

## CHAPTER 4.0 FUTURE CITY SERVICE AREA/SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

This chapter addresses the following for the proposed future City service area/sphere of influence, as designated in the Land Use Element of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP):

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) relating to the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts that would result from the proposed future service area/sphere of influence, including impacts associated with the land-use plan designations for properties within this area; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid any potentially significant impacts.

Information regarding the regulatory framework as it applies to the proposed future service area/sphere of influence is the same as set forth in Chapter 3.0 for each environmental component, and this information is not repeated in this chapter. The setting, impacts, and mitigation measures for the area within the existing City boundary are described in Chapter 3.0, "Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation." Chapter 5.0, "Alternatives to the Proposed Project," discusses the impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project.

The future service area is defined as the geographic area which the City of Goleta anticipates requesting the Santa Barbara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) to be included as part of its Sphere of Influence, and therefore an area which could be annexed into the City territory and where municipal services could be provided in the future. The future service area includes five separate subareas as identified in section LU 12.2 of Policy LU-12. These are as follows (see Figure 4-1, Future Service Areas):

### **Subarea A**

Subarea A is centrally located adjacent to the eastern part of Old Town, east of Highway 217, south of Hollister Avenue, and north of Atascadero Creek and the Coastal Zone. Existing land uses and the County's zoning designation for the entirety of this subarea are Agriculture. The City's proposed land use designation for this tract of land is also Agriculture. This subarea includes two properties, one of which is the site of the proposed St. Athenasius Church complex, recently approved by the County.

### **Subarea B**

Subarea B is located east of the City's Northeast Residential Area, north of US-101, south of Cathedral Oaks Drive, adjacent to the City's easterly boundary and extending eastward to Maria Ignacio Creek. Existing land uses are residential, agricultural, and recreation/open space. County zoning designations include Residential, Recreation, Commercial, and Agriculture. The City's proposed land use designations parallel the County zoning and include Residential, a small area of general commercial, Agriculture, Public/Quasi-Public, and Open Space/Passive Recreation.

### **Subarea C**

Subarea C is located in the foothills north of Subarea B and north of Cathedral Oaks Drive, near the northeasterly City boundary. Existing land uses are residential, agricultural, and recreation/open space. County zoning designations include Residential, Recreation, and

Agriculture. The City's proposed land use designations, which parallel existing County zoning, are Residential, Agriculture, and Open Space/Passive Recreation.

### **Subarea D**

Subarea D is located south of Goleta, extending from Phelps Road and the University Village Neighborhood on the north to the Devereux Slough and Pacific shoreline on the south. It is bounded on the east by Storke Road and on the west by Ellwood Mesa. Existing land uses include the Ocean Meadows Golf Course, UCSB North Campus, the Venoco Ellwood Oil Marine Terminal, and the COPR area. The City's proposed land use designations for Service Area D include Planned Residential, Open Space/Active Recreation, and Open Space/Passive Recreation. Several proposed residential development projects are pending in this subarea adjacent to the present Goleta boundary, including the 55-unit Residences at Ocean Meadows project, the 236-unit Faculty Housing project of UCSB, and the 151-unit family student housing project of UCSB. Portions of this subarea south of these pending projects are intended to be preserved as permanent open space.

### **Subarea E**

Subarea E is located north of the Northwest Residential Subarea, north of Cathedral Oaks Drive and west of Glen Annie Road. The site currently consists solely of the Glen Annie Golf Course. The County zoning designation is Agriculture. The City's proposed land use designation is Open Space/Active Recreation.

## **4.1 VISUAL RESOURCES**

### **4.1.1 Existing Conditions**

The following describes the existing visual resources setting in relation to the five subareas of the potential future Goleta Sphere of Influence and City service area.

#### **Subarea A**

The existing visual character of subarea A is defined by its agricultural land use, which includes lemon orchards on the larger of the two properties.

#### **Subarea B**

The existing visual character of Subarea B is defined by single-family residential development interspersed with vacant parcels zoned for single-family residential development, as well as a several agricultural parcels. This subarea also includes a linear open space/passive recreation area associated with San Jose Creek in the vicinity of Kellogg Avenue.

#### **Subarea C**

The existing visual character of Subarea C is similar to that of Subarea B, except that the terrain changes to the lower foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains.

#### **Subarea D**

The existing visual character of Subarea D is predominantly open space associated with the Ocean Meadows Golf Course, Devereux Creek, and Devereux slough, which extends to the its outlet at the Pacific shoreline.

**Subarea E**

The existing visual character of Subarea E comprises an active recreation area/golf course in the rolling terrain of the lower foothills.

**4.1.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, State, and local regulations related to aesthetics and visual resources are the same as presented in Section 3.1.

**4.1.3 Service Area Impacts and Mitigation****4.1.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for the service areas are the same as those presented in Section 3.1, "Aesthetics and Visual Resources."

**4.1.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP policies for the service areas are the same as those identified in Section 3.1, "Aesthetics and Visual Resources."

**4.1.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation*****Class I Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class I impacts of the proposed Goleta GP/CLUP related to aesthetics that would be caused by including the future service areas as part of the Goleta sphere of influence or by annexation and development of the subject areas consistent with the land-use plan map in Figure 2-4 of the GP/CLUP. Except for several vacant parcels, the GP/CLUP is intended to reflect existing development as of 2005.

***Class II Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class II impacts related to aesthetics associated with the service areas/sphere of influence.

***Class III Impacts*****Short-Term Impacts**

There are no short-term Class III impacts associated with the service areas. The visibility of construction equipment and activities associated with the buildout of vacant land within Sub Areas B, C, and D could impact aesthetic resources. However, impacts associated with future construction activities are not considered to be impacts of the GP/CLUP. If Subareas B, C, and D are included within the sphere of influence and annexed into the City, future development projects would be required to undergo separate environmental review, during which short-term impacts would be further addressed and applicable mitigation identified.

**Long-Term Impacts**

*Impact 4.1-1. Impacts of Service Areas on Visual Character*

With implementation of the GP/CLUP, existing and planned land uses within the service areas would not change from those currently allowed by the applicable zoning districts of the County of Santa Barbara. Future development of several vacant land areas could occur in Subareas B, C, and D. In Subareas B and C, vacant parcels exist east of Patterson Avenue and south of Cathedral Oaks Road, as well as east of Fairview Avenue and north of Cathedral Oaks Road. The vacant land is currently zoned for residential uses by the County. However, such development within Subareas B and C would represent an extension of single-family residential uses in the northern portion of the City. Vacant lots in Subarea D on the west side of Storke Road and south of Phelps Road that are planned for residential uses in association with approved County and UCSB projects would be a visual extension of existing residential uses within the City. The open space areas associated with Devereux slough would not be altered in association with development of the residential uses. Therefore, inclusion of these areas in a future sphere of influence and potential annexation into the City would not result in impacts to the existing and planned visual character of the City or the future service areas/sphere of influence.

*Impact 4.1-2. Impacts of Service Areas on Visual Resources—Santa Ynez Mountains and Foothills*

Subareas B, C, and E are located within the foothill areas immediately to the north of the City. These future service areas, including the Glen Annie Golf Course, would be maintained for recreational use with the implementation of the GP/CLUP. The visual character of Subareas B and C would consist of existing single-family residential uses and development of vacant parcels with residential uses in accordance with County zoning. Subarea E would extend within the foothill areas to the north of the City in proximity to the Glen Annie Golf Course and Fairview Avenue. Because the GP/CLUP would not change the existing or planned land uses within these service areas, provision of service by the City to the service areas would not result in a significant adverse impact to the visual character of the foothills or views of the foothills from areas within the City.

***Class IV Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class IV impacts related to aesthetics associated with the service area.

**4.1.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.1, "Aesthetics and Visual Resources."

**4.1.3.5 Mitigation**

***Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies***

No modifications are required.

***Additional Mitigation***

No additional mitigation is identified.

#### **4.1.3.6 Residual Impacts**

There would be no residual impacts.

## **4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FARMLAND**

### **4.2.1 Existing Conditions**

The following section describes the existing agriculture and farmland setting in relation to the five potential future Goleta service areas.

#### **4.2.1.1 Existing and Planned Agriculture and Farmland in the Future Service Area**

##### ***Subarea A***

Subarea A includes two large tracts of unincorporated County agricultural land. This subarea is part of what is known as the South Patterson Agricultural Block, which is a 610-acre area made up of numerous contiguous parcels of different sizes, zoned by the County for agriculture uses. The area supports orchards and row crops, and contains land classified as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. The soils on site include both prime and nonprime soils, including Elder sandy loam (0 to 2 percent slopes—Class II), Goleta loam (0 to 2 percent slopes—Class I), and Camarillo fine sandy loam. Access to the service area is via Goleta City streets. A piece of the area is in the flight path of the City of Santa Barbara Airport, which could constrain other possible future uses besides agriculture in that area. This entire 85.4 acres is planned for Agriculture use under the GP/CLUP.

