZN, -OA, -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:**
   - H. Oliver Dixon
   - Mariposa, LLC
   - P.O. Box 642
   - Los Olivos, CA 93441-0642

   **AGENT:**
   - Harwood A. White
   - 1553 Knoll Circle Drive
   - Santa Barbara, CA 93103

5. **PROJECT LOCATION:** The project is located at 7760 Hollister Avenue; APN 079-210-057; outside of the Coastal Zone within the City.
6. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The project includes the following elements:

- An Ordinance Amending the Official Zoning Map to Rezone 7760 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-057) from M-RP (Industrial Research Park) to C-3 (General Commercial);
- An Ordinance for a Development Agreement between the City of Goleta and Mariposa, LLC, which, among other things, provides funding to the City for unspecified public works infrastructure in the City;
- A Development Plan for a 70,510 square foot (SF) building to be used as an assisted-living facility accommodating a maximum of 99 elderly residents with project access provided via two access points off Viajero Drive, one located in the southwest corner of the project site and one in the northwest corner of the project site as well as landscaping and frontage improvements within the City right-of-way of Hollister Avenue and Viajero Drive per the project architectural and civil site plans;
- A Minor Conditional Use Permit to allow a special care home in the C-3 zone district; and

The Development Plan includes modifications to two development standards of the Goleta Municipal Code, Chapter 35, Article III, Inland Zoning Ordinance, as follows:

- A modification to the City’s parking setback requirements to allow for four (4) parking spaces within the secondary front setback along Viajero Drive (Section 35-262(a)).
- A modification from the required number of parking spaces to allow 49 spaces rather than the 85 spaces required (Section 35-232.12).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Existing Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Land Use Designation</td>
<td>General Commercial (C-G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Ordinance, Zone District</td>
<td>Inland Zoning Ordinance, Industrial Research Park (M-RP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>2.94 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Use and Development</td>
<td>Recreational and Commercial Vehicle Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North: Parking Lot, zoned M-RP</td>
<td>South: Hollister Avenue; Bluffs at Sandpiper Residential Development, zoned 7-R-1; and Santa Barbara Shores Park, zoned REC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: Ellwood Elementary School, residential, zoned DR-12.3</td>
<td>West: Parking Lot, zoned M-RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Existing: Hollister Avenue and Viajero Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply: Goleta Water District</td>
<td>Sewage: Goleta West Sanitary District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
<td>Natural Gas: Southern California Gas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verizon</td>
<td>Fire: Santa Barbara County Fire Department Station #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Districts: Goleta Union and Santa Barbara High School Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Project CEQA Baseline
The project site was originally developed as a recreational vehicle (RV) sales, rental, and repair facility under permits from Santa Barbara County issued in 1971. In 1985 the site was converted to its current use as an RV, boat, and vehicle storage lot (storage yard). The property is almost entirely paved and the existing storage yard and improvements onsite constitute the baseline for environmental review.

CEQA Review of the Development Agreement
The requested Development Agreement does not require or obligate the applicant or the City to pursue any physical changes to the environment, and, therefore, has no potential to cause environmental impacts.

Surrounding Land Uses
The project site is surrounded by a mix of uses including the adjacent Ellwood Elementary School to the east, a vehicle storage and a parking lot to the north and west, the Bluffs at Sandpiper single-family residential development and the Santa Barbara Shores Park regional open space across Hollister Avenue to the south, and a Reliant Energy vacant
parcel to the northwest. Access to the site is provided from two driveways on Viajero Drive, and one on Hollister Avenue. Sidewalks exist on both Hollister Avenue and Viajero Drive frontages.

**Slope/Topography**
The property is a relatively flat parcel that slopes gradually to the south. Soils onsite consist of Milpitas-Positas fine sandy loams, a gently sloping soil with medium runoff, and a moderate hazard for erosion.

**Flora and Fauna and Surface Water Bodies**
The site is currently used as a parking lot for recreational vehicles and boats and is almost entirely paved with asphalt. A few trees are dispersed throughout the parking area, but no water bodies or significant wildlife habitat exist onsite.

**Cultural Resources**
The project site is located within the Santa Barbara Channel cultural area. Evidence of cultural activity along the coastline extends over 9,000 years. The prehistoric cultural development has been characterized in three stages: the Early Period (ca. 8,000 to 5,000 years ago); the Middle or Intermediate Period (ca. 5,500 to 900 years ago); and the Late Period (ca. 900 to 200 years ago), (Stone Archaeological Consulting; August, 2007). Historically, settlement in the vicinity of the project site was defined by three periods; the Mission Period (AD 1769 to 1830), the Rancho Period (AD 1830 to 1865), and the American Period (AD 1865 to 1915). As provided in the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) Final EIR (SCH#2005031151; available at Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117), Section 3.5 Cultural Resources, the City is known to contain prehistoric, ethnographic, historical and paleontological resources.

**10. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

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

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

- I find that the 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 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 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 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 project, nothing further is required.

Mitigated Negative Declaration Determination made on November 14, 2011 by Patricia S. Miller, Planning Manager, City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Services (on file).

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 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 and Visual 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 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>
<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 site is currently developed as a storage yard and covered by a paved parking lot with minimal landscaping. The lot is surrounded with chain link fence topped with barbed wire along the south and western property lines. Skyline eucalyptus trees and various shrubs surround the perimeter of the site. A pole sign is located in the southwestern portion of the site and pole lighting is distributed throughout the parking lot. A trailer and shed exist near the northern property line. An existing 30-foot Venoco Offsite Meteorological Station, previously permitted by the County of Santa Barbara in 1999 to monitor air quality downwind of the Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) gas processing plant, is located near the center of the property. Venoco currently has a month-to-month lease agreement with the property owner and will relocate the station upon termination of the lease. The project site is surrounded by a mix of uses including the adjacent Ellwood Elementary School to the east, vehicle storage and a parking lot to the north and west, the Bluffs at Sandpiper single-family residential development and the Santa Barbara Shores & Sperling Preserve Park regional open space across Hollister Avenue to the south, and a vacant parcel to the northwest which abuts the existing Reliant Energy electrical substation, also owned by Reliant.
Thresholds of Significance

A significant aesthetic/visual resources impact would occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist (a – d). In addition, per the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (Thresholds Manual), affirmative answers to the following questions also indicate potentially significant impacts on aesthetic/visual resources:

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

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

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

Project Specific Impacts

a,g) Hollister Avenue fronting the project site is designated as a Local Scenic Corridor in the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) with views identified in all directions from Hollister Avenue near the project site (Figure 6-1, GP/CLUP Visual and Historic Element). Public lands with view opportunities exist across Hollister Avenue to the south of the project site at Santa Barbara Shores & Sperling Preserve Park. The topography of the project site is relatively flat, sloping in a southeasterly direction at an average slope of 2%, with a slightly steeper slope of up to 30% along the south and southwest edge of the property near Hollister Avenue and Viajero Drive. At these locations there is a difference in elevation between the sidewalk and roadway and the parking lot, with the sidewalk and Hollister Avenue and Viajero Drive approximately four (4) to six (6) feet lower than the parking lot. From foreground viewing locations closest to the site, project features would likely intrude into the lines-of-sight of viewers and interfere with or block the visibility of more distant scenic mountains to the north. With increasing distance and change in elevation of public viewpoints from the project site, the potential for the project to interfere with more distant scenic views diminishes. The backdrop of the Santa Ynez Mountain skyline is visible intermittently to pedestrians and motorists who may look across the site to the north when traveling past it. While the new building would have a setback of over 86 feet from Hollister Avenue, it would be elevated above the roadway and the southern elevation of the building would intrude into pedestrians and motorists’ passing views of the Santa Ynez Mountains. The loss of views of the Santa Ynez Mountains for pedestrians and motorists from Hollister Avenue would be of short duration and is, therefore, considered a less than significant impact on public views of any scenic vistas.
As noted in the project description, the applicant is requesting approval of a modification to the City’s parking setback standards to allow for four (4) parking spaces to partially encroach into the secondary front setback (10’) along Viajero Drive. Although such parking setbacks are intended to allow for visual screening of parking from public streets and thereby improve the aesthetic quality of a development, in this instance the project would still provide for substantial vegetation between the sidewalk/street and the parking involved and as such would not result in any degradation of the facility’s overall aesthetic quality. In fact, given the existing condition of the street frontage on Viajero Drive along its eastern project frontage, the proposed landscaping improvements would significantly improve the visual quality of that frontage, even with the partial encroachment of these four spaces within the setback. Therefore, the visual impact of requested parking setback modification is considered less than significant.

b,e) The existing paved parking lot lacks discernable relief and does not contain drainage courses, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Surrounded by a chain link fence with barbed wire, the storage yard does not hold visual interest in public views from surrounding locations. Therefore, potential project impacts on any onsite visual resources are considered less than significant.

c) With project implementation, the site would undergo a substantial change in its existing visual character. Currently the site is developed as a storage yard and is covered by a deteriorating paved parking lot with minimal landscaping. The lot is surrounded with chain link fence topped with barbed wire along the south and western property lines. Skyline eucalyptus trees and various shrubs surround the perimeter of the site. A pole sign is located in the southwestern portion of the site and pole lighting is distributed throughout the parking lot. A trailer and shed exist near the northern property line. The existing condition lacks features that could be construed as conveying significant positive visual resource values to the site.

The project would result in the displacement of the existing development and replace it with a 70,510 SF building to be used as a senior assisted living facility, parking, exterior lighting, and extensive landscaping. The structure would be two stories with a maximum height of 34’2”. The project would have a finished pad elevation approximately four (4) to five (5) feet higher than that of the sidewalk and street along Hollister Avenue. For this reason, the project may result in aesthetic impacts related to its perceived scale relative to surrounding development. However, as illustrated by the project’s site plan, landscaping plan, and architectural elevations, included as Attachment 1, the project’s positive aesthetic qualities and setbacks would lessen the visual massing effect.

The architecture would be reminiscent of the agricultural tradition of Goleta with exterior finishes consisting of horizontal and clapboard siding and the use of stone veneer on the entry, retaining walls, and chimney. The color palette includes yellow, tan, red, and white trim accents. All mechanical equipment would be screened in mechanical wells that would range from three feet to 8.5 feet deep. Project landscaping would be used to soften building masses, reinforce pedestrian scale, provide a transition between adjacent properties, and provide screening along public streets. Landscaping includes trees planted along the property lines and the use of drought-tolerant plantings along the walking paths and patios, as well as butterfly and kitchen gardens. Approximately 14 trees would be removed from the site, but some larger trees along the project’s perimeter would be preserved. A fence would be constructed along the eastern property
line with the school. The existing Venoco Meteorological Station will be removed from the project site when Venoco’s month-to-month lease agreement with the property owner is terminated.

While the existing character of the project site north of Hollister Avenue is developed with parking lots and a school, the introduction of a 70,510 square-foot, two-story structure would substantially change the existing visual character of the area. Additionally, this 70,510 square-foot structure has the ability to degrade the visual quality of the site and its surroundings depending upon the design and architecture used to address unsightly aspects of the structure. For instance, this 70,510 square-foot, two-story structure would include above-ground utility lines, utility service connections and above-ground mounted equipment such as backflow devices, gas and electrical meters, and communications equipment, as well as vaults and transformers. Also, the project would require an adequate amount of trash and recycling containers located on-site to serve the employees and residents of the project as analyzed in the Utilities and Service Systems section. Therefore, If the project is not constructed consistent with the final approved project plans, including the site plan and architectural and landscape plans, this change in the visual character of the area and the degradation of the visual quality of the site and its surroundings would be considered potentially significant.

d) Exterior night lighting, including lighting of the parking area, could result in the exposure of adjoining areas to excessive light and glare if such lighting is not properly shielded and directed away from neighboring land uses, or if mounted on light standards substantially higher than those identified on the submitted development plan (approximately ½ of the structure’s height). Such light and glare spillover impacts are considered potentially significant.

f) Although the segment of Hollister fronting the project site is within the Coastal Zone and provides open views of the ocean and Channel Islands to the south, the project’s location on the north side of Hollister is outside of the Coastal Zone and would have no affect on public views southward.

Cumulative Impacts

The project would contribute to the overall changes in aesthetic resources of the City as it grows in accordance with the GP/CLUP. Most planned new development in the vicinity would occur on vacant land with predominantly single and multi-family residences. These vacant lands and planned developments are considered extensions to existing residential and commercial areas. Policies of the GP/CLUP to protect scenic resources and local design review would ensure visual character is maintained. The project’s contribution to cumulative aesthetic impacts is considered significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The permittee shall receive Preliminary and Final approval of all project plans from the Design Review Board. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The project plans shall include the site plan, floor and roof plans, elevations, grading and drainage plans, landscape plan, utility plan and lighting plan. Additional materials shall be provided as required by the DRB to complete their review. In particular, the DRB shall review the following items of concern:
a) Compatibility of the architectural design with surrounding development and its consistency with a rural agricultural theme;

b) Size, bulk, and scale/massing in the visual context of the neighborhood;

c) Quality of building materials;

d) Appropriateness of landscaping for screening and blending the project with its surroundings; and,

e) Prevention of lighting/glare spillover.

The permittee shall submit all project plans to City staff for review and approval and DRB Preliminary and Final review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance with all approved final project plans prior to issuance of any LUP, during construction, and prior to occupancy clearance.

2. The height of structural development shown on approved final project 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 approved final project plans shall be adhered to during construction. Plan Requirements and Timing: Prior to the first pre-pour foundation inspection, the permittee shall have a California licensed surveyor verify the first floor elevation for the purposes of finished grade verification per the final approved grading plan. During the framing state of construction and prior to commencement of roofing, the permittee shall submit verification from a California licensed surveyor demonstrating that the mean height and peak height conform to those shown on approved final project plans.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance with the approved final project plans, including the approved final grading plan, prior to issuance of any LUP, during field inspection, and prior to commencement of roofing.