##### ***Subarea B***

Subarea B consists primarily of residential housing, with open space/recreation and agriculture land uses. Area B contains a 25.9-acre existing agricultural site that is currently the Noel Christmas Tree Farm. The property was once part of a larger agricultural area that has been gradually diminished in size with the building of the nearby Sunrise Village and Cathedral Pointe residential developments. The southwest corner of the property abuts the City of Goleta's eastern boundary at San Jose Creek. The parcel is entirely classified as Prime Farmland, and the soils on site include Elder sandy loam (0 to 2 percent slopes—Class II) and Goleta loam (0 to 2 percent slopes—Class I). This entire 25.9 acres is planned for continued Agriculture use under the GP/CLUP.

##### ***Subarea C***

Subarea C consists of residential housing, open space/recreation, and agriculture land uses. Two small existing agricultural parcels comprising 5.8 acres and 3.8 acres are located in the southeastern portion of Subarea C. The parcels are not currently classified as Important Farmland and do not contain prime agriculture soils; the soils on site are made up of Elder-Soboba complex (2 to 9 percent slopes) and Milpitas-Positas fine sandy loam (15 to 30 percent slopes). The combined 9.6 acres are planned for continued Agriculture use under the GP/CLUP.

##### ***Subarea D***

Subarea D does not contain any existing or proposed agricultural land, nor does it contain prime agriculture soils. The soils on site are made up of Aquents (fill areas) Xerothents (cut and fill

areas), Concepcion fine sandy loam (0 to 2 percent slopes), Concepcion fine sandy loam (2 to 9 percent slopes) and Concepcion fine sandy loam (15 to 30 percent slopes).

### **Subarea E**

Subarea E does not contain any existing or proposed agricultural land. The parcels are not currently classified as Important Farmland (a small portion along the western boundary is classified as Grazing Land), and do not contain prime agriculture soils. The soils on site are made up of Ayar clay (15 to 30 percent slopes and 30 to 50 percent slopes), Goleta fine sandy loam (0 to 2 percent slopes), Diablo clay (2 to 9 percent slopes), and Concepcion fine sandy loam (0 to 2 percent slopes, 2 to 9 percent slopes, and 15 to 30 percent slopes).

## **4.2.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulations related to “Agriculture and Farmland” resources are the same as presented in Section 3.2.

## **4.2.3 Service Area Impacts and Mitigation**

### **4.2.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for the future service areas are the same as those presented in Section 3.2, “Agriculture and Farmland.”

### **4.2.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP policies for the future service areas are the same as those identified in Section 3.2, “Agriculture and Farmland.”

### **4.2.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation**

#### ***Class I Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class I impacts related to agriculture and farmland associated with annexation of the future service area.

#### ***Class II Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class II impacts related to agriculture and farmland associated with annexation of the future service area.

#### ***Class III Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class III impacts related to agriculture and farmland associated with annexation of the future service area.

#### ***Class IV Impacts***

##### **Short-Term Impacts**

There are no short-term Class IV impacts related to agriculture and farmland associated with the future service area.

### Long-Term Impacts

#### *Impact 4.2-1. Preservation of Agricultural Land*

With implementation of the GP/CLUP, existing agricultural land uses within the service areas would be preserved as agricultural land uses. The preservation of this agricultural land is considered to be consistent with the proposed GP/CLUP, and further advances GP/CLUP Goal 3 in the Land Use Element and Goal 8 in the Conservation Element. The implementation of Policy CE 11, Preservation of Agricultural Lands, would help to discourage further conversion of agricultural lands to noncompatible and urbanized uses, and would minimize the loss of agricultural land in the future service area. Therefore, incorporation of the future service area into the City's sphere of influence would result in beneficial impacts to agriculture and farmland in the future service area.

#### **4.2.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

There would be no cumulative impacts associated with the future service area. Implementation of the proposed GP/CLUP would result in the preservation of existing agricultural land uses. When combined with impacts from other cumulative projects, the proposed project would be considered cumulatively beneficial. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to agriculture and farmland.

#### **4.2.3.5 Mitigation**

##### ***Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies***

No modifications are required.

##### ***Additional Mitigation***

No additional mitigation is identified.

#### **4.2.3.6 Residual Impacts**

Residual impacts associated with agriculture and farmland in the future service area would be beneficial.

### **4.3 AIR QUALITY**

#### **4.3.1 Existing Conditions**

The existing air quality setting for the future service area is the same as presented in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."

#### **4.3.2 Regulatory Framework**

The federal and state regulatory frameworks for the future service area related to air resources are the same as those presented in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."

### **4.3.3 Service Area Impacts and Mitigation**

#### **4.3.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for the future service area are the same as those presented in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."

#### **4.3.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP policies for the future service area are the same as those identified in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."

#### **4.3.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation**

##### ***Class I Impacts***

###### Short-Term Impacts

There are no short-term Class I impacts related to air quality associated with the future service area.

###### Long-Term Impacts

There are no long-term Class I impacts related to air quality associated with the future service area.

##### ***Class II Impacts***

###### Short-Term Impacts

Short-term Class II impacts related to air quality associated with the service areas would be similar to those identified in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."

###### Long-Term Impacts

There are no long-term Class II impacts related to air quality associated with the service areas.

##### ***Class III Impacts***

###### Short-Term Impacts

There are no short-term Class III impacts related to air quality associated with the service areas.

###### Long-Term Impacts

Long-term Class III impacts related to air quality associated with the service areas are the same as those identified in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."

##### ***Class IV Impacts***

There are no short-or long-term Class IV impacts related to air quality associated with the service areas.

#### **4.3.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."

#### **4.3.3.4 Mitigation**

##### ***Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies***

No modifications are required.

##### ***Additional Mitigation***

No additional mitigation is identified.

#### **4.3.3.6 Residual Impacts**

Residual impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."

### **4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

#### **4.4.1 Existing Conditions**

The following section describes the existing biological resources and conditions in the future service area/sphere of influence. All habitat types that occur in the City also occur in the service area/sphere of influence and are associated with same set of special status species (see Table 3.4-2). Table 4.4-1 indicates the estimated acreage of habitats in each service area by type, together with ESHA types. Distribution of habitats in the service areas is depicted in Figures 3.4-1 and 3.4-2.

##### ***Subarea A***

This area is almost entirely in active agricultural use and would remain designated for agriculture under the GP/CLUP.

##### ***Subarea B***

Approximately 87% of this area is developed land. Maria Ignacio Creek meanders south along the eastern edge and San Jose Creek meanders south along and through the western portion. ESHA habitats are limited to linear riparian areas along the creeks.

##### ***Subarea C***

This area includes a combination of developed lands and agriculture, together with approximately 53.7 acres of ESHA types. There is more riparian/marsh/vernal ESHA in this area (53.0 acres) than in any of the other service areas. The area also includes 1.5 acres of ESHA scrub types. For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the eucalyptus woodland is potential roosting habitat for monarch butterflies and/or raptors.

##### ***Subarea D***

This area includes lands covered by the Ellwood-Devereaux Open Space and Habitat Management Plan. It contains the widest variety of natural habitats among the subareas of the

future service area/sphere of influence, including approximately 42.7 acres of ESHA types. Devereux Slough is located just to the east of this subarea, and Devereux Creek drains through the area to its confluence with Devereux Slough. The primary habitat type on the area is nonnative grassland (81.8 acres).

**TABLE 4.4-1  
HABITAT TYPES IN THE POTENTIAL FUTURE SERVICE AREAS**

Habitat Types	SA-A	SA-B	SA-C	SA-D	SA-E
Native grassland (ESHA)	0	0	0	0.4	0
Non-native grassland	0	0	7.3	81.8	0
Native Scrub (ESHA)	0	0	1.5	26.8	12.5
Native Upland Woodland/Savannah (ESHA)	0	0	0	0	0
Eucalyptus woodland/Monarch Butterfly and/or Raptor Roosting Habitat (ESHA) <sup>1</sup>	0	0	1.2	9.4	0
Riparian/Marsh/Vernal (ESHA)	0.2	27.1	53.0	18.2	10.1
Open Water (ESHA)	0	0	0	1.1	0
Unvegetated Open Creek Channel (ESHA) <sup>2</sup>	0	0	0	0	0
Beach/Shoreline (ESHA) <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0	3.8	0
Disturbed/Landscaped	0	2.4	11.5	42.7	19.1
Golf Course	0	0	0	52.0	117.5
Orchards/Crops	90.8	16.2	155.7	0	0.2
Developed	0.1	306.4	389.9	21.8	0.5
Total	91.2	352.1	618.1	258.0	159.9
ESHA Total	0.2	27.1	53.7	49.8	10.1
Notes					
SA = Service Area					
<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this FEIR, all eucalyptus woodland in the service areas is assumed to be monarch butterfly and/or raptor roosting habitats.					
<sup>2</sup> This habitat type was not mapped in the service areas					
<sup>4</sup> The beach./shoreline habitat in this SA also is western snowy plover critical habitat.					

### **Subarea E**

This area is primarily an existing golf course. There are a combination of ESHA and non-ESHA scrub types on the area, together with approximately 10 acres of riparian/marsh/vernal types. Glen Annie Creek runs along the eastern portion of the subarea.

### **4.4.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulations applicable to the future service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."

### **4.4.3 Service Area Impacts and Mitigation**

#### **4.4.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for the service areas are the same as those presented in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."

#### **4.4.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP Plan Policies for the service areas are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."

#### **3.4.3.3 Service Area Impacts**

##### ***Class I Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class I impacts related to biological resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

##### ***Class II Impacts***

###### **Short-Term Impacts**

For Areas B, C, D, and E, short-term Class II impacts related to biological resources are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."

###### **Long-Term Impacts**

For Areas B, C, D, and E, long-term Class II impacts related to biological resources are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."

##### ***Class III Impacts***

For Areas A, B, C, D, and E, short-term and long-term Class III impacts related to biological resources are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."

##### ***Class IV Impacts***

For Areas B, C, D, and E, Class IV impacts related to biological resources are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."

#### **4.4.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."

#### **4.4.3.5 Mitigation**

##### ***Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies***

No modifications are required.

**Additional Mitigation**

No additional mitigation is identified.

**4.4.3.6 Residual Impacts**

Residual impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."

**4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

The following section describes the existing cultural resources setting in relation to the five potential future Goleta service areas.

**4.5.1 Existing Conditions****Subarea A**

The results of the record search for Area A indicate 11 prehistoric and/or historic archaeological sites that have been previously recorded that lie within, or partially within, the subarea. Ten of the archaeological sites recorded within, or partially within, Subarea A are strictly prehistoric in origin and one contains materials from both the prehistoric and historic periods. The sites present in Area A represent major villages, places of less substantial habitation such as temporary campsites, and resource procurement and/or processing locations. As indicated on the site records, some of the sites may be disturbed, and/or either largely or completely destroyed. Some of the village or larger habitation sites in the Goleta area either contain or have the potential to contain human burials.

The records search also indicated that approximately 55 percent of the area within Subarea A has been previously surveyed for cultural resources. Most of these surveys have been conducted since the inception of CEQA in the mid-1970s. However, these previous surveys may not have all been of the same intensity. Depending on the intended purpose of the survey, different levels of intensity were sometimes employed. Also, over time, methods of archaeological survey have evolved, with methods employed 20 or 30 years ago often being less methodical than those generally practiced today. In general, if archaeological and historical surveys for currently undeveloped parcels or lands are older than ten years, the parcels or lands should be resurveyed.

**Subarea B**

The results of the record search for Area B indicate 4 prehistoric archaeological sites that have been previously recorded that lie within, or partially within, the subarea. The four prehistoric sites present in Subarea B represent places of habitation such as temporary campsites and resource procurement and/or processing locations. One of the sites within Subarea B is spatially located in neighboring Area C as well. As indicated on the site records, some of the sites may be disturbed, and/or either largely or completely destroyed. Some of the village or larger habitation sites in the Goleta area either contain or have the potential to contain human burials.

The records search also indicated that approximately 27 percent of the area within Subarea B has been previously surveyed for cultural resources. Most of these surveys have been conducted since the inception of CEQA in the mid-1970s. However, these previous surveys may not have all been of the same intensity. Depending on the intended purpose of the survey, different levels of intensity were sometimes employed. Also, over time, methods of

archaeological survey have evolved, with methods employed 20 or 30 years ago often being less methodical than those generally practiced today. In general, if archaeological and historical surveys for currently undeveloped parcels or lands are older than ten years, the parcels or lands should be resurveyed.

### **Subarea C**

The results of the record search for Subarea C indicate 7 prehistoric and/or historic archaeological sites that have been previously recorded that lie within, or partially within, the service area. Six of the archaeological sites recorded within, or partially within, Subarea C are strictly prehistoric in origin and one contains materials from both the prehistoric and historic periods. The sites present in Subarea C represent places of habitation such as temporary campsites, resource procurement and/or processing locations, and trails. One of the sites within Subarea C is spatially located in neighboring Subarea B as well. As indicated on the site records, some of the sites may be disturbed, and/or either largely or completely destroyed. Some of the village or larger habitation sites in the Goleta area either contain or have the potential to contain human burials.

The records search also indicated that approximately 7 percent of the area within Subarea C has been previously surveyed for cultural resources. Most of these surveys have been conducted since the inception of CEQA in the mid-1970s. However, these previous surveys may not have all been of the same intensity. Depending on the intended purpose of the survey, different levels of intensity were sometimes employed. Also, over time, methods of archaeological survey have evolved, with methods employed 20 or 30 years ago often being less methodical than those generally practiced today. In general, if archaeological and historical surveys for currently undeveloped parcels or lands are older than ten years, the parcels or lands should be resurveyed.

### **Subarea D**

The results of the record search for Subarea D indicate 5 prehistoric and/or historic archaeological sites that have been previously recorded that lie within, or partially within, the service area. Four of the archaeological sites recorded within, or partially within, Subarea D are strictly prehistoric in origin and one record is unavailable and is therefore of unknown temporal identity. The prehistoric sites present in Subarea D represent major villages, places of less substantial habitation such as temporary campsites, and resource procurement and/or processing locations. As indicated on the site records, some of the sites may be disturbed, and/or either largely or completely destroyed. Some of the village or larger habitation sites in the Goleta area either contain or have the potential to contain human burials.

The records search also indicated that approximately 81 percent of the area within Subarea D has been previously surveyed for cultural resources. Most of these surveys have been conducted since the inception of CEQA in the mid-1970s. However, these previous surveys may not have all been of the same intensity. Depending on the intended purpose of the survey, different levels of intensity were sometimes employed. Also, over time, methods of archaeological survey have evolved, with methods employed 20 or 30 years ago often being less methodical than those generally practiced today. In general, if archaeological and historical surveys for currently undeveloped parcels or lands are older than ten years, the parcels or lands should be resurveyed.

### **Subarea E**

The results of the record search for Subarea E indicate 2 prehistoric and/or historic archaeological sites that have been previously recorded that lie within, or partially within, the service area. One of the archaeological sites recorded within, or partially within, Subarea E is strictly prehistoric in origin and one is a historic trash deposit. The prehistoric site present in Subarea E represents a place of habitation such as a temporary campsites and resource procurement and/or processing location. As indicated on the site records, some of the sites in the Goleta area may be disturbed, and/or either largely or completely destroyed. Some of the village or larger habitation sites in the Goleta area either contain or have the potential to contain human burials.

The records search also indicated that approximately 93 percent of the area within Area E has been previously surveyed for cultural resources. Most of these surveys have been conducted since the inception of CEQA in the mid-1970s. However, these previous surveys may not have all been of the same intensity. Depending on the intended purpose of the survey, different levels of intensity were sometimes employed. Also, over time, methods of archaeological survey have evolved, with methods employed 20 or 30 years ago often being less methodical than those generally practiced today. In general, if archaeological and historical surveys for currently undeveloped parcels or lands are older than ten years, the parcels or lands should be resurveyed.

## **4.5.2 Regulatory Framework**

### **4.5.2.1 Federal and State**

Federal, state, and local regulations for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources."

## **4.5.3 Service Area Impacts and Mitigation**

### **4.5.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources."

### **4.5.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP policies for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources."

### **4.5.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation**

#### ***Class I Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class I impacts related to cultural resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

**Class II Impacts**

Short- and long-term Class II impacts to cultural resources in the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources."

**Class III Impacts**

There are no short- or long-term Class III impacts related to cultural resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

**Class IV Impacts**Short-Term Impacts

There are no short-term Class IV impacts related to cultural resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

Long-Term Impacts

Long-term Class IV impacts related to cultural resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources."

**4.5.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources."

**4.5.3.5 Mitigation****Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies**

No modifications are required.

**Additional Mitigation**

No additional mitigation is identified.

**4.5.3.6 Residual Impacts**

Residual impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources."