3. The permittee shall submit a 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 as appropriate on all project 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 utility plans showing all external/roof mounted mechanical equipment shall be submitted for review and approval by City staff and the DRB prior to any LUP issuance.

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

4. All new utility service connections and above-ground mounted equipment such as backflow devices, etc., 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. Utility transformers shall be placed in underground vaults, unless otherwise approved by the City and then shall be completely screened from public view. 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 shall be completely screened from public view.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** Detailed utility plans shall be submitted for review and approval by City staff and DRB Preliminary/Final review and approval prior to any LUP issuance and 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 occupancy clearance, City staff shall verify that all above-ground utility connections and equipment is installed, screened, and painted per the approved final utility 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 structure and surrounding area. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall submit the lighting plan, including the locations of all exterior lighting fixtures, design and height of all lighting mounting standards, 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, to City staff for review and approval by the DRB and City staff prior to any LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** Prior to occupancy clearance, City staff shall inspect to ensure that exterior lighting fixtures have been installed consistent with the approved final lighting 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 permittee shall submit the final landscape plan to City staff for review and approval by the DRB and City staff prior to any LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** Prior to occupancy clearance, City staff shall site inspect to ensure that landscaping has been installed consistent with the approved final landscape plan.
7. The permittee shall install required landscaping and water-conserving irrigation systems as well as maintain required landscaping and water-conserving irrigation systems for the life of the project. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall execute a City-approved landscape and water-conserving irrigation system installation and maintenance agreement, including at least a 3-year maintenance period, prior to any LUP issuance. The permittee shall submit the performance securities for installation and maintenance for review and approval by City staff prior to any LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** Prior to occupancy clearance, City staff site inspect to ensure installation according to the approved final landscape plan. City staff shall check maintenance periodically. Release of any performance security requires appropriate documentation and City staff signature as required by the agreement.

8. Trash/recycling enclosure(s) shall be provided and shall be maintained in good condition for the life of the project. The enclosure(s) 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 the solid waste hauler for removal. The trash/recycling enclosure(s) shall be of sufficient size to accommodate all necessary trash containers as well as an equivalent number of recycling containers. The trash/recycling enclosure(s) shall be enclosed with a solid wall of sufficient height to screen the area and shall include a solid gate and a roof. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The trash/recycling enclosure(s) shall be shown on project plans and the permittee shall submit all project plans for review and approval by City staff and the DRB prior to any LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** Prior to occupancy clearance, City staff shall site inspect to ensure installation according to the approved final project plans.

9. All utility lines within the project site shall be placed underground. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Detailed utility plans shall be submitted for City staff and DRB Preliminary/Final review and approval prior to any LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** Prior to occupancy clearance, City staff shall verify the location and undergrounding of utility lines per the approved final utility plans.

Residual Impacts

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific impacts to aesthetics and visual resources, as well as project contributions to cumulative changes in visual character of the surrounding area, would be less than significant.
AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract? |
| c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use? |
| 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))? |
| e. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |

**Existing Setting**

The existing storage yard is almost entirely paved and has been used as either a RV sales/rental/repair facility or as a storage yard since 1971.

**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 result in the conversion of any prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance or conflict with any existing agricultural use, agricultural zoning, or Williamson contract. There are no forest resources onsite or in proximity to the project. No impacts to agricultural or forest resources would occur as a result of project implementation.

Cumulative Impacts

Because there are no agricultural or forest resources located onsite and the project would not result in impacts to such resources, the project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts to agricultural or forest resources in the area.

Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures

As no impacts to agricultural or forest resources are anticipated to occur as a result of project implementation, no mitigation is recommended or required.

Residual Impacts

None.

Air Quality

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

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

Surface temperature inversions (0 to 500 feet) are most frequent during the winter, and subsidence inversions (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).

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

** Ambient Air Quality Standards**

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

Federal standards are established by the 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**

The criteria pollutants of primary concern include ozone ($O_3$), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide ($NO_2$), sulfur dioxide ($SO_2$), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter ($PM_{10}$), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$). Also regulated are sulfates, lead, hydrogen sulfide ($H_2S$), and vinyl chloride.
Ozone air pollution is formed when nitrogen oxides (NO\textsubscript{X}) and reactive organic compounds (ROCs) react in the presence of sunlight. According to the APCD, the major sources of ozone precursor emissions in Santa Barbara County are motor vehicles, the petroleum industry, and solvent usage (paints, consumer products, and certain industrial processes). Sources of PM\textsubscript{10} include grading, demolition, agricultural tilling, road dust, mineral quarries, and vehicle exhaust.

**Air Quality Planning**

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

In 2010, an attainment plan was developed that was designed to meet both Federal and State planning requirements. The Federal attainment plan was combined with those from other statewide non-attainment areas to become the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP) was adopted as the Santa Barbara County portion of the SIP, designed to meet and maintain Federal clean air standards. The adopted 2010 CAP incorporates updated data and is currently the most recent Clean Air Plan for ultimately meeting the State ozone standard.

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

**Thresholds of Significance**

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

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

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

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

**APCD Thresholds**

The following significance thresholds have been established by the Santa Barbara County APCD (*Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents*, SBCAPCD,
2010). While the City of Goleta has not yet adopted any new threshold criteria, these APCD thresholds are considered appropriate for use as a guideline for the impact analysis.

**APCD Operational Impacts Thresholds:** The project would result in a significant impact, either individually or cumulatively, if it would:

1. Emit 240 pounds/day or more of ROG (reactive organic gases; same as reactive organic compounds [ROC]) and NOX from all sources;
2. Emit 25 lbs/day or more of unmitigated ROG from any motor vehicles trips only;
3. Emit 25 lbs/day or more of unmitigated NOX from any motor vehicle trips only;
4. Emit 80 lbs/day or more of PM10;
5. Cause or contribute to a violation of any California or Ambient Air Quality standard (except ozone);
6. Exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board (10 excess cancer cases in a million for cancer risk and a Hazard Index of more than 1.0 for non-cancer risk); or
7. Be inconsistent with Federal or State air quality plans for Santa Barbara County.

The cumulative contribution of project emissions to regional levels should be compared with existing programs and plans, including the most recent Clean Air Plan (CAP; 2010). Due to the County’s non-attainment status for ozone and the regional nature of ozone as a pollutant, if a project’s emissions from traffic sources of either of the ozone precursors (NOX or ROC), exceed the operational thresholds, than the project’s cumulative impacts are considered significant. For projects that do not have significant ozone precursor emissions or localized pollutant impacts, if emissions have been taken into account in the 2010 CAP growth projections, regional cumulative impacts may be considered to be less than significant.

**APCD Construction Impacts Thresholds:** Quantitative thresholds of significance are not currently in place for short-term emissions. However, short-term impacts such as exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generation during grading must be discussed. In the interest of public disclosure, the APCD recommends that construction-related NOX, ROC, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions, from diesel and gasoline powered equipment, paving, and other activities be quantified. The APCD uses 25 tons per year for NOX and ROC as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts.

Under APCD Rule 202 D.16 (www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule202.pdf), if the combined emissions from all construction equipment used to construct a stationary source which requires an Authority to Construct permit, have the potential to exceed 25 tons of any pollutant, except carbon monoxide, in a 12-month period, the permittee shall provide offsets under the provisions of APCD Rule 804 (www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule804.pdf) and shall demonstrate that no ambient air quality standard will be violated. APCD Rule 345 (www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule345.pdf) regulates generation of visible fugitive dust emissions at demolition and construction sites.

**Project Specific Impacts**

The project site currently includes a parking lot for a storage yard and a trailer and shed associated with the existing Venoco air monitoring station. The project would result in the
construction of a new 70,510 SF building to be used as an assisted living facility. Grading and construction would result in new short-term air quality impacts. New air quality impacts associated with both operational and vehicular sources would also occur as a result of an estimated increase in vehicular trips of 226 average daily trips (ADTs) (see also Transportation/Traffic section).

The City’s methodology for quantifying criteria pollutant emissions relies upon the URBEMIS 2007 (version 9.2.4) air quality modeling software for identifying short-term construction and long-term operational impacts for the pounds/day unmitigated condition (see Greenhouse Gas Emissions section for more information regarding the URBEMIS 2007 (version 9.2.4) air quality modeling software). 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. Preliminary earthwork quantities are estimated at 9,400 cubic yards of cut and 800 cubic yards of fill (8,600 cubic yards of exported material). As a result, construction grading generated PM$_{10/2.5}$ dust for a project of this size is estimated to be 18 lbs/day. Construction related ROC and NO$_X$ emissions are estimated at 188 lbs/day and 55.3 lbs/day respectively (please refer to Attachment 2, the URBEMIS daily summer emission summary for the project). Neither the City nor the APCD has adopted any significance thresholds for construction-generated ROC, NO$_X$, or PM$_{10}$. These emissions have been adequately incorporated into the 2010 CAP in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities. Therefore, impacts are considered adverse, but less than significant.

d,h) Fine particulate emissions from diesel equipment exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the State of California. PM$_{10/2.5}$ exhaust emissions for heavy equipment involved in project construction are estimated at 6.4 lbs/day. Such temporary project generated diesel particulate emissions are not considered substantial and as such, the health risk caused by construction related particulate emissions would be considered adverse but less than significant for sensitive receptors such as the nearby Ellwood Elementary School.

e) Construction of new parking areas onsite would require application of aggregate concrete (AC aka asphalt) that could create objectionable odors. Such odors would be temporary and localized. APCD Rule 329 (www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule329.pdf), a prohibitory rule governing the application of cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials in the County, would apply to all project paving activities. Therefore, short-term construction impacts related to objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people are considered less than significant.

**Long-term Operational Impacts:**

a,b,f,g) A long-term pollutant emission analysis for the project using the URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 air quality modeling software for the 2008 lbs/day unmitigated condition. Under that analysis long-term area source and operational emissions for the project are estimated at 2.6 lbs/day of NO$_X$ and 7.7 lbs/day of ROCs. As these estimated criteria pollutant emission levels are well below the City threshold of 25 lbs/day, long-term operational project impacts on air quality resulting from project emissions of ROCs and NO$_X$ well as
the region’s ability to meet air quality attainment goals would be considered less than significant.

d,e) The project site is adjacent to the Ellwood Elementary School and would include an emergency generator rated at 350 kilowatts powered by a diesel engine rated at 546 horsepower. The generator would only be operated for testing and maintenance when students are not present. A Health Risk Assessment was prepared for the project to evaluate the health impacts of toxic air contaminants emitted by these sources (Dudek; Health Risk Assessment for the Mariposa at Ellwood Shores Assisted Living Project, September 2009). The Santa Barbara County APCD has indicated that health impacts of a project would be significant if they exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds of 10 excess cancer cases in a million for cancer risk and a hazard index of more than 1.0 for non-cancer health effects. The report concluded that the maximum anticipated cancer risks associated with the project vary from 1.1 in one million at the property line to 3.2 in one million for residents and staff at the project site and 7.8 in one million for students and staff at the adjacent Ellwood Elementary School based on a 70-year lifetime exposure. The report also found that the acute and chronic hazard indices for non-cancer health impacts would be below 1.0 for all receptors. The anticipated amount of generator operations (less than 26 hours per year, a time period that is not likely to be exceeded based on typical needs or expected outages), would not result in any related health risk in excess of the APCD’s significance criteria. As such, associated impacts would be less than significant.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has conducted numerous studies that indicate that diesel particulate emissions from diesel engines pose a health risk to sensitive receptors, especially children. These studies indicate that such health risks are elevated when sensitive receptors are located within 500 feet of heavily traveled transportation corridors (Dudek; Supplemental Air Quality Analysis, Health Risk Assessment for the Mariposa at Ellwood Shores Assisted Living Project; August 2010). In a rural setting “heavily traveled” transportation corridors are defined as roadways carrying 50,000 average daily trips (ADTs) or more and in urban settings roadways carrying 100,000 ADTs or more. According to the Santa Barbara County APCD, such health risks drop off about 70% when the intervening distance between the transportation corridor and the sensitive receptors is greater than 500 feet (Santa Barbara County APCD; Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents, June, 2010).

US Highway 101 in the vicinity of the project site currently carries 65,800 ADTs (SBCAG; 2006) which is below the threshold for a heavily traveled urban transportation corridor and well below the daily traffic volumes experienced on the I-405, I-710, and I-80 corridors through Los Angeles and Sacramento which were the sites for the CARB studies (Dudek; August 2010). The northern property boundary of the project site lies over 530 feet south of the #2 lane of US Highway 101. In addition, prevailing winds in the area are typically onshore blowing from the southwest to the northeast and therefore either parallel to the freeway or toward areas to the northeast and north side of the freeway.

The Southern Pacific Railroad tracks run in an east-west orientation 325 feet to the north of the northern boundary of the project site. The CARB has not developed siting guidelines for sensitive receptors and rail lines. Instead, the CARB recommends
avoiding siting sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a major service and maintenance rail yards and provides guidelines for mitigation of potential health risks when siting sensitive land uses within one mile of a rail yard (Dudek; August 2010). Rail yards present a hazard to nearby sensitive receptors due to a high concentration of locomotives, many of which are older locomotives and many of which idle during railcar switching operations. However, the project is not within one mile of a rail yard and neither the CARB nor the APCD have developed guidelines for siting sensitive receptors in proximity to rail lines (Dudek; August, 2010). Furthermore, general operations along rail lines have not been recognized as a significant source of toxic air contaminants (TAC) related impacts to nearby sensitive receptors, and thus, no agency guidance has been developed to date (Dudek; August, 2010). Therefore, given that about one train per hour passes in the vicinity of the project site for a few minutes, it is anticipated that the resulting locomotive emissions would not rise to the level of a high-traffic roadway or would not result in significant health impacts to the residents of the assisted living facility. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

Finally, it is noted that project residents are generally confined indoors. Therefore, given the project’s distance from US Highway 101, existing and anticipated future traffic volumes on the freeway in this location, the minimal level of diesel particulate emissions resulting from the passage of trains on the nearby rail line, and nature of the facility and its future residents, potential health risks posed by the projects proximity to the freeway and the rail line would be considered less than significant.

e) Based on the nature of the project, the assisted living community is not expected to generate long-term objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

c,f,g) Cumulative Impacts

Criteria Pollutants
Per the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, a project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considered significant if the project’s total emissions of either NO\textsubscript{X} or ROCs exceed the long term threshold of 25 lbs/day. The project’s long-term contribution to NO\textsubscript{X} and ROCs emissions (2.6 lbs/day and 7.7 lbs/day respectively) would be far less than this threshold, and therefore the project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts involving NO\textsubscript{X} and ROCs would be considered less than significant.