**4.6 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES**

The following section describes the existing geology, soils, and mineral resources setting in relation to the potential future Goleta service area/sphere of influence.

**4.6.1 Existing Conditions****4.6.1.1 Topography****Subarea A**

This area is composed of nearly-level ground on the floor of the Goleta Valley at an elevation of about 30 feet above sea level.

**Subarea B**

Seventy-five percent of the area is composed of nearly-level ground on the floor of the Goleta Valley at an elevation of about 60 feet above sea level. A hill extending to an elevation of 100 feet above sea level occupies the northeastern quarter of this area.

**Subarea C**

This area is comprised of several north-south trending ridges separated by intervening stream valleys in the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains. Elevations in this area range up to 300 feet above sea level.

**Subarea D**

This area is primarily occupied by an elevated, gently sloping terrace approximately 60 feet above sea level. The Devereaux Creek valley also crosses this area.

**Subarea E**

This area includes the northern edge of the Goleta Valley and the adjoining steep foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains. The topography in this area has been modified with the development of the Glen Annie Golf Course. The elevation of this area ranges up to 350 feet above sea level.

**4.6.1.2 Geology**

The geologic formations exposed within the City of Goleta and the service area/sphere of influence are delineated in Figure 3.6-1. Relevant information pertaining to the stratigraphy and geologic structure of the service area is presented below. For a detailed explanation of these descriptions, please see Section 3.6, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources."

**Stratigraphy**Quaternary Units

**Younger Alluvium (Qa):** All of Area A, half of Area B, and portions of Areas C and D are underlain by this unit.

**Older Alluvium (Qoa):** This Pleistocene Age unit is exposed on low hills at the northern edge of the Goleta Valley in Areas B, C, and D. In these areas, this unit unconformably overlies older bedrock formations and can be over 200 feet thick. In Area E, deposits assigned to this unit form a thin veneer (less than 30 feet thick) of alluvial and marine sediment that unconformably overlies older bedrock on the Ellwood Mesa.

**Quaternary Older Gravels (Qog):** This unit is exposed in Area B.

**Santa Barbara Formation (Qsb):** A small outcrop of this unit is present at the edge of Area C.

Tertiary Units

**Monterey Formation (Tml):** The Monterey Formation is exposed in Area C along North Fairview Avenue.

**Rincon Formation (Tr):** This geologic unit is exposed in the Area E located west of Glen Annie Road (the Glen Annie Golf Course) and in Area C just east of Fairview Avenue and north of Cathedrals Oaks Road.

**Vaqueros Formation (Tvq):** Two small outcrops are located within the northernmost portion of Area C.

### ***Geologic Structure***

#### **Subarea A**

This area is underlain by a thick accumulation of flat-lying Younger and Older Alluvium that fills the structural depression located north of the More Ranch Fault. Tilted Tertiary bedrock underlies the alluvium.

#### **Subareas B, C, and E**

The geologic structure that underlies Areas B, C, and E generally consists of a southerly dipping, east-west trending homocline (i.e., all the rock layers dip uniformly in one direction) of consolidated Tertiary bedrock that is unconformably overlain by gently sloping Quaternary alluvial sedimentary units. In the foothills north of the City in Areas C and E, a more complex geologic structure with folds and faults has been mapped in the exposed bedrock. These folds and faults trend from east-west to northwest-southeast. With one exception, the faults are classified as inactive. The exception is the San Pedro fault (USGS 2003). This fault is shown on Figures 3.6-1 and 3.6-2 along the northeast edge of Area B. It is located along the northeast edge of Area B coincident with a segment of Cathedral Oaks Road just east of the Patterson Avenue intersection. The linear topographic depression in this area has been interpreted to be a potentially active fault. This fault inferred to trend northwest across Area C.

#### **Subarea D**

This area is underlain by south-dipping bedrock of the Sisqouc and Monterey formations that is unconformably overlain by a thin veneer of Younger and Older alluvium. The potentially active More Ranch Fault traverses this area.

#### **4.6.1.3 Soils**

The soils present at the ground surface within the service area/sphere of influence are described by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service (formerly the Soil Conservation Service) in the "Soil Survey of Santa Barbara County, California, South Coastal Part" (Shipman 1981).

Expansive soils would be found in all of the Subareas. In addition, compressible soils would be potentially encountered in Area A. Refer to Section 3.6, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources," for a discussion of the hazards associated with these soil types.

#### **4.6.1.4 Mineral Resources**

There are no existing or planned surface mining operations within the service areas.

### **4.6.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulations for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.6, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources."

### **4.6.3 Service Area Impacts and Mitigation**

#### **4.6.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.6, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources."

#### **4.6.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP policies for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.6, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources."

#### **4.6.3.3 Potential Geologic Impacts and Hazards**

##### ***Seismic Hazards***

##### **Ground Rupture**

The potentially active More Ranch fault and San Pedro fault (see Figure 3.6-2) are the only recognized sources of ground rupture within the service area/sphere of influence.

##### **Groundshaking**

Groundshaking is a regional phenomenon that affects land areas surrounding an earthquake epicenter, with the intensity of shaking diminishing with distance from the fault. Groundshaking within the City can be generated by an earthquake on a local onshore or offshore fault or by a major quake on a remote fault such as the San Andreas. This hazard is faced by all properties in the service area/sphere of influence.

##### **Liquefaction**

The impacts from this hazard are the same as those described in Section 3.6, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources."

##### ***Slope Stability Hazards***

Impacts related to slope stability (landslide) hazards can occur where development is proposed on or adjacent to steep slopes underlain by weak geologic units. Existing landslide deposits are illustrated in Figure 3.6-5. The geologic unit generally associated with landslide hazards on the South Coast, the Rincon Formation, underlies portions of the two northernmost subareas (Areas C and E).

##### ***Soils Hazards***

Expansive soils would be found in all of the service area/sphere of influence. In addition, compressible soils would be potentially encountered in Area A. Refer to Section 3.6, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources," for a discussion of the hazards associated with these soil types.

##### ***Radon Gas***

Radon gas, a known carcinogen, is known to emanate from the Rincon Formation due to the decay of naturally-occurring uranium present in this rock unit. The high radon hazard area

depicted on Figure 3.6-6 generally coincides with the outcrops of this geologic unit. Portions of two subareas (Areas C and E) are underlain by the Rincon Formation.

### ***Accelerated Erosion***

Construction activities on a site can temporarily increase the rate of erosion and the volume of downstream sediment transport. These effects are generally short-term in nature and are alleviated by required erosion control measures during construction and the growth of vegetation after the completion of construction.

#### **4.6.3.4 Project Impacts**

##### ***Class I Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class I impacts related to geology, soils, and mineral resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

##### ***Class II Impacts***

###### **Short-Term Impacts**

###### ***Impact 4.6-1. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting during Construction on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils***

- *Northern Subareas:* Because of the steep terrain and unstable soils and geologic units in Areas C and E, north of Cathedral Oaks Road, development in these areas could cause higher likelihood of landslides. Unstable geologic and soil units of most concern are the Rincon Formation and the Ayars series.
- *Southern Subareas:* Because of the dominant coastal character of Areas A and D, south of the City, development in these areas could cause higher likelihood of landslides from coastal erosion.

###### **Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.6-1.**

- *Northern Subareas:* Although development on steep terrain or unstable soils and geologic units can potentially lead to landslides, the City's policies for general safety and soil and slope stability reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level. These policies are:
  - Policy SE 1: Safety in General
  - Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards
- *Southern Subareas:* Although development near the coast can potentially lead to landslides, the City's policies for general safety, soil and slope stability, bluff erosion and retreat, and beach erosion reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level. These policies are:
  - Policy SE 1: Safety in General
  - Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
  - Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
  - Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards

*Impact 4.6-2. Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil*

- *Northern Subareas:* Because of the steep terrain and unstable soils and geologic units in Areas C and E, north of Cathedral Oaks Road, development in these areas could cause higher levels of accelerated erosion (see discussion for Impacts 3.6-1 and 3.9-1).
- *Southern Subareas:* Because of the dominant coastal character of Areas A and D, south of the City, development in these areas could cause higher levels of accelerated erosion (see discussion for Impacts 3.6-1 and 3.9-1).

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.6-2.

- *Northern Subareas:* Although development on steep terrain or unstable soils and geologic units can potentially lead to accelerated erosion, the City's policies for general safety, soil and slope stability, bluff erosion and retreat, and beach erosion would reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level.
  - Policy SE 1: Safety in General
  - Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards
- *Southern Subareas:* Although development near the coast can potentially lead to accelerated erosion, the City's policies for general safety, soil and slope stability, bluff erosion and retreat, and beach erosion reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level.
  - Policy SE 1: Safety in General
  - Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
  - Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
  - Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards

Long-Term Impacts

*Impact 4.6-3. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from Seismically Induced Landsliding or Liquefaction*

- *Northern Subareas:* Because of the steep terrain and unstable soils and geologic units in Areas C and E, north of Cathedral Oaks Road, the risk of a seismic event triggering a landslide in unstable geologic or soil units (described above) or on steep (i.e., greater than 20 percent) slopes may be greater than in study area.
- *Southern Subareas:* Because the More Ranch fault runs through Areas A and D, south of the City, the risk associated with surface rupture along the trace and landsliding along the coastal bluffs and steep stream beds may be greater than in the study area.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.6-3.

- *Northern Subareas:* Although development in a seismically active region is potentially dangerous, the City's policies for seismic and seismically induced hazards would reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level. The City's policies, listed below, include maintaining up-to-date geologic information, complying with the California Building Standards Code (CBSC), prohibiting building within a fault trace corridor, requiring geotechnical reports, pursuing retrofitting older masonry buildings, requiring a higher level of seismic safety for critical buildings to minimize this impact, and discouraging construction with high liquefaction potential.
  - Policy SE 1: Safety in General

- Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically-Induced Hazards
- Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness
- *Southern Subareas*: The City's policies for seismic and seismically induced hazards reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level. The City's policies, listed below, include maintaining up-to-date geologic information, complying with the CBSC, prohibiting building within a fault trace corridor, requiring geotechnical reports, pursuing retrofitting older masonry buildings, requiring a higher level of seismic safety for critical buildings to minimize this impact, and discouraging construction with high liquefaction potential.
  - Policy SE 1: Safety in General
  - Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically-Induced Hazards
  - Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
  - Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness

### ***Class III Impacts***

#### **Short-Term Impacts**

There are no short-term Class III impacts related to geology, soils, and mineral resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

#### **Long-Term Impacts**

##### ***Impact 4.6-4. Exposure of People to Elevated Levels of Indoor Radon***

Because of the occurrence of the Rincon Formation and Rincon-derived soils in Areas C and E, north of Cathedral Oaks Road, these areas may be at a higher risk for elevated indoor radon exposure. Both the City and the service area/sphere of influence are located in Radon Zone 1, which indicates the area has the highest potential for elevated levels of radon (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2006a), and therefore people could be exposed to elevated levels of indoor radon. The potential for such exposure is considered an adverse but less-than-significant impact. The City has included a policy subsection SE 1.9 that addresses radon hazards as suggested in the DEIR. No additional mitigation is identified.

#### **4.6.3.5 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.6, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources."

#### **4.6.3.6 Mitigation**

##### ***Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies***

No modifications are required.

##### ***Other Mitigation***

No additional mitigation is identified.

#### **4.6.3.7 Residual Impacts**

Residual impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.6, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources."

### **4.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

#### **4.7.1 Existing Conditions**

The following section describes the existing hazards and hazardous materials setting in relation to the potential future service area/sphere of influence.

##### ***Subarea A***

Area A is currently under agricultural use. Such land use indicates the possible presence or use of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides and herbicides).

##### ***Subarea B***

Existing land uses in Area B are residential, agricultural, and recreation/open space. Agricultural land use indicates the possible presence or use of hazardous materials.

##### ***Subarea C***

Existing land uses in Area C are residential, agricultural, and recreation/open space. Agricultural land use indicates the possible presence or use of hazardous materials.

##### ***Subarea D***

Existing land uses in Area D include the Ocean Meadows Golf Course, UCSB North Campus, the Venoco Ellwood Oil Marine Terminal, and the COPR area. Golf course uses indicate the possible storage or use of hazardous materials (e.g., petrochemicals, pesticides, and rodenticides). Two above-ground crude oil tanks are located south of Ocean Meadows Golf Course as part of the Venoco Ellwood Oil Marine Terminal. These tanks appear to be located within catch basins for containment.

##### ***Subarea E***

The existing land use in Area E comprises the Glen Annie Golf Course. Golf course uses indicate the possible storage or use of hazardous materials (e.g., petrochemicals, pesticides, and rodenticides).

#### **4.7.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulations for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.7, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials."

### 4.7.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.7.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

Thresholds of significance for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.7, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials."

#### 4.7.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies

GP/CLUP Policies for the service areas are the same as those identified in Section 3.7, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials."

#### 4.7.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation

##### ***Class I Impacts***

###### Long-Term Impacts

There are no short- or long-term Class I impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

##### ***Class II Impacts***

###### Long-Term Impacts

###### *Impact 4.7-1. Wildland Fires*

All of Area E and considerable portions of Area C fall in areas that are classified by CDF as wildland fire hazard areas (see Figure 3.7-1). The undeveloped hills and canyons that border the City to the north feature rough terrain, large amounts of vegetation, and occasional high velocity winds. This combination can create a challenge to firefighting crews and put homes and property at risk in the event of a fire. Due to the proximity of single family residences to undeveloped wildland, the fire risk to homes and other structures within these areas is considered significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.7-1. The following policies should ensure that fire hazards for future development are identified and mitigated to the extent feasible:

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
  - SE 1.1: Maintenance of Maps and Resources on Hazards
  - SE 1.2: Guidelines for Siting Highly Sensitive Uses and Critical Facilities
  - SE 1.3: Site-Specific Hazards Studies
  - SE 1.4: Deed Restriction in Hazardous Areas
  - SE 1.5: Subdivision of New Lots in Hazard Areas
  - SE 1.6: Enforcement of Building Codes
  - SE 1.7: Abatement of Public Safety Hazards
  - SE 1.8: Reduction of Non-Conforming or Substandard Structural Conditions
- Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards
  - SE 7.1: Fire Prevention and Response Measures for New Development

- SE 7.2: Review of New Development
- SE 7.3: Identification of Fire Hazard Areas
- SE 7.4: Fuel Modification Plans
- SE 7.5: Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems
- SE 7.6: Standards for Rebuilding in High Fire Hazard Areas

Implementation of the policies above would expect to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

*Impact 4.7-2. Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal*

The EMT is located on 17 acres of property immediately east of the City-owned Sperling Preserve/Santa Barbara Shores within Area D. Located outside but adjacent to the City limits, the EMT is located on UCSB-leased land. The onshore storage facilities are located south of the planned Ocean Meadows residential project and about 0.5 mile from UCSB residential development at its North and West Campus areas. Oil storage and transfer operations at EMT create risks to marine and land resources and planned neighboring populations associated with spills, leaks, or pipeline ruptures. Impacts would be similar to those described under Impact 3.7-4.

Policy That Would Reduce Impact 4.7-2. The Safety Element includes policies that would ensure that impacts associated with oil storage and transfer operations are identified and mitigated to the extent feasible.

- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
  - SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required
  - SE 8.5: Inventory of Oil and Gas Pipelines
  - SE 8.9: Safety Requirements for New Petroleum Pipelines
  - SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines
  - SE 8.14: Pipeline Burial Depths

Implementation of Policy SE 8 would minimize the risk of hazards related to risk of upset at the Ellwood Marine Terminal by reducing the probability of an oil leak and ensuring that a leak if one were to occur would be promptly identified and effectively addressed. In particular, Annual Safety Audits would examine the integrity of storage tanks, secondary containment, pipelines, and related equipment, as well as insure safety and emergency response procedures are up-to-date and effective. Aspects related to ample pipeline inventories, marking/warning, and burial depths would help avoid pipeline exposure and third party damage to oil pipelines.

In addition, a detailed characterization of the hazards associated with an oil release will be developed as part of the QRA for the facility as required by SE 8.6 in the event of any alternations to the EMT. Proper implementation of these policies would ensure that any risk of upset associated with the operation of the EMT is reduced to a less than significant level.

*Impact 4.7-3. Listed/Contaminated Sites*

Based on a review of current land uses, Area D may contain listed sites that use and/or store hazardous materials and have had reported releases of hazardous materials. Existing land uses within this area include the Ocean Meadows Golf Course, which is under the jurisdiction of the County, USCB North Campus, the Venoco Ellwood Oil Marine Terminal, and COPR. The

release of hazardous materials associated with oil and gas production, processing, and transport may result in significantly adverse impacts if conditions or risks described by County and CEQA Thresholds exist or occur. Prior to new development or redevelopment in Area D, an environmental review would be required, including a hazardous materials database search and field reconnaissance.