Construction Emissions/Fugitive Dust
Project construction related contributions to cumulative NO\textsubscript{X}, ROCs, and PM\textsubscript{10/2.5} exhaust and fugitive dust emissions would also be considered adverse but less than significant as these emissions are believed to have been adequately incorporated into the 2010 Clean Air Plan in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities.

Recommended Mitigation Measures

1. Dust generated by construction and/or demolition activities shall be kept to a minimum. Plan Requirements: The following dust control measures shall be shown on all project
plans, including grading plans, and the permittee shall ensure that these measures are implemented by the contractor/builder:

a) During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, and/or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day’s activities.

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

c) Onsite vehicle speeds shall be 15 miles per hour or less.

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

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

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

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

The permittee shall ensure that the contractor or builder designates a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering as necessary to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to City staff and the APCD and shall be posted in three locations along the project site’s perimeter for the duration of grading and construction activities. **Timing:** All requirements shall be noted on all approved final project plans and the permittee shall submit all project plans for review and approval by City staff prior to any LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall ensure all requirements are printed on all approved final project plans and shall periodically site inspect to ensure compliance. APCD inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.

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

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

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

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, unless otherwise approved by the City.

e) Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment, unless otherwise approved by the City.

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

g) Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, unless otherwise approved by the City.

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 shall be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing lunch onsite.

Timing: All requirements shall be noted on all approved final project plans and the permittee shall submit all project plans for review and approval by City staff prior to any LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure all requirements are printed on all approved final project plans and shall periodically site inspect to ensure compliance. APCD inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.

3. 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 approved final project plans submitted for issuance of any LUP.
4. Diesel fuel emissions shall be limited. **Plan Requirements:** The following limitations on diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds shall apply during all construction and subsequent operational activities:

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

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

c) The permittee shall designate one or more locations as deemed appropriate, for the permanent posting of a notice(s) to all drivers of diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds of these limitations on vehicle idling in all areas of the property that may be frequented by such vehicles. Such signs shall be maintained in their approved location(s) as long as diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds are being used.

**Timing:** All requirements shall be noted on all approved final project plans and the permittee shall submit all project plans for review and approval by City staff prior to any LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods. The permittee shall submit the location and information provided on the sign(s) for review and approval by City staff prior to any LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall ensure all requirements are printed on all approved final project plans and shall periodically site inspect to ensure compliance. APCD inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.

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

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance during all construction activities.

6. The permittee shall limit the operation of the emergency generator engine to 26 hours per year. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be shown on all approved final project plans prior to any LUP issuance and prior to any building permit issuance.

**Monitoring:** The City shall monitor in the field for compliance.
Residual Impacts

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project-specific and project contributions to cumulative impacts on air quality 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

The existing storage yard is almost entirely paved. The project site is surrounded by a mix of urban uses including the adjacent Ellwood Elementary School to the east, vehicle storage and a parking lot to the north and west, the Bluffs at Sandpiper single-family residential development and the Santa Barbara Shores Park regional open space across Hollister Avenue to the south, and a vacant parcel to the northwest owned by Reliant Energy. The site has minimal non-native landscaping and does not support any significant biological resources.
**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 & 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-f) Given the lack of any significant biological resources onsite the project will have no 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. There is no riparian habitat, protected wetlands, 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 either onsite or in proximity to the project. The project would not 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. The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance and there are no adopted habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the project site or in close proximity to the project.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Because there are no biological resources located onsite and the project would not result in interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, interference with wildlife corridors or impediments to the use of native wildlife nursery sites, the project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts to biological resources in the area.

**Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures**

As no impacts to biological resources are anticipated to occur as a result of project implementation, no mitigation is recommended or required.

**Residual Impacts**

None.
Cultural Resources

Would the project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.  Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

The project site is located within the Santa Barbara Channel cultural area. Evidence of cultural activity along the coastline extends over 9,000 years. The prehistoric cultural development has been characterized in three stages: the Early Period (ca. 8,000 to 5,000 years ago); the Middle or Intermediate Period (ca. 5,500 to 900 years ago); and the Late Period (ca. 900 to 200 years ago), (Stone Archaeological Consulting; August, 2007). Historically, settlement in the vicinity of the project site was defined by three periods; the Mission Period (AD 1769 to 1830), the Rancho Period (AD 1830 to 1865), and the American Period (AD 1865 to 1915). As provided in the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) Final EIR (SCH#2005031151; available at Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117), Section 3.5 Cultural Resources, the City is known to contain prehistoric, ethnographic, historical and paleontological resources.

The project site was undeveloped until the early 1970’s when the previous RV sales, rental, and repair facility was constructed onsite. As a result of that development virtually the entirety of the property was disturbed and developed. Based on a review of City files, no archaeological/cultural resource investigations were ever conducted prior to that development. The GP/CLUP identifies areas where known archaeological resources exist. Figure 3.5-1 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR shows areas containing sensitive historic/cultural resources, identifying 46 historic resource locations. The project site is not known to contain any significant archaeological, paleontological or historical resources.

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 Thresholds 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) A Phase I Archaeological Study was conducted for the property by Stone Archaeological Consulting in August 2007. A records search through the California Archaeological Inventory Central Coast Information Center at UCSB indicated that no archaeological sites have been recorded on the project site and the project site is not shown to contain significant archaeological, paleontological or historical resources (Stone Archaeological Consulting; Phase I Archaeological Resources Report, Dixon Senior Housing Project; August 2007). The record search did indicate that three archaeological sites have been recorded and 27 archaeological surveys have been performed within ½ mile of the project site. The nearest identified resource occurs approximately 1,300 feet to the northeast of the project area. Field investigations indicate that approximately 90% of the project site is covered with asphalt for parking of recreational vehicles, thus precluding ground surface visibility, but the intensive survey of the parking lot periphery soils was characterized by overall good reliability (Stone Archaeological Consulting; August 2007). The perimeter of the parking area and dirt island areas of the parking lot were inspected uncovering a few isolated shellfish fragments. No other prehistoric cultural materials were observed. Shovel test pits excavated to an approximate 18-inch depth were completed to determine if any subsurface cultural materials existed, but no shellfish fragments or other potential prehistoric artifacts were observed (Stone Archaeological Consulting; August 2007).

Given the paved condition of the project site, there are no unique geologic features located there. Previous site preparation for the existing parking lot would have disturbed at least the top 18 inches of any cultural deposits. Moreover, there is no evidence that the site was ever used as a cemetery or burial site and, therefore, there is no evidence that human remains are located onsite.

During construction of the project, grading activities would likely require the excavation of fill soil in order for re-compaction to structural standards to support the structure. Such excavation may result in grading disturbance to the underlying native soils. As the isolated shellfish fragments are not considered significant historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, ground disturbances/excavations resulting from project construction would not have the potential to adversely impact known prehistoric or historic artifacts. However, given the historical presence of Chumash in the Santa Barbara area, there is a low potential for unknown resources, including a small, limited prehistoric activity site, or human remains, to be uncovered and adversely affected by construction activities. While there is no evidence of any historical, archaeological, or paleontological artifacts and/or human remains onsite and, therefore, the potential for such artifacts and/or remains to be disturbed onsite is very low, the possibility that unknown resources of this nature might be present cannot be dismissed with complete certainty. Therefore, project construction is considered to pose a potentially significant impact to archaeological, paleontological, and historical resources due to the low potential for such unknown resources to exist onsite.

Cumulative Impacts

Continued loss of cultural resources on a project-by-project basis could result in significant cumulative impacts to such resources over time. The project’s low potential to impact such
resources is considered a potentially significant contribution to this cumulative impact in the event that unknown resources are uncovered.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

1. A City-approved archaeologist and Native American representative 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 historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources are located on the project site. In the unlikely event that potentially intact historical, archaeological, or paleontological artifacts are identified during the inspection, shovel test pits or controlled backhoe trenching shall be performed to identify the integrity and spatial extent of the artifact deposit. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be printed on all approved final project plans submitted for any LUP, building, grading, or demolition permits. The permittee shall enter into a contract and provide a copy of the contract to the City with a City approved archaeologist and Native American representative and shall fund the provision of onsite historical, archaeological, paleontological resource monitoring during initial grading, excavation, and/or demolition activities prior to any LUP issuance. **Monitoring:** City staff shall conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground disturbing activities.

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

3. In the event human remains are encountered during grading, work shall be stopped immediately and the remains shall be treated in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3) Section 15064.5(e). **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.
Residual Impacts

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific impacts as well as the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on historical, archaeological, paleontological resources, as well as human remains, would be less than significant.

Geology and Soils

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

Existing Setting

The City of Goleta is located within the Transverse Range Geomorphic Province of California and the project site is located near the western edge of the Goleta Groundwater Basin. The geologic formations exposed on the site are recent artificial fill (Qaf) and Quaternary-age older alluvium (Q0a). The topography of the project site is relatively flat, sloping less than 2%, with a
small, steeper slope of up to 30% along the south and southwest edge of the property near Hollister Avenue and Viajero Drive. Borings onsite to a depth of 15 feet did not encounter the presence of groundwater (Pacific Materials Laboratory of Santa Barbara, Inc.; Preliminary Foundation Investigation, Proposed Senior Housing Facility, Mariposa at Ellwood Shores, June 5, 2007).

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 Thresholds Manual assumes that a project would result in a potentially significant impact on geological processes if the project, and/or implementation of required mitigation measures, could result in increased erosion, landslides, soil creep, mudslides, and/or unstable slopes. In addition, impacts are considered significant if the project would expose people and/or structures to major geological hazards such as earthquakes, seismic related ground failure, or expansive soils capable of creating a significant risk to life and property.

Project Specific Impacts

a,c,d) No active faults, (defined as those where rupture within the last 11,000 years can be demonstrated), have been mapped in the immediate area of development. The closest active fault is the Red Mountain Fault approximately 25 miles east of the site. An inferred fault known as the East Ellwood Fault southeast of the project site is a previously mapped geologic structure of interest. However, this fault was not found to exist in the location previously mapped during extensive exploratory trenching conducted in 2000 for UCSB’s faculty and family student housing project. The nearest significant fault is the More Ranch Fault segment of the Mission Ridge-Arroyo Parida-More Ranch Fault system less than one kilometer south of the site. This fault, along with the North Channel Slope Fault (9.1 kilometers from the site), are considered to be significant potential sources of seismic shaking (Campbell Geo Inc., Preliminary Geologic Hazards Evaluation of the Proposed Mariposa at Ellwood Shores Senior Housing Project, 7760 Hollister Avenue, July 31, 2007). Severe ground shaking during earthquakes is a hazard endemic to most of California, and all project construction would be subject to compliance with the seismic safety standards of the California Building Code Zone 4 which has been adopted by the City in Chapter 15.01 of Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code.

Artificial fill is present near the southern and eastern portions of the site as well as a historic, buried, gently sloping drainage swale which may contain additional fill (Pacific Materials Laboratory of Santa Barbara, Inc.; June 5, 2007). The site is located in an area of low landslide potential and the natural slope underlying the site is relatively flat and is not subject to instability (Pacific Materials Laboratory of Santa Barbara, Inc.; June 5, 2007).

Pacific Materials Laboratory of Santa Barbara, Inc., as part of a preliminary foundation investigation drilled eight borings to depths of up to 15 feet. None of the borings indicated the presence of groundwater (Pacific Materials Laboratory of Santa Barbara, Inc.; June 5, 2007). The supporting soils were found to be only slightly compressible and sensitive to collapse, were found to have a low potential for expansion, and the potential for liquefaction is considered to be very low (Pacific Materials Laboratory of
Santa Barbara, Inc.; June 5, 2007). As such, potential risks to people and improved property associated with geologic hazards would be considered less than significant.

b) The existing storage yard is almost entirely paved. No areas of active erosion have been observed onsite. However, during construction the parking lot would be removed and the site would be cleared of vegetation. Estimated earthwork quantities include 9,400 cubic yards of cut, 800 cubic yards of fill, and 8,600 cubic yards of export not including over-excavation and recompaition. Removal of artificial fill, site grading and soil disturbance needed for installation of the new swale and storm drain system for the project could temporarily increase erosion causing increased silt in the surface water runoff and siltation of the storm drain system. Such erosion impacts are considered potentially significant.

e) Sewage disposal service for the project would continue to be provided by the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD). Therefore, no potential geological hazards posed by the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems would exist.

Cumulative Impacts

As the project poses potentially significant project specific erosion impacts by possibly causing increased silt in the surface water runoff and siltation of the storm drain system, the contribution of project generated, silt laden runoff to cumulative erosion impacts within the Goleta Valley would also be considered potentially significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The final grading and erosion control plan shall be designed to minimize erosion. **Plan Requirements:** The plan shall include the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Timing:** The permittee shall submit the final grading, drainage, and erosion control plans for review and approval by the City prior to any LUP issuance. BMPs and erosion control measures shall remain in place/shall be implemented for the duration of grading and construction.

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

**Residual Impact**

With implementation of this mitigation measure, residual project specific and project contributions to cumulative geological hazards and impacts to geological processes would be considered less than significant.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

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

**Existing Setting**

The project site has been used as a RV sales and repair center in the past and is currently used as a storage yard.

**Background**

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

Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and have led to a trend of unnatural warming of the earth’s climate, known as global climate change or global warming. It is extremely unlikely that global climate change of the past 50 years can be explained without the contribution from human activities (Bates, B.C., Z.W. Kundzewicz, S. Wu and J.P. Palutikof, Eds., Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Secretariat, Geneva, Climate Change and Water, June 2008).

Climate change is a global problem. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants (TACs), which are pollutants of regional and local concern. Whereas criteria pollutants and TACs with localized air quality effects have relatively short atmospheric lifetimes (about one day), GHGs have long atmospheric lifetimes (one year to several thousand years). GHGs persist in the atmosphere for long enough time periods to be dispersed around the world. Although the exact lifetime of any particular GHG molecule is dependent on multiple variables and cannot be pinpointed, it is understood that currently more CO₂ is emitted into the atmosphere than is sequestered by ocean uptake, vegetation, and other forms of sequestration. Of the total annual human-caused CO₂ emissions, approximately 54% is sequestered within a year through ocean uptake, uptake by northern hemisphere boreal forest growth, and other terrestrial sinks; whereas the remaining 46% of human-caused CO₂ emissions remains stored in the atmosphere (J.H. Seinfeld and S.N. Pandis, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, From Air Pollution to Climate Change, 1998). Similarly, impacts of GHGs are borne globally, as opposed to localized air quality effects of criteria air pollutants and TACs. The quantity of GHGs that it takes to ultimately result in climate change is not precisely known.

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

California has one of the largest economies in the world, and is consequently one of the larger emitters of GHGs. In 2004, California released 484 million metric tons (MMT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) (CARB; 2009) and is the 12th to 16th largest emitter of CO₂ in the world (CEC; 2006).
CO₂e is a measurement used to account for the fact that different GHGs have different potential to retain infrared radiation in the atmosphere and contribute to the greenhouse effect. This potential, known as the global warming potential (GWP), is a measure of the heat trapping ability of a given GHG over a 100-year period relative to the heat trapping ability of CO₂. Expressing individual GHG emissions as CO₂e converts the heat trapping ability and longevity of the individual GHGs to a common basis that is equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO₂ were being emitted.

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

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

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

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

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

In August 2007, the State adopted Senate Bill (SB) 97. This bill directed the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to prepare, develop, and transmit to the California Natural Resources Agency guidelines for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions and the effects of GHG emissions, as required by CEQA by July 1, 2009. The Natural Resources Agency was required to certify or adopt those guidelines by January 1, 2010. Those guidelines were
submitted, and on March 18, 2010 became effective. In relevant part, those guidelines in Section 15126.4(c) provide as follows:

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

(1) Measures in an existing plan or mitigation program for the reduction of emissions that are required as part of the lead agency’s decision;

(2) Reductions in emissions resulting from a project through implementation of project features, project design, or other measures, such as those described in Appendix F;

(3) Off-site measures, including offsets that are not otherwise required, to mitigate a project’s emissions;

(4) Measures that sequester greenhouse gases;

(5) In the case of adoption of a plan, such as a general plan, long range development plan, or plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, mitigation may include the identification of specific measures that may be implemented on a project-by-project basis. Mitigation may also include the incorporation of specific measures or policies found in an adopted ordinance or regulation that reduces the cumulative effect of emissions.

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

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

Also on November 2, 2010, the Goleta City Council adopted the Energy Efficiency Standards, Chapter 15.13 of Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code, implementing local building energy efficiency standards for the City that includes a “reach” goal of an additional 15% reduction in GHGs when compared to the Title 24 California Code of Regulations 2008 California Building Standards Code. The increased energy efficiency standards apply to new buildings or structures of any size, including the project.

Thresholds of Significance

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

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

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

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

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

- The extent to which the project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;
- Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the Lead Agency determines applies to the project; and
- The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions.

The amendments call on Lead Agencies to establish significance thresholds for their respective jurisdictions.

Currently, neither the State of California nor the City of Goleta has established CEQA significance thresholds for GHG emissions. Indeed, many regulatory agencies are sorting through suggested thresholds and/or making project-by-project analyses. This approach is consistent with that suggested by CAPCOA in its technical advisory entitled “CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through the California Environmental Quality Act Review (CAPCOA; 2008):
...In the absence of regulatory standards for GHG emissions or other specific data to clearly define what constitutes a 'significant project', individual lead agencies may undertake a project-by-project analysis, consistent with available guidance and current CEQA practice.

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

Table 1
Bay Area Air Quality Management District GHG Thresholds of Significance

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

*SP = Service Population

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

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

Accordingly, given that the City of Goleta does not have established thresholds of significance for GHG emissions, and as the City is located in Santa Barbara County, the rationale for applicability of the BAAQMD thresholds would generally apply. Therefore, the City has applied the following two thresholds of significance to the project. Would the project:
1) Exceed the daily significance threshold adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, i.e., of 1,100 MT CO$_2$e/yr, for operational GHG emissions and/or result in significant GHG emissions based on a qualitative analysis.

2) Employ reasonable and feasible means to minimize GHG emissions from a qualitative standpoint, in a manner that is consistent with the goals and objectives of AB 32.

It is also noted that the use of the BAAQMD threshold does not imply that it is a threshold that the City of Goleta has formally adopted, or should adopt, as a GHG significance threshold for all present or future project analyses.

**Sea Level Rise**

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

**Project Specific Impacts**

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

The URBEMIS model does not contain emission factors for GHGs other than CO$_2$, except for methane from mobile sources, which is converted to CO$_2$e. This is not a major problem since CO$_2$ 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 (version 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. Based on construction model runs conducted using the URBEMIS 2007 (version 9.2.4) air quality modeling software for the 2008 unmitigated condition, it is anticipated that project construction-generated CO₂ emission levels would be 2.46 metric tons per day. Assuming that construction would occur over the course of a 6-month period, the project’s total GHG emissions due to construction would be 448 MT. The City of Goleta has not adopted significance criteria for construction activities, and neither has the BAAQMD. However, this level of GHG emissions is not considered significant because the emissions would be temporary and finite in nature and the project construction activities will follow Best Management Practices.

**Project Operational Emissions**

Direct operational CO₂ emissions would occur as a result of project-generated traffic, onsite consumption of fossil fuels for water and space heaters, and other activities such as landscape maintenance that consumes fossil fuels. Based on long-term operational model runs conducted using the URBEMIS 2007 (version 9.2.4) air quality modeling software for the 2008 unmitigated condition, anticipated direct project operational CO₂ emissions for the project are estimated at 2,017 lbs/day or 332 metric tons/year (0.91 metric tons/day). This is below the BAAQMD significance threshold of 1,100 metric tons CO₂e/year.

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

**Project Significance**

The project’s short-term construction level of GHG emissions is not considered significant and the long-term operational level of GHG emissions is substantially less than the previously noted BAAQMD threshold value. Additionally, the project is subject to and would implement measures required by the Green Building Code of the City and the Energy Efficiency Standards. The project would also not conflict with any other plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Therefore, project GHG emissions impacts are considered less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts**

GHG emissions from the project, as well as GHG emissions from other projects in the area, would be incrementally cumulative. However, these emissions represent a small percentage of California’s GHG emissions, which were estimated at 484 million metric tons of CO₂e in 2004 (CARB; 2009). The incremental impact of the project's operational GHG emissions is less than the BAAQMD’s threshold of 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e per year, and when combined with the
GHG emissions of other projects in the area, the cumulative impact is not cumulatively considerable and is, therefore, less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

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

Residual Impact

Residual impacts as a result of greenhouse gas emissions would remain less than significant.

<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 Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</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. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

The existing storage yard is almost entirely paved. The project site is surrounded by a mix of uses including the adjacent Ellwood Elementary School to the east, vehicle storage and a parking lot to the north and west, the Bluffs at Sandpiper single-family residential development and the Santa Barbara Shores Park regional open space across Hollister Avenue to the south, and a vacant parcel to the northwest owned by Reliant Energy. The project site is not listed on the Cortese List pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 as a hazardous materials site. Although no private airstrips are in the vicinity of the project site, the property does lie within 2¼ miles of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBMA). The project site lies well out of the Wildland Fire Hazard Area of the City.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) The project would generate hazardous biomedical waste that would require specialized handling and disposal. Such waste commonly includes needles from injections, outdated medications, and bandages for wound care (Julie McGeever; August 23, 2010). If not disposed of properly, such bio-hazardous waste would pose a potentially significant hazard to the public and the environment.

b) The project site is located adjacent to Ellwood Elementary School. However, it is not anticipated that typical operations of the assisted living facility would involve hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste that would impact adjacent land uses, including the Ellwood Elementary School. Therefore, the potential impact from such hazards to the public, environment, or schools in the area would be considered less than significant.
c) The project would be located approximately 500 feet east of the existing Reliant Energy Peaking Facility which operates during electrical power emergencies or peak electrical power demand to augment electricity supplies in the area (on average, less than 3% of the time). In addition, one transmission and two distribution electrical power lines border the project site to the south along Hollister Avenue. Electrical power generating facilities and high-voltage power lines are sources of low frequency electromagnetic fields (EMFs). Exposure to EMFs of 2 milli-Gauss (mG) or greater is considered to pose a potentially significant health hazard source since common domestic sources of EMFs like microwaves, radios, and electric blankets generate EMFs in the range of 1 mG or less where the intensity of the EMFs emitted drops off substantially within three (3) feet of the EMF source (Dudek; *EMF Assessment, Mariposa at Ellwood Shores Assisted Living Facility*, August 1, 2010). According to this EMF study, during operation of the peaking facility EMFs of up to 2 mG extended outward 150 feet from the plant (350 feet from the facility). Three power lines exist along Hollister Avenue (one 66 kV transmission line and two 16 kV distribution lines), and are about 103 feet south of any staff area or client residence. During normal operations EMFs from these lines were measured at 2mG 40 feet from the lines and 1 mG 60 feet from these lines (Dudek; August 1, 2010). Even during operation of the Reliant Energy Peaking facility during periods of high electrical demand, EMFs generated by the transmission lines along Hollister of 2mG would only extend up to 90 feet away and EMFs of up to 1 mG would extend up to 150 feet away. As the facility is located 100 feet to the north of these transmission lines, even during the peaking substation’s operations (estimated to be no more than 3% of the time), maximum exposure of residents, guests, and employees of the facility would not exceed 1 mG, and for only limited time periods (Dudek; August 1, 2010). As potential EMF exposure of residents, visitors, and employees of the facility would not exceed 1 mG for any length of time, which is considered a common exposure level for any residential use with typical EMF generators such as microwaves, radios, and electric blankets, associated health risks would be considered less than significant.

d) The project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List). As such, associated hazardous material risks and impacts would not occur to the public or the environment as a result of project implementation.

e,f) There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. The project site is located outside of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport approach zone as defined by the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan, and therefore, no safety impact would result.

g,h) The project would not result in the construction of any new facilities or establishment of new uses that could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The County Fire Department has reviewed the project and with the required 20-foot wide emergency access around the building on the northern and eastern perimeters of the site, along with the two driveways on Viajero Drive, has determined that the internal access system is adequate for emergency services purposes. The project site is located outside of the City's Wildland Fire Hazard Area. Therefore, associated impacts on emergency services and exposure to wildland fire hazards would be less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts

Because project specific hazards related to biomedical waste are limited to the project site and the other project specific hazards risk are considered less than significant, project contributions to cumulative hazards risks and exposure to hazardous materials are considered less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The permittee shall arrange for all medical waste disposal, which shall be provided by a licensed medical waste hauler and shall comply with all applicable laws, rules and regulations (including California Health and Safety Code §117600 et seq.). **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The permittee shall provide City staff with a draft contract from a licensed medical waste disposal contractor for handling and disposal of all biomedical waste pursuant to all applicable laws, rules and regulations (including California Health and Safety Code §117600 et seq.) prior to any LUP issuance and a copy of the executed contract prior to occupancy clearance.

**Monitoring**: City staff shall verify compliance with these requirements prior to any LUP issuance and prior to occupancy clearance.

Residual Impact

Residual project hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be considered less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? |  |  |  |  |  |

e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? |  |  |  |  |  |

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? |  |  |  |  |  |

g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? |  |  |  |  |  |

h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? |  |  |  |  |  |
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? |  |  |  |  |  |
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? |  |  |  |  |  |

Existing Setting

The site is almost entirely paved and its topography is relatively flat, sloping in a southeasterly direction at an average slope of 2%, with a slightly steeper slope of up to 30% along the south and southwest edge of the property near Hollister Avenue and Viajero Drive. Drainage from the parcel to the north sheet flows onto the site across the northern property line. Runoff of surface water at the site is by sheet flow primarily southerly across the property, draining to Hollister Avenue, with a small portion of the site draining west to Viajero Drive and then to the Hollister Avenue gutter. Runoff is then directed to the curb inlet at the southeast corner of the site on Hollister Avenue (Flowers and Associates, Preliminary Drainage Analysis, April 2007).