Existing Policy That Would Reduce Impact 4.7-3. The following policy should ensure that the community is protected from exposure to residual contamination:

- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
  - SE 10.1: Identification of Hazardous Materials Facilities
  - SE 10.3: Hazard Assessment Required for Hazardous Materials Facilities
  - SE 10.4: Prohibition on New Facilities Posing Unacceptable Risks
  - SE 10.5: Restriction on Residential Development near Hazardous Facilities
  - SE 10.6: Responsibility for Cleanup by Responsible Party
  - SE 10.7: Identification, Transport, and Disposition of Potentially Contaminated Soil

*Impact 4.7-4. Surface Water*

Surface water quality could be adversely affected by ordinary use or spills of hazardous materials used during site grading and construction activities. Fuels, solvents, paint, and other similar substances used during grading and construction could adversely impact local surface water quality if they were spilled directly into the runoff drainage system. Impacts to water quality associated with spills of such materials would be considered potentially significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.7-4. Implementation of SWPPPs and SPCC Plans as discussed in the GP/CLUP would greatly reduce the impact to the environment of any spills. These plans would help minimize the potential for spills of hazardous materials in drainages and creeks. In addition, implementation of the following policies identified in the Conservation Element of the GP/CLUP would ensure that construction impacts on surface water quality resulting from Plan implementation would be less than significant.

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
  - CE 1.1: Definition of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas
  - CE 1.2: Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas
  - CE 1.3: Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs
  - CE 1.4: Illegal Destruction of ESHAs
  - CE 1.5: Corrections to Map of ESHAs
  - CE 1.6: Protection of ESHAs
  - CE 1.7: Mitigation of Impacts to ESHAs
  - CE 1.8: ESHA Buffers
  - CE 1.9: Standards Applicable to Development Projects
  - CE 1.10: Management of ESHAs
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
  - CE 2.1: Designation of Protected Creeks

- CE 2.2: Streamside Protection Areas
- CE 2.3: Allowable Uses and Activities in Streamside Protection Areas
- CE 2.4: Dedication of Easements or Other Property Interests
- CE 2.5: Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems
- CE 2.6: Restoration of Degraded Creeks
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
  - CE 3.1: Definition of Wetlands
  - CE 3.2: Designation of Wetland ESHAs
  - CE 3.3: Site-Specific Wetland Delineations
  - CE 3.4: Protection of Wetlands
  - CE 3.5: Wetland Buffer Areas
  - CE 3.6: Mitigation of Wetland Fill
  - CE 3.7: Lagoon Protection
  - CE 3.8: Vernal Pool Protection
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
  - CE 10.1: New Development and Water Quality
  - CE 10.2: Siting and Design of New Development
  - CE 10.3: Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management
  - CE 10.4: New Facilities
  - CE 10.5: Beachfront and Blufftop Development
  - CE 10.6: Stormwater Management Requirements
  - CE 10.7: Drainage and Stormwater Management Plans
  - CE 10.8: Maintenance of Stormwater Management Facilities
  - CE 10.9: Landscaping to Control Erosion

### ***Class III Impacts***

#### Short-Term Impacts

There are no short-term Class III impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

#### Long-Term Impacts

##### *Impact 4.7-5. Airport*

Areas A and D, and a portion of Area B, are contained within the influence area of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. Within the influence area, the areas underneath the takeoff and landing paths have the greatest risk. A considerable portion of Area A is under the takeoff and landing path on the east end of the airport. The safety areas at each end of runway 7-25 (east-west) are 200 feet long on the east end and 300 feet long on the west end (SBA website, 2006), and therefore do not meet the current FAA standard of 1,000 feet. Although this adds to the inherent risk associated with takeoff and landing routes, the subject area is principally

characterized by agriculture land uses. Such land uses correspond to low population density, so that potential hazards are less than significant.

*Impact 4.7-6. Exposure of Populated Areas to Oil and Gas Pipelines*

Impacts would be similar to those described under Impact 3.7-10. The potential for pipelines to exist in the service area is high. This is especially true for Subarea D, which contains about 3.7 miles of pipeline between EMT and EOF. The same mitigation measures proposed under Impact 3.7-10 would apply.

***Class IV Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class IV impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

**4.7.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.7, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials."

**4.7.3.5 Mitigation**

***Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies***

No modifications are required.

***Other Mitigation***

No additional mitigation is identified.

**4.7.3.6 Residual Impacts**

Residual impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.7, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials."

**4.8 POPULATION AND HOUSING**

**4.8.1 Existing Conditions**

The following section describes the existing population and housing setting in relation to the potential future service area/sphere of influence.

***Subarea A***

Area A is currently under agricultural use. A portion of the area lies within Santa Barbara County census tract 30.01, block group 2, block 2003. According to the 2000 Census Data, there are currently 416 people and approximately 201 housing units within the block group (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000a and 2000b). However, based upon aerial photography and personal knowledge of the area, it appears that no housing units exist within Subarea A (Loyst 2006; Google Earth 2006). This area was included within the Goleta CDP and is considered part of the Goleta Valley; refer to Section 3.8 for additional information on employment and other economic data.

**Subarea B**

Existing land uses in Area B are residential, agricultural, and recreation/open space. A portion of the area lies census tracts 29.13, block groups 1 and 2, within Santa Barbara County. According to the 2000 Census Data, there are approximately 3,129 people and 1,213 housing units within the two block groups (U.S. Census Bureau 2000c and 2000d). This area was included within the Goleta CDP; refer to existing setting for additional information related to population, housing, and employment.

**Subarea C**

Existing land uses in Area C are residential, agricultural, and recreation/open space. A portion of the subarea lies within census tract 29.07, block groups 1 and 3, within Santa Barbara County. According to the 2000 Census Data, there are 7,445 people and 911 housing units within the two block groups (U.S. Census Bureau 2000e and 2000f). This area was included within the Goleta CDP and is considered part of the Goleta Valley; refer to existing setting for additional information housing, employment, and economic data.

**Subarea D**

Existing land uses in Area D include the Ocean Meadows Golf Course, UCSB North Campus, the Venoco Ellwood Oil Marine Terminal, and the COPR area. A portion of the subarea lies within Santa Barbara County census tract 29.04, block group 4, block 4003. According to the 2000 Census Data, there are approximately 541 people and 206 housing units within block 4003 (U.S. Census Bureau 2000g and 2000h). The entire subarea, with the exception of the COPR area, was included within the Goleta CDP; refer to existing setting for additional information related to employment.

Area D is located within the Joint Proposal area for the Ellwood-Devereux Coast. This proposed land development includes the Santa Barbara Development Partnership Residential Development at the Santa Barbara Shores Park property in Goleta, student and faculty housing on UCSB's North and West Campus properties, and a residential development on Ocean Meadows Golf Course under the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara (County of Santa Barbara, 2005).

As part of the Joint-Proposal for the Ellwood-Devereux area, the County prepared an EIR in 2004 for the Ocean Meadows Residences and Open Space Project. The project includes the development of 32 single-family dwellings, 21 condominium units and two employee dwellings on 9.5 acres of the existing approximately 70-acre Ocean Meadows Golf Course property. Construction of these housing units would increase the residential population by 168 persons. The project also includes rezoning approximately 63 acres of the Ocean Meadows Golf Course property from Planned Residential Development (PRD) to Recreation (REC) to provide long-term protection of the existing recreational use (County of Santa Barbara, 2004a).

Another EIR was prepared by UCSB for the Joint-Proposal area for the UCSB North Campus area. The Faculty and Family Student Housing, Open Space Plan, and LRDP Amendment EIR was prepared in 2004 and allows for the development of 236 units of faculty housing and 151 units of family student housing, which would increase the residential population of the project area by approximately 1,003 new persons, including 612 persons residing in the faculty housing and 391 residing in the family student housing. According to the EIR, the proposed residential development would provide housing for faculty and students that would be enrolled or employed at UCSB even without the proposed project, and neither employment nor enrollment at UCSB would increase as a result of the proposed project (USCB, 2004).

### **Subarea E**

The existing land use in Area E consists solely of the Glen Annie Golf Course. A portion of the subarea lies within Census tract 29.10, block group 1, block 1000. This area was not included in the Goleta CDP. According to the 2000 Census, there are 593 persons and 185 housing units within this block (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000i and 2000j). Based on aerial photography, none of the housing units are within the Sub area E (Loyst 2006; Google Earth 2006).

Assessor Parcel data based on 2000 US Census data was used to estimate the existing population for all the service area (JDL mapping 2006). The data indicated that there are approximately 4,285 residents in the future service area. The projects proposed in the Ellwood-Devereux Joint-Proposal area would add approximately 1,171 people to the estimated 2000 service area population.

## **4.8.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulations for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3. 8, "Population and Housing."

## **4.8.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation**

### **4.8.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.8, "Population and Housing."

### **4.8.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP Policies for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.8, "Population and Housing."