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 Thresholds Manual assume that a significant impact on hydrology and water resources would occur if a project would result in a substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns, alter the course of a stream or river, increase the rate of surface runoff to the extent that flooding, including increased erosion or sedimentation, occurs, create or contribute to runoff volumes exceed existing or planned stormwater runoff facilities, or substantially degrade water quality.
Project Specific Impacts

a) All sewage effluent generated by the project would be collected by the Goleta West Sanitary District and conveyed to the Goleta Sanitary District’s sewage treatment on William Moffett Place adjacent to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. The only other source of wastewater discharged from the site would be landscape irrigation tailwater which given the design of the preliminary landscape plan and use of pervious surfaces to interrupt the flow of such runoff, would not adversely affect water quality. Therefore, project related impacts involving the discharge of wastewater from the facility would be considered less than significant.

b) Water for the project would be provided by the Goleta Water District (GWD). The GWD operates under the Wright Judgment which prohibits overdrafting of the Goleta Groundwater Basin (GGWB) and mandates the maintenance of the basin in a hydrologically balanced condition. Therefore, the project would not result in any significant depletion of groundwater supplies and project related impacts to groundwater supplies would be considered less than significant.

c) During construction the parking lot would be removed and the site would be cleared of any remaining vegetation and graded. The project could temporarily increase erosion resulting in an increase in the amount of silt and sediment introduced into any stormwater runoff discharged from the site. Associated construction related impacts on stormwater quality would be considered potentially significant.

d) The storm drain system associated with the project would more efficiently deliver project drainage, as well as the off-site drainage from the north, to the existing curb inlet on Hollister Avenue, thus reducing the street gutter flows existing in Viajero Drive and Hollister Avenue. No alteration of the course of a stream or river would occur. Impacts on existing drainage patterns both onsite as well as offsite resulting from project implementation would be less than significant.

e-f) In order to minimize stormwater runoff and protect water quality, drainage improvements associated with the project would route as much roof and surface drainage as possible through the landscaped areas, swales and/or the pervious pavement of the emergency access driveway along the north and east perimeter of the site. The surface swales would drain to area inlets throughout the site which would connect to a new storm drain system. The storm drain system would discharge offsite at the southeast corner of the property where there is an existing curb inlet box on Hollister Avenue. Offsite drainage from the north would be collected by a swale and drainage inlets constructed behind a retaining wall along the northern property line. The inlets would discharge through the wall onto the pervious pavement of the emergency access driveway (Flowers and Associates; Preliminary Drainage Analysis, Mariposa at Ellwood Shores; April 2007).

Runoff calculations were prepared for the pre- and post-development conditions for the 10, 25, 50 and 100 year storm events. Per the drainage analysis (Flowers and Associates; April 2007), the stormwater runoff resulting from development of the project site would be decreased by approximately 0.37 cfs in the 25-year storm. Overall, the results of that analysis indicate that the project would reduce the existing runoff by approximately 5% in all storm events due to the introduction of new pervious surfaces and drainage improvements beyond the current paved condition (Flowers and
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The storm drain system would be sized to accommodate the 25 year storm event, including the offsite drainage running through the property, allowing for overland escape via the surface swales. The outlet storm drain from the southeast corner to the Hollister Avenue curb inlet would be sized to accommodate a 100 year storm event. Existing street gutter flows in Viajero Drive and Hollister Avenue would be reduced due to the more efficient storm drain system conveying project and offsite drainage from the north to the existing curb inlet on Hollister Avenue (Flowers and Associates; April 2007). Although the project would not result in the need for construction of new storm water drainage facilities offsite, if the final design, installation, and/or maintenance and onsite drainage control systems are not adequate, stormwater treatment prior to discharge would not be adequate and resulting potential impacts on water quality would be potentially significant.

g,h) No new development is proposed within areas subject to flooding during the 100-year event and as such, associated flooding impacts as a result of project implementation are considered non-existent.

i,j) There are no levees or dams upstream of the project site to the top of the area’s watershed that could threaten the facility in the event of a dam or levee failure. The entirety of the site lies outside the City’s Potential Tsunami Run-Up Area as mapped by the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) (GP/CLUP Safety Element, Figure 5-2). Therefore, impacts to people and property associated with the failure of an upstream levee and/or dam, or due to inundation as a result of a tsunami, are considered non-existent.

Cumulative Impacts

Project generated stormwater runoff contributions to cumulative flooding, as well as the contribution of project generated sediment laden runoff to cumulative water quality impacts, would be considered potentially significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

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

2. The permittee shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) covering all phases of grading and construction activities. **Plan Requirements:** The SWPPP shall be prepared by a licensed civil engineer and incorporate all appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) necessary to mitigate short-term construction impacts. The plan shall include the following BMPs:

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

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

c) Runoff shall not be directed across exposed slopes; all surface runoff shall be conveyed in accordance with the approved final drainage plans;

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

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

**Timing:** The final drainage plan and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be submitted to City staff for review and approval prior to any LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify that the SWPPP has been implemented per the approved final SWPPP during all phases of grading and construction.

3. The permittee shall prepare a final drainage/stormwater quality protection plan consistent with the City’s Storm Water Management Plan that identifies all Best Management Practices (BMPs). **Plan Requirements:** The final drainage/stormwater quality protection BMPs plan shall be prepared by a licensed civil engineer. The plan shall include the following BMPs:

a) A final drainage analysis that provides final calculations on pre/post development stormwater runoff volumes, required storage capacity, and specifications on all elements of the drainage control system;

b) Regular maintenance and cleaning of catch basins, detention basins, and other drainage infrastructure per a City approved operations and maintenance (O&M) plan;

c) Routine cleaning of streets, parking lots, and storm drains;

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

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

f) Provision of educational flyers to residents/commercial tenants regarding proper disposal of hazardous water and automotive waste;
g) Provision of trash storage/material storage areas that are covered by a roof and protected from surface runoff.

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

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

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

**Monitoring:** Community Services staff shall annually review the maintenance report to verify compliance with the provisions of the Operations and Maintenance Plan and shall respond to instances of non-compliance as necessary.

**Residual Impact**

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

**Land Use and Planning**

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

The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (General Plan) land use designation of the site within the Land Use Element is General Commercial (C-G). According to Land Use Policy LU 3.7, the intent of the General Commercial designation is to provide appropriate sites to accommodate a diverse set of commercial uses that do not need highly visible locations or that may involve activities that reduce compatibility with other uses. General commercial uses may serve as a buffer between industrial activities or major transportation corridors and residential areas. Policy LU 3.7 also identifies specific criteria and standards applicable to lands within this jurisdiction, including the allowance for assisted living residential uses, accessibility from major arterials, and limitations on heavy vehicle traffic and heavy commercial uses. The project site lies outside of the Coastal Zone, within the Inland Area of the City, with an existing zoning designation of Industrial Research Park (M-RP). An assisted living facility is an allowed use with a Minor Conditional Use Permit in every zone district, including this zone district.

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,c) The project would not result in the physical division of any established community or neighborhood. The project represents infill within a developed area of the City. A mix of commercial, residential and transportation corridor uses surround the site including the adjacent Ellwood Elementary School to the east, vehicle storage and a parking lot to the north and west, single-family residential development and regional open space across Hollister Avenue to the south, and a vacant parcel to the northwest. In addition, the project does not involve modifications to the existing circulation network within the community. Therefore, there would be no impact related to dividing an established community. Per the General Plan Conservation Element Figure 4-1, no Environmentally Sensitive Habitats Areas (ESHAs) or special status species are documented on the project site (see also Biological Resources section). There are no habitat or natural community conservation plans that apply to the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to any conservation plans.

b) The application includes a request to rezone the project site from Industrial Research Park (M-RP) to General Commercial (C-3). Such a rezone would bring the zoning of the project site into conformance with the General Plan land use designation of General Commercial (C-G) for the property. The assisted living facility use is allowed in that land use category by the General Plan and may be allowed in the C-3 zone district with approval of a Minor Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Therefore, the applicant is also applying for approval of a Minor Conditional Use Permit to allow for the special care home.

Given the request for a rezone of the property to C-3, the project would be subject to the C-3 zone district development standards including setbacks, maximum building height, landscaping, parking, and performance standards. The project is currently consistent with all provisions of the zoning code, Article III of Chapter 35 of the Goleta Municipal Code, with the exception of the location of four (4) parking spaces within the setback of
Viajero Drive, and the number of parking spaces being provided (49). Modifications to these development standards are requested by the applicant and discussed below. In addition, the project would include landscaping and frontage (e.g. sidewalks) improvements within City rights-of-way along both Viajero Drive and Hollister Avenue which are typically required for such developments.

**Long Term Parking**
The Goleta Municipal Code, Chapter 35, Article III, Division 6 Parking Regulations require one space per guest room and one space per two employees for retirement and special care homes. The project includes 63 guest rooms with a total of 99 beds (1.6 beds/room) and 44 total employees. Therefore, 85 spaces would be required per the zoning code. The project as designed includes a total of 49 parking spaces, 36 spaces less than required. In addition, four (4) of these spaces would be located partially within the secondary front setback off Viajero Drive (7’ vs the required 10’). Therefore, project approval of the facility as designed would require the decision-maker to approve a modification to the zoning code requirements involving the location and number of parking spaces provided.

The parking demand estimates for the project have been calculated based on the parking rates provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation Report (Fourth Edition) (ATE; December 13, 2011). Using the ITE parking rates for Assisted Living Complexes, the project is estimated to need 26 spaces (0.41 spaces/dwelling unit). Additionally, ATE assessed peak parking demand at three similar local facilities, including Wood Glen Hall, Heritage House, and Villa Alamar (ATE; October, 2007). That study showed that the peak demand ranged from a low of 0.19 spaces per bed to a high of 0.40 spaces per bed, with an average rate of 0.35 spaces bed. Applying the average rate based on these local studies to the project with 99 beds, establishes a parking demand estimate of 35 spaces. Both the ITE rate and the average rate based on local studies establish that project generated demand for onsite parking would be substantially less than the number of spaces required per the zoning code. Specifically, the project’s 49 spaces would exceed the peak parking demand forecast for the project by 23 spaces for the ITE rate, and 14 spaces for the local rate. For specials events, tandem parking provided by a valet service could increase parking capacity onsite to 69 or 70 cars, a 43% increase over the project’s 49 spaces (Signature Parking; Mariposa at Ellwood Shores Valet Parking Services, August 2, 2010).

Given the data provided in the supplemental parking demand analysis (ATE; December 13, 2011), and the ability to use valet parking for special events thereby increasing onsite parking capacity by up to 43% over the number of spaces provided by the project, the requested modification to the City’s minimum parking requirements in this instance can be supported and justified for the following reasons: a) parking demand for this project is estimated to range from 31% to 41% of the minimum number of spaces required per the zoning ordinance; b) requiring so many spaces beyond estimated demand results in a constraint on the facility and the applicant’s ability to serve its targeted clientele; and c) results in excess impervious surface that could be more appropriately used for pervious improvements and/or structural facilities to enhance project operations and efficiencies of scale. However, future project generated parking on City streets and/or the failure to utilize valet parking for special events could result in potentially significant parking impacts within City right-of-ways.
The requested parking setback modification, four (4) spaces along Viajero Drive, would encroach into the secondary front setback by approximately three (3) feet. As discussed in the Aesthetics/Visual Quality section of this document, such an encroachment in this instance is not expected to create an adverse aesthetic or visual quality impact.

**Short Term Parking**

Vehicular access to the project site for construction activities and workers is available from Viajero Drive off of Hollister Avenue. Because construction activities often conflict with onsite construction vehicle parking, such vehicles may have to be parked offsite for significant amounts of time. Viajero Drive is a 380’ long, 40’ wide paved road terminating in an 80’ diameter cul-de-sac at its northern terminus. Vehicular parking is currently allowed on both sides of Viajero Drive with sufficient space along the curb to accommodate a significant number of construction vehicles. In addition, the applicant owns a 2.10 acre paved parking lot that abuts the project site on its northern boundary. Again, this parking lot can accommodate a significant number of construction related vehicles. As such, given the opportunities for parking of construction related vehicles on either Viajero Drive or the parking lot owned by the applicant immediately to the north of the project site, construction generated parking demand is not expected to result in the need for any construction related vehicles to be parked along Hollister Avenue. Therefore, demand for construction related vehicle parking is considered a less than significant, short term parking impact.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Because the project is consistent with the General Plan and zoning code, any impacts contributing to the cumulative land use impacts of other projects in the area associated with aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geological processes, hydrology, noise, public services, traffic, and utilities would be considered less than significant. However, any cumulative parking demand impacts that may result from the project through the provision of less parking than required by the zoning code would be potentially significant.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

1. The permittee shall execute a contract or other documentation approved by the City establishing the availability of parking valet service for special events and shall implement valet parking for all special events where the number of peak hour employee and guest vehicles is reasonably estimated to equal or exceed 90% of the 49 parking spaces provided (0.9 x 49 = 44 spaces). **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall submit an executed contract or other documentation approved by the City for valet parking services from a licensed valet parking provider prior to occupancy clearance. Valet parking services shall be used by the permittee whenever it is reasonably estimated that parking demand generated by both employee and guest vehicles will equal or exceed 90% of the 49 parking spaces provided (44 spaces).

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify submittal of the executed valet parking service contract or other documentation prior to occupancy clearance. City staff shall perform random site inspections for three years following full occupancy and respond to all complaints regarding facility generated overflow parking on City streets.
2. No project related operational parking shall be allowed on any City street. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be printed on all approved final project plans submitted for any LUP and/or building or grading permit. Prior to occupancy clearance the permittee shall record a Notice to Property Owner (NTPO), in a form acceptable to the Planning and Environmental Services Department and City Attorney advising all future property owners of this prohibition.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to issuance of any LUP and/or building or grading permit as well as prior to occupancy clearance.

3. The total number of beds for elderly care and/or elderly residents of the facility shall not exceed 99. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be printed on all approved final project plans submitted for any LUP and/or building or grading permit. Prior to occupancy clearance the permittee shall record a Notice to Property Owner (NTPO), in a form acceptable to the Planning and Environmental Services Department and City Attorney advising all future property owners of this restriction.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to issuance of any LUP and/or building or grading permit as well as prior to occupancy clearance.

**Recommended Mitigation Measures**

4. Construction related vehicle parking shall be prohibited on Hollister Avenue. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Prior to issuance of any LUP for the project, the permittee shall provide for review and approval by City staff and the County Fire Department an overflow construction parking plan that ensures that all construction related parking demand can be accommodated either on Viajero Drive or the paved parking lot immediately north of the project site.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall periodically site inspect to ensure that no construction related parking is occurring on Hollister Avenue.