### **4.8.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation**

#### ***Class I Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class I impacts related to population and housing associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

#### ***Class II Impacts***

##### **Short-Term Impacts**

Short-term Class II impacts related to population and housing associated with the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.8, "Population and Housing."

##### **Long-Term Impacts**

There are no long-term Class II impacts related to population and housing associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

### **Class III Impacts**

#### Short-Term

There are no short-term Class III impacts related to population and housing associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

#### Long-Term

##### *Impact 4.8-1. Increased Population Would Generate the Need for Additional Housing and Jobs, Which Would Result in the Physical Alteration of Vacant and Previously Disturbed Land Within the Service Areas*

Annexation of Areas B, C, and D would result in the addition of about 5,450 people to the City; however, this increase has been projected on site and is considered in local population and housing estimates (the service areas are accounted for in the Goleta CDP and employment and economic data for the Goleta Valley). These areas are also included in the regional growth forecasts and plan. Annexation of the service areas would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the City since most of the population in the service areas is accounted for in existing population and housing estimates, and future population growth is accounted for in regional growth forecasts and plans; therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

No impacts to population and housing would occur with annexation of Areas A and E, since the proposed land use designations under the Goleta GP/CLUP are consistent with the County's existing land use.

#### Long-Term Impacts

##### *Impact 4.8-2. Annexation of the Services Areas Would Not Result in the Displacement of a Substantial Number of People or Existing Homes*

No impacts would occur with annexation of the service area, since the proposed land use designations under the Goleta GP/CLUP are consistent with the County's existing land uses. Existing land uses will remain until land use changes would occur through voluntary means and through private redevelopment efforts. As such, annexation of the service area would not displace a substantial number of people or existing homes. No mitigation measures are required.

### **Class IV Impacts**

There are no short- or long-term impacts.

#### **4.8.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.8, "Population and Housing."

#### **4.8.3.5 Mitigation**

##### ***Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies***

No modifications are required.

##### ***Additional Mitigation***

No additional mitigation is identified.

#### **4.8.3.6 Residual Impacts**

There would be no residual impacts.

### **4.9 WATER RESOURCES**

#### **4.9.1 Existing Conditions**

The following section describes the existing water resources setting in relation to the potential future Goleta service area/sphere of influence. Existing water quality conditions of the creeks in or adjacent to the five subareas are described in Section 3.9, "Water Resources." All future service areas overlie the Goleta Groundwater Basin and are served by the Goleta Water District. There is no known available information regarding a detailed analysis of area-specific groundwater conditions. A basinwide description has been provided in Section 3.9. The geographic area addressed in the City's 2006 WSA is the existing City boundary.

##### ***Subarea A***

Goleta Slough borders Area A to the south and partly to the west. Atascadero Creek meanders westward near the southern portion of Area A until its confluence with Goleta Slough. According to FEMA's Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), most of Area A is located outside of the 100-year flood zone. However, some areas around Atascadero Creek and Maria Ygnacia Creek, and other portions of Area A, are located in areas having a 1 percent annual chance of flooding (i.e. 100-year flood zone).

##### ***Subarea B***

Maria Ygnacia Creek meanders south along the eastern portion of Areas B and C. San Jose Creek meanders south along and through the western portion of Areas B and C. Most of Area B is located in Zone X and are outside of the 100-year flood zone, with the exception of a few, very small areas.

##### ***Subarea C***

Surface water resources and flood risk in Area C are similar to that of Area B.

##### ***Subarea D***

Devereux Slough is located just to the east of Area D, and Devereux Creek drains down through the northern portion of Area D until its confluence with Devereux Slough. Some small sections of Area D are also subject to the 100-year flood zone, especially around Devereux Slough.

##### ***Subarea E***

Glen Annie Creek is the primary surface water feature along the eastern portion of Area E. Flood risk is similar to that of Area D.

#### **4.9.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulations for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.9, "Water Resources."

### **4.9.3 Service Area Impacts and Mitigation**

#### **4.9.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for the service areas are the same as those presented in Section 3.9, "Water Resources."

#### **4.9.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP Plan Policies for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.9, "Water Resources."

#### **3.9.3.3 Service Area Impacts**

##### ***Class I Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class I impacts related to water resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

##### ***Class II Impacts***

###### Short-Term Impacts

Short-term Class II impacts related to water resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.9, "Water Resources."

###### Long-Term Impacts

It is not anticipated that annexation of the service area/sphere of influence would result in an increased water demand since these areas are currently developed and served by the GWD. In addition, no changes in land use are anticipated upon annexation. Future water demand for these areas are included in the basinwide calculation of existing and future water demands available in Section 3.9, "Water Resources." As indicated in Table 3.9-3, sufficient water supplies would be available during all water year types to meet GWD's projected demands.

Water demand for the future development proposed in Area D was analyzed in earlier EIRs prepared for the projects in 2004. According the EIRs, the Ocean Meadows Residence and Open Space Plan would increase water demand by 14 acre-feet per year (AFY) and 80.2 AFY for the Faculty and Family Student Housing, Open Space Plan, and LRDP Amendment Project. As indicated in the EIRs, the GWD has adequate water supplies to support current and all anticipated demand within the GWD service area through 2020 (County of Santa Barbara 2004a; USCB 2004). Long-term Class II impacts related to water resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.9, "Water Resources."

##### ***Class III Impacts***

###### Short-Term Impacts

There are no short-term Class III impacts.

### Long-Term Impacts

Long-term Class III impacts related to water resources associated with the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.9, "Water Resources."

### ***Class IV Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class IV impacts.

#### **4.9.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.9, "Water Resources."

#### **4.9.3.5 Mitigation**

### ***Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies***

No modifications are required.

### ***Additional Mitigation***

No additional mitigation is identified.

#### **4.9.3.6 Residual Impacts**

Residual impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.9, "Water Resources."

## **4.10 LAND USE AND RECREATION**

### **4.10.1 Existing Conditions**

The following section describes the existing land use and recreation setting in relation to the potential future Goleta service area/sphere of influence.

#### **4.10.1.1 Land Use Settings**

### ***Subarea A***

Existing land uses, the County zoning designation, and the City's proposed land use designation in Subarea A are Agriculture. The St. Athanasius Church complex has been approved by the County on a parcel within this area, but had not been constructed as of early 2006.

### ***Subarea B***

Existing land uses in Subarea B are residential, agricultural, and recreation/open space. County zoning designations include Residential, Recreation, Commercial, and Agriculture. The City's proposed land use designations are Residential, Agriculture, Public/Quasi-Public, and Open Space/Passive Recreation.

**Subarea C**

Existing land uses in Subarea C are residential, agricultural, and recreation/open space. County zoning designations include Residential, Recreation, and Agriculture. The City's proposed land use designations are Residential, Agriculture, and Open Space/Passive Recreation.

**Subarea D**

Existing land uses in Subarea D include the Ocean Meadows Golf Course, UCSB North Campus, the Venoco Ellwood Oil Marine Terminal, and the COPR area. Area D is located within the Joint Proposal area for the Ellwood-Devereux Coast, which is a collaborative effort by the City of Goleta, UCSB, City of Santa Barbara, and the County of Santa Barbara to preserve about 665 acres of open space for habitat, passive recreation, and public access (County of Santa Barbara, 2005). The approved land development includes the Santa Barbara Development Partnership Residential Development at the Santa Barbara Shores Park property in Goleta, student and faculty housing on UCSB's North and West Campus properties, and a residential development on Ocean Meadows Golf Course under the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara (County of Santa Barbara, 2005). EIRs were prepared for each of the projects and approved prior to preparation of the GP/CLUP. The City intends to adopt the existing land use designations for the areas. The proposed land use designations include Planned Residential, Open Space/Active Recreation, and Open Space/Passive Recreation.

**Subarea E**

Existing land uses in Subarea E consist solely of the Glen Annie Golf Course. The County zoning designation is Agriculture. The City's proposed land use designation is Open Space/Active Recreation, to reflect the existing golf course use.

**4.10.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulations for the service areas are the same as those presented in Section 3.10, "Land Use and Recreation."

**4.10.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation****4.10.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.10, "Land Use and Recreation."

**4.10.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP Policies for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.10, "Land Use and Recreation."

**4.10.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation*****Class I Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class I impacts related to land use and recreation associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

## **Class II Impacts**

### Short-Term Impacts

There are no short-term Class II impacts.