**Residual Impact**

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative land use and planning impacts would be less than significant.

**MINERAL RESOURCES**

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

The project site is almost entirely paved and has been used as either a RV sales/rental/repair facility or as a storage yard since 1971. There is no evidence that extraction of mineral resources ever occurred 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) There are no known mineral resources of importance to the region or the state onsite and the project site is not designated under the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan as an important mineral resource recovery site. Associated impacts as a result of project implementation would not occur.

Cumulative Impacts

As there are no project specific impacts on mineral resources, project contributions to cumulative impacts on mineral resources in the area would also not occur.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required or recommended.

Residual Impacts

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. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<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>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 outside of the existing 65 dB(A) noise contour for the airport, the Union Pacific Railroad, US Highway 101 and Hollister Avenue. The project site is located outside of the approach zone of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBMA). Sensitive noise receptors in the vicinity include Ellwood Elementary School adjacent to the project site.

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 from the source.

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

Duration is a measure of the time to which the noise receptor is exposed to the noise. Because noise levels in any given location fluctuate during the day, it is necessary to quantify the level of variation to accurately describe the noise environment. One of the best measures to describe the noise environment is the Community Noise Equivalent Level 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
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Thresholds Manual. The City’s adopted thresholds assume that outdoor CNEL noise levels in excess of 64 dB(A) are considered potentially significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors.

Project Specific Impacts

a,c) The project site lies within the 60 dB(A) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise exposure contour within the City. The primary sources of noise in the area are vehicular traffic on Hollister Avenue, Highway 101, the Union Pacific Railroad Right of Way, and aircraft operations at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (General Plan) indicates that the range of normally acceptable noise levels for schools and rest homes is 50-60 dB(A). “Normally acceptable” for a specified land use is defined as:

\[
\text{satisfactory based on the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements. Both such uses are considered sensitive receptors and the limit of acceptable noise exposure of sensitive receptors is typically 60 dBA CNEL.}
\]

Pursuant to the General Plan, noise levels of up to 65 dB(A) are considered “conditionally acceptable” for sensitive receptors. The term “conditionally acceptable” is defined as:

\[
\text{New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and the needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.}
\]

Future noise contours at build out of the General Plan indicate that the anticipated exterior noise levels to be experienced by project residents and employees fall within this range, and with typical construction techniques, the interior noise levels typically decrease by 20 dB. Given the project’s location and anticipated future traffic volumes on Hollister Avenue and the Union Pacific Railroad, the railroad is considered to pose the most significant noise source affecting the assisted living facility. To verify the existing noise environment, a noise study was conducted using onsite noise measurements and the Federal Highway Transit Administration’s train noise model (Dudek; Mariposa Assisted Living Facility, Focused Noise Assessment; July 23, 2010). The train noise model uses a number of factors such as train speeds, number of locomotives, and use of transit warning devices such as train whistles (Dudek; July 23, 2010). Per the noise study, Amtrak operates 12 daily trips (north and south bound) consisting of both passenger and freight trains that pass by the facility generally between the hours of 6:30 AM and 10:00 PM. Based on this study, cumulative noise from passing trains, assuming use of a warning signal, was calculated at 56 dBA CNEL at a second-floor level (Dudek; July 23, 2010). Noise levels at ground level would be less due to attenuation from the existing topography and structures (Dudek; July 23, 2010). Typical construction techniques in Southern California would reduce the CNEL by 12 dB(A) with windows open and 20 dB(A) with windows closed (Dudek; July 23, 2010). As such, the resulting internal CNEL would range from 44 dB(A) to 36 dB(A), which is within the 45 dB(A)
standard mandated for internal living space as normally acceptable per the City’s General Plan. Therefore, noise impacts on residents and staff at the assisted living facility would be considered less than significant.

A 350 KV diesel powered electrical generator would provide emergency power during power outages for the assisted living facility. Typically, diesel powered generators of this size with standard factory Level II weather protective/noise attenuation enclosures produce noise at about 72 dB(A) (www.cumminspower.com, Sound-Attenuated and Weather-Protective Enclosures). The generator would be housed in an enclosed accessory structure at the south east corner of the building, just opposite the Ellwood Elementary School. Acoustical construction techniques can intercept noise as it passes through walls, floors, windows, ceilings, and doors. For instance, construction techniques with a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of 40 would reduce a noise of 85 dB at the source to 45 dB outside of the STC 40 enclosure (US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Physical Techniques to Reduce Noise Impacts–Audible Landscape–FHWA, www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/audible/al4.htm). However, if the generator enclosure is not properly designed, generator operations, either during power outages or for maintenance purposes, would pose a potentially significant impact on such nearby sensitive noise receptors as the adjacent Ellwood Elementary School.

b) The project would not expose neighboring sensitive receptors to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels since construction of the project would not require such vibration/noise generating construction techniques, as the driving of foundation piles. Impacts associated with groundborne noise and vibration on sensitive receptors in the area would be considered less than significant.

d) The City’s Thresholds Manual notes construction noise poses a potentially significant impact on sensitive receptors if such receptors are within 1,600 feet of the construction site. 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 reach 1,600 feet. Per the City’s General Plan Noise Element, schools are considered a sensitive noise receptor, making the Ellwood Elementary School the closest sensitive receptor to the project site. Since the school is located adjacent to the site, with the closest building located within approximately 45 feet of the eastern property line, construction noise would be considered to result in a potentially significant impact on sensitive receptors in the area.

e) The site is located outside of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Approach Zone as defined by the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan as well as the Airport’s 60 dB(A) noise contour. The project site is located along the extended runway centerline of Runway 7 and would be subject to occasional aircraft overflights from westbound straight-out departures. However, as these overflights would be at relatively high altitudes, such overflights and occasional noise intrusions for the residents of the assisted living facility are considered a less than significant noise impact on project residents and employees.
f) There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site.

Cumulative Impacts

Incremental increases in ambient CNEL as a result of the inclusion of a diesel powered emergency power generator would be considered a potentially significant contribution to cumulative noise impacts in the vicinity of the project site.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The accessory structure housing the diesel powered emergency generator shall incorporate acoustical construction techniques sufficient to reduce generator operations noise to 60 dB(A) or less. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** A City approved acoustical engineer shall certify that the architectural design of the accessory structure housing the 350 KV diesel power emergency generator uses sufficient acoustical construction techniques to ensure that generator noise levels at the exterior wall of the accessory structure would not exceed 60 dB(A) maximum. The required certification shall be submitted to the Planning and Environmental Services Department prior to issuance of any building permit(s) for the project.

**Monitoring:** The City Building Inspector shall verify that the accessory structure housing the emergency generator is constructed per the approved acoustical design prior to occupancy clearance.

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

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

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

4. The following measures shall be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise:
   a) All construction equipment shall have properly maintained sound-control devices, and no equipment shall have an unmuffled exhaust system.
   b) Contractors shall implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, and installing acoustic barriers around significant sources of stationary construction noise.

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

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

Residual Impact

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

Public Services and Utilities

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

Fire Protection

Fire protection services would be provided by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD). The closest station to the project site is Fire Station 11 located at 6901 Frey Way, just off Storke Road on the south side of US Highway 101. The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and the SBCFD identify the following three guidelines regarding the provision of fire protection services:

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

The mandated Cal-OSHA requirement for firefighter safety, known as the “two-in-two-out rule” is also applicable. This rule requires a minimum of two personnel to be available outside a structure prior to entry by firefighters to provide an immediate rescue for trapped or fallen firefighters, as well as immediate assistance in rescue operations.

Station 11 has an engine company with a staff of three personnel, consisting of an engine company captain, engineer, and firefighter. This engine company provides immediate response on incidents as determined by the type of call. Station 11 also houses a truck company (ladder truck), which is staffed with three personnel. This truck company is designated a countywide emergency response rescue vehicle and is not solely dedicated to serve Station 11’s first-in district. As such, Truck Company 11 is not relied on to provide immediate response for the service population in the Station 11 district.

Fire Station 11 currently does not meet the first two NFPA and SBCFD guidelines, as follows (City of Goleta, General Plan/CLUP Final EIR, Table 3.12-1; 2006):

1. The current ratio of firefighters to population at Fire Station 11 is 1:7,198.
2. Fire Station 11 currently serves a population of 21,594 (2000 Census), which is above the ratio of one engine company (three-person crew) per 12,000 population by approximately 9,594 people.

Response time from Fire Station 11 is typically within 5 minutes. The SBCFD has also recently implemented a dynamic deployment system, for its fire engines, in addition to the traditional static deployment system from fire stations when the station’s engine is “in-house”. Dynamic deployment allows for the dispatching of engines already on the road to emergency calls rather than dispatching by a station’s “first in area”, as has been the previous practice. Basically, dynamic deployment uses a Global Positioning System (GPS) to monitor the exact location of each engine in real time. Previously, when an engine was out on routine (non-emergency) activities, such as inspections or training, the engine company was considered “in-service” and its exact location at any given moment in time was not known to County Dispatch. However, with dynamic deployment using the County’s GPS, County dispatch has real-time information on the exact location of each engine at all times and can dispatch the closest, un-engaged engine
to an emergency incident, regardless of which fire station’s service area the call originates from. This precludes the need for an in-service engine to have extended run times when another fire engine would be closer (Glenn Fidler; August 16, 2011). The Fire Department has also added a battalion chief as the fourth fire fighter on scene, in order to meet the “two-in-two-out rule”.

**Police Services**

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

**Libraries**

Services at the Goleta Public Library are provided by contract with the City of Santa Barbara in a facility owned by the City at 500 North Fairview Avenue. The 2-acre library site includes a 15,437 square foot (SF) building and parking areas. The facility provides services for the City and nearby unincorporated areas. In 2010/2011, library visits were 256,996 and circulation was 606,741. Services were provided by 5 full-time and 2 part-time employees.

**Schools**

Public education services are provided within Goleta and the remainder of the Goleta Valley by the Goleta Union School District (GUSD) and the Santa Barbara Unified School District (SBUSD). In general, enrollments in the area school system have been declining for the past several years and area schools serving the project vicinity are operating below capacity. These schools include Isla Vista Elementary School at 6875 El Colegio Road, Ellwood Elementary School at 7686 Hollister Avenue, Goleta Valley Junior High at 6100 Stow Canyon Road, and Dos Pueblos High School at 7266 Alameda Avenue.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant impact on public services would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. While the NFPA and SBCFD criteria shown above are not adopted thresholds of significance, they provide a guideline for determining significance. In addition, the City’s Thresholds Manual includes thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools. Specifically, under these thresholds any project that would generate enough students to generate the need for an additional classroom using current State standards, would be considered to result in a significant impact on area schools. Current State standards for classroom size are as follows:

- Grades K - 2: 20 students/classroom
- Grades 3 – 8: 29 students/classroom
- Grades 9 – 12: 28 students/classroom

**Project Specific Impacts**

**Fire Protection**

Project structural development would include an approximately 70,510-square foot (SF) building to be used as an assisted living facility accommodating a maximum of 99 elderly residents. Fire
protection requirements would include, but would not be limited to, structural fires, emergency medical services, public assistance, and other requests.

The project would be primarily served by Fire Station 11, which currently exceeds service-to-population standards. Therefore, while fire protection services would still be provided, some emergency calls from the project may experience a delayed response. Depending on volume of calls being handled by Fire Station 11 at the time of service request originating at the project, response may be within 5 minutes, may be delayed, and/or first response may come from a back-up fire station through static and/or dynamic deployment.

Once on the scene following any emergency call, the Fire Department would need adequate onsite fire protection facilities. Therefore, impacts to fire protection services are considered potentially significant, until such time as approved final site, utility, and other project plans are reviewed and approved for proper inclusion of Fire Department requirements.

Police Services
The Santa Barbara County Sheriffs Department provides 24-hour police protection services to the area under contract to the City of Goleta. The City of Goleta is divided into three patrol units with one police car assigned to each unit. Additional police services are available from Santa Barbara County to supplement City of Goleta police in an emergency. City of Goleta police operate from three locations: the City of Goleta offices, an office located in Old Town on Hollister Avenue and the other located at the Camino Real Marketplace. Demand for police services resulting from the anticipated population increase (up to 99 elderly residents and 44 total employees), would not change measurably from baseline levels in the foreseeable future. Additionally, the project includes facilities management, adequate safety lighting, and adequate patrol car access. Therefore, project related impacts on police services in the City would be considered less than significant.

Schools
The project would provide residential services for up to 99 elderly residents and would not result in any increase in student enrollment either within the Goleta Union or Santa Barbara School and High School Districts. No associated impacts on area schools are expected.

Parks and Other Public Facilities
A variety of public parks exist in and around the City, with the closest public park to the project site being Santa Barbara Shores Park, just south of the site across Hollister Avenue. The project would also include onsite amenities such as a large central courtyard, a barbeque terrace, walking paths and patios, butterfly and kitchen gardens, and a fitness room. See the Recreation section for full analysis of the project relating to parks and recreational facilities.

Cumulative Impacts

Fire Protection
Cumulative development in the City would affect fire protection service, due to an increase in emergency calls to primary and secondary responding stations Citywide (City of Goleta; Cumulative Development Projects List, July 2011). In particular, the western Goleta area is the most underserved area in Goleta relative to NFPA and SBCFD service guidelines (City of Goleta; GP/CLUP Final EIR, 2006). While fire protection services would still be provided Citywide, some emergency calls from the project and other cumulative development projects may experience delayed response. Depending on the volume of calls being handled by any
given station, response may be within 5 minutes, may be delayed, and/or first response may come from a back-up fire station through static and/or dynamic deployment.

The deficiency in fire protection service in western Goleta would be addressed by the construction of future Fire Station 10 on property owned by the City at 7952 Hollister Avenue. Such construction is identified in the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (General Plan). A Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Fire Station #10 Conceptual Site Feasibility/Site Selection Plan (10-MND-003) (Final MND) was prepared for Fire Station 10 site acquisition/selection (City of Goleta; November 2010). The Final MND was adopted by the City Council via Resolution No. 10-52 (City of Goleta; November 16, 2010). The Final MND found that Fire Station 10 would result in no significant and unavoidable (Class I) impacts and potentially significant but mitigable (Class II) impacts in the areas of Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Noise, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities/Service Systems. The Final MND includes mitigation measures for all Class II impacts that would reduce impacts below the level of significance.

The project would be subject to payment of Development Impact Fees (DIFs) adopted for the purpose of requiring projects to pay a fair share of fire protection services and facilities associated with cumulative development. Fees are due according to applicable City ordinances or as otherwise provided by the Development Agreement. The project would pay a Fire Protection Fee for replacement of fire apparatus and equipment and a Fire Facility Fee to assist in financing fire protection capital facilities, such as Fire Station 10. As a result of payment of these fees, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant.

Police Services and Libraries
The project would be subject to payment of Development Impact Fees (DIFs) adopted for the purpose of requiring projects to pay a fair share of police and library services and facilities associated with cumulative development. Fees are due according to applicable City ordinances or as otherwise provided by the Development Agreement. The project would pay a Police Facility Fee and a Library Facility Fee. As a result of payment of these fees, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on police protection and library services would be less than cumulatively considerable and is considered less than significant.

Schools
The school districts establish and collect School Facilities Fees independent of the City. The project would be required to pay all applicable school fees prior to building permit issuance. Schools affected by the project in the GUSD and the SBUSD are currently operating below capacity. Given current available capacity, the distribution of projected new cumulative residential population in Goleta over several different elementary schools, the low student generation associated with the junior high and high school age levels, and payment of required school fees, the project’s contribution to cumulative school impacts would be less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The permittee shall comply with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD) letter dated March 2, 2012. Plan Requirements and Timing: The permittee shall ensure that all work shall stop immediately and shall contact the SBCFD, Hazardous
Materials Unit if visual contamination or chemical odors are detected during any grading and/or construction activities. Grading and/or construction activities shall not resume until approval from the SBCFD, Hazardous Materials Unit.

Prior to any building permit issuance, the permittee shall:

a. Obtain Fire Protection Certificate(s);
b. Create a defensible space of 100 feet or to the property line, whichever is nearer to any structure, around any structure;
c. Install and make serviceable all access ways (public and private, road and driveways);
d. Obtain SBCFD approval of all access plans;
e. Provide a minimum width of 30 feet for both access ways from Viajero Drive;
f. Provide driveway and access around the 70,510 square foot building consistent with the driveway and access shown on project plans dated October 28, 2007 and May 1, 2008 on file with SBCFD;
g. Provide a 20-foot fire lane around the north and east side of the 70,510 square foot building;
h. Install new fire hydrant(s) to be located per SBCFD specifications and shall flow 1,250 gallons per minute at a 20 psi residual pressure; and
i. Obtain SBCFD approval of plans for required fire hydrant(s) prior to installation.

Prior to occupancy clearance, the permittee shall:

a. Install required interior automatic fire sprinkler system;
b. Obtain Fire Protection Engineer certification of alarm systems plans and install certified alarm systems;
c. Obtain SBCFD approval of portable fire extinguishers and install portable fire extinguishers according to SBCFD approval;
d. Post building address numbers as required by SBCFD;
e. Obtain SBCFD approval of access way entrance gates in conformance to SBCFD standards prior to installation and install approved access way entrance gates;
f. Provide any documentation required by SBCFD that elevators are sized to accommodate medical gurneys;
g. Obtain a Fire Protection Specialist, subject to SBCFD approval, to coordinate all fire system requirements such as alarm panel placement, fire extinguisher placement, Knox entry systems, fire department connections and fire hydrant placement and upgrades;
h. Submit payment of development impact fees according to City ordinances or as otherwise provided by the Development Agreement; and
i. Obtain any permits required for the use and storage of hazardous materials/hazardous wastes.

SBCFD sign-off shall be required prior to any building permit issuance or occupancy clearance, as applicable.
Monitoring: City staff shall verify SBCFD review and approval of all project plans, as applicable.

Residual Impact

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual project specific impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant. Residual project related impacts on all other public services and facilities would remain as less than significant.

RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 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 City’s 10 public parks, 4 private parks, and 20 public open space areas comprise a total of 523 acres which equate to approximately 18 acres per thousand residents. The three larger City-owned regional open space preserves, the Sperling Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, 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 acres of land per thousand 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 proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project Specific Impacts

a) As an assisted living facility, project generated demand for recreational facilities and parks would represent an incremental, but less than significant, increase in use of existing parks and recreation facilities within the City. Such an incremental increase in demand for
recreational facilities/parks would not result in any substantial physical deterioration of such facilities, or any acceleration in their deterioration. Associated impacts would be considered adverse but less than significant.

b) The project includes the following recreational facilities; fitness room, communal lounge, courtyard with walking path, outdoor dining and barbeque facilities, a variety of small gathering places, and a perimeter walkway around all designed to serve the facility’s elderly residents. None of these recreational amenities would pose any adverse environmental effect.

Cumulative Impacts

Although the project would not result in any significant project-specific effects on recreational facilities or create any substantial new demand for such public amenities, the resulting incremental increase in demand would represent an adverse contribution to cumulative impacts on parks and recreational facilities and the demand for such amenities in the area. However, the project would be subject to payment of Development Impact Fees (DIFs) for parks and recreation facilities. The DIFs would be adjusted pursuant to City ordinances and resolutions, which takes into account the incremental increase in demand of these facilities and identifies the project as a beneficial project resulting in an 80% reduction of payment of the applicable DIFs. The reduction of payment is included in the Development Agreement. Therefore, the project contribution to cumulative impacts on parks and recreational facilities is considered less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required or recommended.

Residual Impact

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

Transportation and 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>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
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? | | | | | |
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? | | | | | |
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 or such facilities? | | | | | |

Existing Setting

The property is located north of Hollister Avenue adjacent to Ellwood School in western Goleta. The site is within a developed residential and commercial area and is bound on three sides by urban development. The street network generally affected by the project is bound by Hollister Avenue to the south and west, and Glen Annie/Storke Roads to the east. Sidewalks exist along the project frontage on Viajero Drive and Hollister Avenue. The nearest MTD bus stop is located on Hollister Avenue in front of the project site.

The project site is served by a network of City streets and US Highway 101. Access to the project site is currently provided from both Hollister Avenue and Viajero Drive. At the project location, Hollister Avenue has one westbound right turn lane onto Viajero Drive which is also the right turn lane out of the Ellwood Elementary School, and one westbound through lane. A bike
lane exists in this location between the turn lane and the through lane, and adjacent to the right-
of-way west of Viajero Drive. Travelling eastbound, Hollister Avenue has one through lane, a
left turn lane (within a two-way left lane), and a bike lane.

US Highway 101 is a four-lane, north-south interstate highway that connects the City of Goleta
to Santa Barbara, Carpinteria, and Ventura to the south and Buellton, Lompoc, and Santa Maria
to the north. Hollister Avenue is a four-lane arterial that is the primary east-west route through
the City south of the freeway.

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 Thresholds 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 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SERVICE</th>
<th>INCREASE IN V/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(including the project)</td>
<td>(greater than)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR THE ADDITION OF

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

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

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

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

a,c) The site specific trip generation estimates for the new traffic which would be generated by the project when compared to the baseline were calculated based on average trip generation rates provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual 7th edition (ATE; Trip Generation Estimates for the Mariposa at Ellwood Shores Project, March 4, 2008). Using the ITE average trip generation rates for Assisted Living (2.66 trips per bed), the project is estimated to generate a total of 263 new average daily trips (ADT) and 22 PM peak hour trips (0.22 trips per bed). To calculate the difference between the baseline (existing) and proposed uses, counts were conducted to record all vehicles entering and exiting the existing 171-space storage yard for a seven day period in July-August 2007 to determine existing trip generation (ATE; March 4, 2008). The counts indicated a total of 37 ADTs (0.22 trips per space) and 6 PM peak hour trips (0.03 trips per space) (ATE; March 4, 2008). Subtracting the trips generated by the existing use from the estimated number of trips generated by the facility, the project is estimated to result in a net increase in project generated traffic over baseline levels of 226 ADTs and 16 PM peak hour trips.

Table TR-1 shows the existing PM peak hour study area intersections. Potential project impacts to these study area intersections were evaluated by considering the existing LOS, the potential new project trips that would move through these intersections, and whether or not this net increase in project generated peak hour trips would result in a significant impact based on City thresholds. As shown in the table, the study area intersections are currently operating in the LOS B-C range during the PM peak hour. Even if all of the PM peak hour project trips were oriented through each of these intersections, project generated peak hour traffic would not be sufficient to cause any significant impacts on intersection operations based on City impact thresholds. Furthermore, since the project traffic will become more disbursed at the intersections farther from the project site, it can be surmised that the project will not cause any significant impacts to any intersections within the study area. Project specific impacts on all intersection operations within the project travelshed would therefore be considered to be adverse but less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>V/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storke Road/US-101 NB Ramps</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storke Road/US-101 SB Ramps</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storke Road/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 project would be below both of the City’s initial screening levels. Therefore, the project’s addition of approximately 16 PM peak hour trips above baseline levels would not be considered to pose a project specific significant impact on the City’s CMP system.

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

f) Access would be provided from two driveways on Viajero Drive, with the existing curb cut on Hollister Avenue being removed. Ingress/egress using the driveways at Viajero Drive is not currently, nor would it in the future as a result of project implementation, be subject to insufficient sight distance, excessive cross-traffic speeds, or unsafe roadway alignments (both horizontal and vertical). Therefore, the project does not pose a significant traffic safety hazard due to design considerations. However, during construction, there is the potential for construction trips related to heavy equipment operations to be incompatible with trips associated with Ellwood School operations. As such, the project poses a potentially significant short-term impact from construction traffic on the adjacent school.

g) As indicated previously, access would be provided from two driveways on Viajero Drive, with the existing curb cut on Hollister Avenue being removed. A 20-foot emergency access consisting of grass-crete would be provided around the building on the northern and eastern portions of the site as required by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department (County Fire). County Fire has reviewed the internal site circulation plan and determined that if constructed per plan, it would provide adequate emergency and fire vehicle access. Therefore, if constructed per the Fire Department approved access plan, project implementation would not result in any impacts on emergency access needed to serve the expanded facility.

No bike parking area is included in the project site plan but sufficient space is available onsite to accommodate such a feature. The project would not adversely affect any existing or planned bus stops in the area. MTD Line 25 serves the project site and there are existing bus stops on both sides of Hollister Avenue in front of the project site making public transportation access to the site feasible for residents and employees. A revised, preliminary frontage improvements plan (Flowers & Associates; December 7, 2011) utilizes a retaining wall between the onsite parking bordering Hollister Avenue and a curve-linear sidewalk with a bus pull-out as a bus stop for Line 25 in this location. The Community Services Department has reviewed these frontage improvements and preliminarily determined that such improvements would be adequate. However, without
final engineering plans prepared by the applicant and approved by the Community Services Department, inadequate frontage improvements could pose a potentially significant impact on traffic flows and MTD service along this segment of Hollister Avenue.

Therefore, until final design elements of the bus pocket are determined to be acceptable, potential projects impacts associated with public transit and alternative modes of transportation are considered potentially significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Application of the City’s thresholds for cumulative impacts, which are based solely on changes in the volume/capacity (V/C) ratio and not on a given number of increased trips as is the case with project specific impacts, indicates that none of the intersections within the vicinity of the project site would experience potentially significant project contributions to cumulative traffic impacts. No intersections within the project’s travelshed would experience a significant reduction in level of service from the cumulative condition to the cumulative + project condition as a result of project implementation. The project’s addition of approximately 16 PM peak hour trips above baseline levels would not be considered to pose a considerably significant contribution to cumulative impacts on the City’s CMP system. The project’s contribution to cumulative traffic impacts in the City would be addressed by payment of the required traffic development impact fees. Therefore, project contributions to cumulative traffic conditions at area intersections would be considered to be less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. Construction plans shall minimize construction-related impacts on motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists using Hollister Avenue during the construction period. A Traffic Management Plan shall be prepared and shall include traffic handling features according to City requirements. Hollister Avenue frontage improvements shall be constructed during the summer period when the adjacent Ellwood School is not in session to minimize impacts to the school. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Prior to any LUP issuance, the permittee shall prepare a Traffic Management Plan and submit for review and approval by City staff to minimize impacts to students, motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists using Hollister Avenue during the construction period.

   **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to issuance of any LUP as well as monitoring for compliance with the approved Traffic Management Plan during construction.

2. The permittee shall provide all adjacent property owners with a construction activity schedule and construction routes as well as the name and telephone number of a contact person responsible for the construction schedule no less than fourteen (14) days in advance of commencement of construction activities. Any alterations or additions shall require a minimum seven (7) day notification. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall submit a copy of the schedule and mailing list to Planning and Environmental Services no less than fourteen (14) days prior to initiation of any earth movement. The plan shall schedule truck hauling trips to avoid peak traffic hours (peak hours defined as 7:30 - 8:30 AM. and 4:30 - 5:30 PM).
**Monitoring:** City of Goleta staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance with activity schedules.

3. The permittee shall prepare final engineering plans for all frontage improvements in substantial conformance with the revised preliminary frontage improvements plans prepared by Flower & Associates and dated December 7, 2011 for review and approval by the Community Services Department. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The final engineering plans for all frontage improvements, including the bus pull-out, shall be submitted to the Community Services Department for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP, grading, or building permit. All approved frontage improvements shall be constructed per the approved final engineering plans prior to occupancy clearance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall site inspect to ensure installation of the required frontage improvements and bus pull-out per the approved plans prior to occupancy clearance.

**Recommended Mitigation Measure**

4. A total of five (5) bike parking spaces shall be provided. Bicycle racks shall be the “Inverted U” type in compliance with the SBCAG Traffic Solutions recommended bicycle rack. Minor adjustment in bicycle parking locations may be approved by the Planning and Environmental Services Department. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Final plans showing bicycle parking locations and type shall be submitted for review and approval by City staff prior to any LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to ensure installation of the required bike parking amenities per the approved plan prior to occupancy clearance.

**Residual Impact**

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual impacts to traffic and transportation systems 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>
</tbody>
</table>
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Would the project:

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

Wastewater Treatment
The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) provides sewer service in the project area. Sewage travels along gravity fed collection sewers to a main trunk line. The trunk line terminates at the GWSD pump house located on the UCSB campus Lot 32, at which point the waste is transferred via a pressurized line running parallel to the Santa Barbara Airport, to the Goleta Sanitary District's (GSD) treatment plant located on William Moffet Place next to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. Treatment of wastewater collected by GWSD is provided through a contract with the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD). The GSD treatment plant has a capacity of 9.7 million gallons per day (based on average daily flow) but is currently limited to a permitted discharge of 7.64 million gallons per day. GWSD is allocated 40.78% of the capacity at the sewage treatment plant, which equates to about 3.12 million gallons per day (mgd). GWSD currently generates approximately 1.71 mgd of sewage that is treated at the GSD plant, resulting in about 1.41 mgd of remaining capacity in the GWSD's existing system (City of Goleta; September 2006).

Water Supply
The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water purveyor for the City of Goleta. The GWD currently has four sources of water: 1) surface water from the Lake Cachuma Project (9,322 acre feet/year or AFY); 2) surface water from the State Water Project (4,500 AFY); 3) groundwater from the Goleta groundwater basin (2,350 AFY); and 4) recycled water (up to 3,000 AFY) (Goleta Water District; Water Supply Assessment, City of Goleta Proposed Amended General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, May 22, 2008). These sources delivered a yearly average (2002 to 2007) of 13,992 AFY to the GWD and together are expected to be able to provide approximately 16,572 Acre Feet per Year (AFY) to the GWD through the year 2030 (Goleta Water District; May 22, 2008).

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

The 80-acre Tajiguas Landfill, located 26 miles west of Santa Barbara, has a permitted capacity of 23.3 million cubic yards and is permitted to operate through 2020. The South Coast recycling and Transfer Station processes 550 tons of waste per day (City of Goleta; September 2006).

Drainage Facilities
The existing storage yard is almost entirely paved. Drainage from the parcel to the north sheet flows onto the site across the northern property line. Runoff of surface water at the site is by sheet flow primarily southerly across the property, draining to Hollister Avenue, with a small portion of the site draining west to Viajero Drive and then to the Hollister Avenue gutter. Runoff is then directed to the curb inlet at the southeast corner of the site on Hollister Avenue (Flowers & Associates; Preliminary Drainage Analysis, April 2007).

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,b,e) Sewage disposal service for the project would continue to be provided by the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD). The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) would collect wastewater generated by the project and convey it to the GWSD’s main treatment plant. Applying the GWSD’s wastewater generation rate of 100 gallons/day (gpd) per 1,000 square-feet for commercial uses, project generated wastewater effluent would be 7,051 gallons per day (gpd). This represents approximately 0.5% of the 1.41 mgd remaining allocated capacity of the GWSD. The quantity of wastewater generated by the project would not exceed GWSD’s sewage collection and treatment capacity. However, the applicant has yet to provide a District Sewer Service Connection Permit from the GWSD to ensure its capacity can be utilized. Until such a commitment is given by the GWSD, a final determination as to the availability of central sewer service by the GWSD to serve the project cannot be made. Therefore, the project poses a potentially significant impact on the availability and adequacy of sewage disposal service.

c) In order to maximize ground percolation, drainage improvements associated with the project would route as much roof and surface drainage as possible through the landscape areas, swales and/or pervious pavement of the emergency access driveway that would be located along the north and east perimeter of the site. The surface swales drain to area inlets throughout the site which would connect to a new storm drain piping
system. The storm drain system would exit the site at the southeast corner and tie into the existing curb inlet box on Hollister Avenue. Offsite drainage from the north will be collected by a swale and drainage inlets constructed behind a retaining wall along the northern property line. The inlets would exit through the wall onto the pervious pavement of the emergency access driveway, (Flowers and Associates; Preliminary Drainage Analysis, Mariposa at Ellwood Shores; April 2007).

Runoff calculations were made for the pre-project and post-project conditions for the 10, 25, 50 and 100 year storm events. The results indicate that the project will reduce the existing runoff by approximately 5% in all storm events. The storm drain system will be sized to accommodate the 25 year storm event, including the offsite drainage running through the property, allowing for overland escape via the surface swales. The outlet storm drain from the southeast corner to the Hollister Avenue curb inlet would be sized to accommodate a 100 year storm event. Existing street gutter flows in Viajero Drive and Hollister Avenue would be reduced due to the more efficient storm drain system delivering the project and offsite drainage from the north to the existing curb inlet on Hollister Avenue, (Flowers and Associates, April 2007). Therefore, the project would not result in the need for construction of new storm water drainage facilities offsite that would create significant environmental effects. Impacts as a result of storm drainage facilities are considered less than significant.

d) Potable water service would continue to be provided by the Goleta Water District (GWD) and given the fact that the GWD already has a recycled water main in Hollister Avenue opposite the project site, the District will require the project to be connected to that recycled water main via a main extension up Viajero Drive to supply recycled water for landscape irrigation through a separate metered service. Applying the water consumption rates for General Commercial zone districts provided in the City's Thresholds Manual, projected water demand for the project would be 21.15 AFY. This represents approximately 0.15% of the District's yearly average water demand from 2002 to 2007, approximately 0.13% of the water projected to be available to the GWD on a yearly basis out to the year 2030. Since the GWD currently has a yearly water supply of 2,580 AFY above current demand levels, the addition of approximately 21 AFY of additional demand as a result of the project represents only 0.82% of that existing excess supply. Given these projections, the GWD has sufficient supply to service this project and the project also would not contribute to groundwater overdraft as no wells are proposed onsite. However, until the District formally commits to serving the project through issuance of a Can and Will Serve letter, such service is not guaranteed and potential project impacts on the area’s water supply would be considered potentially significant.
f,g) The City’s Thresholds Manual provides solid waste generation factors for a variety of land uses. Using the rate provided for commercial/industrial/institutional uses, the project would generate approximately 91.66 tons per year. The quantity of solid waste to be disposed of at landfills (non-recycled waste) is typically estimated at 50% of the total solid waste generation. The non-recycled waste from the project is therefore estimated at 45.83 tons per year. This amount does not exceed the City’s project specific threshold of 196 tons per year. Therefore, the project’s specific impact on solid waste disposal capacity at the Tajiguas Landfill would be considered adverse but less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Because the project would result in an increase in demands on water supply, sewage treatment capacity and the storm drain system, the project contributions to cumulative impacts on the GWD’s water supply, GWSD’s sewage treatment capacity, and the City storm drain system would be considered potentially significant. Although the anticipated solid waste flow generated by the project would not be considered a project specific significant impact, any increase in the solid waste stream in excess of 1% of that estimated in the Santa Barbara County Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) would be considered to be an adverse contribution to cumulative impacts on the Tajiguas Landfill due to its very limited remaining capacity. Per the City’s Thresholds Manual, any project generating more that 40 tons/year after receiving a 50% credit for source reduction and recycling would be considered to pose an adverse contribution to cumulative impacts on landfill capacity and the County’s ability to handle its long-term solid waste stream. The project generation of 45.83 tons per year is above the City threshold of 40 tons per year. Therefore, impacts related to solid waste generation are considered adverse from a cumulative standpoint.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. A Connection Permit from the Goleta West Sanitary District shall be obtained. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall submit a Connection Permit issued by the Goleta West Sanitary District to the City within ten (10) days of the issuance of the first building and/or grading permit for the project.

   **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance within ten (10) days from the issuance of the first building/grading permit for the project. Non-compliance shall result in a hold on all building/grading inspections until the required Connection Permit has been submitted to the City.

2. A Can and Will Serve Letter from the Goleta Water District shall be obtained. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall submit a Can and Will Serve Letter issued by the Goleta Water District to the City within ten (10) days from the issuance of the first building and/or grading permit for the project.

   **Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance within ten (10) days from the issuance of the first building/grading permit for the project. Non-compliance shall result in a hold on all building and/or grading inspections until the required Can and Will Serve Letter has been submitted to the City.
3. **Outdoor water use shall be minimized.** **Plan Requirements:** The following measures shall be implemented in the final landscape plan:

   a) The final landscaping shall use native and/or drought tolerant species;
   
   b) Drip irrigation or other water-conserving irrigation shall be installed;
   
   c) Irrigation water for the project shall be provided by a connection to the GWD’s recycled water main in Hollister Avenue;
   
   d) Plant material shall be grouped by water needs;
   
   e) Any turf area shall constitute less than 20% of the total landscaped area if included under the final landscape plan;
   
   f) No turf shall be allowed on slopes of over 4%;
   
   g) Extensive mulching (2" minimum) shall be used in all landscaped areas to improve the water holding capacity of the soil by reducing evaporation and soil compaction; and
   
   h) Soil moisture sensing devices shall be installed to prevent unnecessary irrigation.

   **Timing:** The final landscape plan shall include these requirements and shall be submitted for review and approval by City staff and DRB prior to any LUP issuance. The permittee shall implement all elements of the final landscape plan prior to occupancy clearance.

   **Monitoring:** Prior to occupancy clearance, City staff shall verify installation according to approved final landscape plan.

4. **Indoor water use shall be minimized.** **Plan Requirements:** The following measures shall be implemented in project building plans:

   a) All hot water lines shall be insulated;
   
   b) Re-circulating, point-of-use, or on-demand water heaters shall be installed; and,
   
   c) Self-regenerating water softening shall be prohibited in all structures.

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

   **Monitoring:** Prior to occupancy clearance, City staff shall inspect to verify installation according to the approved final building plans.

5. **Reclaimed/non-potable water shall be used for all dust suppression activities during grading and construction, unless otherwise approved by the City.** **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be included as a note on all project plans submitted for any LUP, grading, and/or building permit. Connection of the project site to the recycled water main in Hollister Avenue for use in dust suppression shall be completed prior to commencement of project grading.

   **Monitoring:** City staff shall site inspect to ensure that connection of the project site to the recycled water main in Hollister Avenue is completed and reclaimed/non-potable water is available for dust suppression prior to issuance of any grading permit for the project.
Recommended Mitigation

6. Pre- and Post- Construction Waste Reduction and Recycling Plans (WRRPs) shall be submitted to the Community Services Department for review and approval. The plans shall include in minimum 50% waste diversion requirement, including the following:

   a) A minimum 50% diversion goal shall be met during construction. Demolition and/or excess construction materials shall be separated onsite for reuse/recycling or proper disposal (e.g. concrete, asphalt).

   b) During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials and brush shall be provided onsite. The permittee shall contract with a City approved hauler to facilitate the recycling of all construction recoverable/recyclable material. A copy of the contract shall be provided to the City.

   c) Recoverable construction material shall include asphalt, lumber, concrete, glass, metals, drywall and any other recoverable construction materials as determined by the City approved hauler.

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

Plan Requirements and Timing: Prior to issuance of any LUP, recycling requirements shall be printed on all approved final project plans, including the grading plan, and a Pre-Construction Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan shall be submitted to the Community Services Department for review and approval. Construction materials shall be recycled throughout construction. Trash control shall occur throughout all grading and construction activities. Prior to occupancy clearance, a Post-Construction Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan shall be submitted to the Community Services Department for review and approval. All construction materials shall be recycled according to the Post-Construction Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan prior to occupancy clearance.

Monitoring: City staff shall site inspect during construction and prior to permit compliance sign-off to ensure waste reduction and recycling components are established and implemented. Additional covered receptacles shall be provided as determined necessary by City staff.

7. The permittee shall develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Program. The program shall identify the amount of waste generation estimated during operation of the project. Plan Requirements: The program shall include the following measures:

   a) Provision of a recyclable materials storage area within the project site that is approved by Marborg. A minimum of 50% of trash/recyclable storage space shall be designated for recyclables.

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

   c) Development of a Source Reduction Plan (SRP), describing the recommended program(s) and the estimated reduction of the solid waste disposed by the project.
d) Implementation of a program to purchase materials that have recycled content for project construction and/or operation (i.e., plastic lumber, office supplies, etc.). The program could include requesting suppliers to show recycled materials content. To ensure compliance, the permittee shall develop an integrated solid waste management program, including recommended source reduction, recycling, composting programs, and/or a combination of such programs.

Timing: The permittee shall submit a Solid Waste Management Program to the City for review and approval prior to any LUP issuance. All program components shall be implemented prior to and concurrent with occupancy clearance and shall be maintained in perpetuity.

Monitoring: Prior to occupancy clearance, City staff shall ensure that the permittee is in compliance with the Solid Waste Management Plan.

Residual Impact

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to 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>b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long term environmental goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ATTACHMENT 1
Project Plans (8½ x 11 reductions)
## URBEMIS Daily Summer Emissions Summary

### Construction Emission Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10 Dust</th>
<th>PM10 Exhaust</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5 Dust</th>
<th>PM2.5 Exhaust</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>44.59</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.524.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)</td>
<td>117.87</td>
<td>65.31</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.303.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area Source Emission Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10 Dust</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>955.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operational (Vehicle) Emission Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10 Dust</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1,132.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sum of Area Source and Operational Emission Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10 Dust</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2,088.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>