### Long-Term Impacts

#### *Impact 4.10-1. Potential Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of Future Service Area Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities*

The future service area/sphere of influence includes lands within the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara, UCSB, California Coastal Commission, and a variety of special districts. Limited buildout of future service area/sphere of influence land uses may have the potential to conflict with policies and/or regulations of the other agencies that maintain full or partial jurisdiction within those service areas. Of specific concern are the locations of Service Areas A, and D with respect to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport RPZs, as follows:

- **Area A:** The southern portion of Area A is within a Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) for the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. The proposed land use designation of Area A, Agriculture, is consistent with the regulations and restrictions for land uses within the RPZ.
- **Area D:** Portions of Area D are within the RPZ. The proposed land use designation of the portion of Area D located within the RPZ is planned residential. Because this portion of the Area D is not located within one mile of the runway end, residential uses would not conflict with the regulations and restrictions for land uses within the RPZ. Proposed land uses of the remaining portions of Subarea D are planned residential, recreation, and open space/passive recreation. These land uses are not anticipated to include uses that which would result in large concentrations of people, such as schools, hospitals, apartment blocks, or shopping centers beneath "downwind and base legs or departure paths" of frequently used traffic patterns.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.10-1. The implementation of proposed GP/CLUP policies listed under Impact 3.10-3 would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant.

## **Class III Impacts**

### Short-Term Impacts

There are no short-term Class III impacts related to land use and recreation associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

### Long-Term Impacts

#### *Impact 4.10-2. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due To Buildout of Future Service Area Land Uses*

The California Coastal Act requires that Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) be protected; therefore, any land uses proposed within the Coastal Zone must comply with the Coastal Zone policies that protect ESHAs. Area D is located within the Coastal Zone and County LCP area. Buildout of Area D land uses therefore have the potential to conflict with Coastal Zone policies that protect ESHAs. However, impacts were previously considered in the EIRs prepared for the projects. No additional development other than what has been previously approved is proposed in this area; therefore, no additional impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is required.

**Class IV Impacts**

There are no short- or long-term Class IV impacts related to land use and recreation associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

**4.10.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.10, "Land Use and Recreation."

**4.10.3.5 Mitigation****Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies**

No modifications are required.

**Additional Mitigation**

No additional mitigation is identified.

**4.10.3.6 Residual Impacts**

There would be no residual impacts.

**4.11 NOISE**

The following section describes the existing noise setting in relation to the potential future Goleta service area/sphere of influence.

**4.11.1 Existing Conditions**

Existing land uses in each of the subareas are described in Section 3.10, "Land Use and Recreation." Figures 3.11-1 and 3.11-2 indicate how noise from roadways, the railroad, and the airport affects each of the subareas. Although noise monitoring was not conducted in the future service area for this GP/CLUP EIR, noise levels measured at monitoring locations in nearby areas are representative of noise levels in the service area as follows (refer to Figure 3.11-1 and 3.11-2 for measurement position numbers):

**Subarea A**

- Positions 23, 24, and 25

**Subarea B**

- Positions 20, 21, and 22

**Subarea C**

- Positions 13, 14, 17, and 18

**Subarea D**

- Positions 30, 31, and 32

**Subarea E**

- Positions 3, 4, and 6

**4.11.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulations for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.11, "Noise."

**4.11.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation****4.11.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.11, "Noise."

**4.11.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP Plan Policies for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.11, "Noise."

**4.11.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation*****Class I Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class I impacts related to noise associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

***Class II Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class II impacts related to noise associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

***Class III Impacts***

Short- and long-term Class III impacts related to noise for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.11, "Noise."

***Class IV Impacts***

There are no short- or long-term Class IV impacts related to noise associated with the service area/sphere of influence.

**4.11.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.11, "Noise."

**4.11.3.5 Mitigation*****Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies***

No modifications are required.

**Additional Mitigation**

No additional mitigation is identified.

**4.11.3.6 Residual Impacts**

There would be no residual impacts.

**4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES****4.12.1 Existing Conditions**

The following section describes the existing public services and utilities setting in relation to the potential future Goleta service area/sphere of influence.

**Subarea A**

Area A is currently unincorporated County land. Public service and utility providers include the County Sheriff's Department, County Fire Department, Santa Barbara public library system, Goleta Water District, Goleta Sanitation District, Tajiguas Landfill, Southern California Edison, The Gas Company, and the Goleta Union Elementary and Santa Barbara High School Districts.

**Subarea B**

Public service and utility providers for Area B are the same as those identified for Area A.

**Subarea C**

Public service and utility providers for Area C are the same as those identified for Area A. In addition, Mountain View Elementary School (part of the Goleta Union Elementary School District) is located in Area C. Students from Mountain View subsequently attend either Goleta Junior High School or La Colina Junior High School.

**Subarea D**

Public service and utility providers for Area D are the same as those identified for Area A, with the exception of wastewater service, which is provided by the Goleta West Sanitation District.

**Subarea E**

Public service and utility providers for Area E are the same as those identified for Area D.

**4.12.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulations for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.12, "Public Services and Utilities".

### 4.12.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.12.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

Thresholds of significance for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those presented in Section 3.12, "Public Services and Utilities".

#### 4.12.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies

GP/CLUP policies for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.12, "Public Services and Utilities".

#### 4.12.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation

##### ***Class I Impacts***

###### Short-Term Impacts

There would be no short-term Class I Impacts.

###### Long-Term Impacts

There would be no long-term Class I Impacts.

##### ***Class II Impacts***

###### Short-Term Impacts

There would be no short-term Class II impacts.

###### Long-Term Impacts

Long-term Class II impacts related to public services and utilities associated with the service areas are the same as those identified in Section 3.12, "Public Services and Utilities."

##### ***Class III Impacts***

###### *Impact 4.12-1. Exceedance of Capacity of Landfills to Accommodate Additional Solid Waste Stream*

Future annexation of the service area/sphere of influence would slightly increase the daily volume of solid waste generated within the City; however, impacts are not considered significant since all nonhazardous solid waste in the services areas are currently handled by the Tajiguas Landfill. The County of Santa Barbara Public Works Department has indicated that regional landfill capacity in the County system is adequate, and that the Taiguas Landfill has a permitted capacity of 23,300,000 cubic yards with an estimated closing date of 2020 (UCSB 2004). Implementation of Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development would limit development in the event that landfill capacity is achieved. The objective of the policy is to ensure that land use decisions are based on the planned capacity of capital facilities and that such facilities are provided when they are needed to support new development. Implementation of this policy and subpolicies would ensure impacts remain less than significant.

##### ***Class IV Impacts***

There would be no short- or long-term Class IV impacts.

#### **4.12.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.12, “Public Services and Utilities.”

#### **4.12.3.4 Mitigation**

##### ***Modifications to Proposed General Plan Policies***

No modifications are required.

##### ***Additional Mitigation***

No additional mitigation is identified.

#### **4.12.3.6 Residual Impacts**

There would be no residual impacts.

### **4.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION**

#### **4.13.1 Existing Conditions**

The following section describes the existing transportation and circulation setting in relation to the potential future Goleta service area/sphere of influence.

The transportation setting in the service area/sphere of influence is similar to that of the City as described in Section 3.13. Listed below are the traffic analysis intersections located within or adjacent to the five subareas within the proposed sphere of influence. Their jurisdiction and existing LOS is also provided.

##### ***Subarea A***

- Hollister Avenue/SR-217 SB Ramp—Goleta—LOS C (V/C = 0.79)
- Hollister Avenue/SR-217 NB Ramp—Goleta—LOS B (V/C = 0.68)
- Hollister Avenue/Patterson Avenue—Goleta—LOS C (V/C = 0.79)

##### ***Subarea B***

- Cathedral Oaks/Cambridge Drive—Goleta—on border with Area C (see following section)
- Cathedral Oaks/Kellogg Avenue—County—on border with Area C (see following section)
- Cathedral Oaks/Patterson Avenue—County—on border with Area C (see following section)

##### ***Subarea C***

- Cathedral Oaks/Cambridge Drive—Goleta—LOS A (V/C = 0.31)—on border with Area B
- Cathedral Oaks/Kellogg Avenue—County—LOS A (V/C = 0.37)—on border with Area B
- Cathedral Oaks/Patterson Avenue—County—LOS B (V/C = 0.63)—on border with Area B
- Patterson Avenue/University Drive—County—LOS A (V/C = 0.52)

- Patterson Avenue/Calle Real—County—LOS A (V/C = 0.59)
- Patterson Avenue/US-101 NB Ramp—Goleta—LOS C (V/C = 0.72)
- Patterson Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp—Goleta—LOS D (V/C = 0.89)  
[Exceeds standard of LOS C]

#### **Subarea D**

- Storke Road/Phelps Road—Goleta—LOS A (V/C = 0.42)
- El Colegio/Storke Road—County—LOS B (V/C 0.65)

#### **Subarea E**

- Cathedral Oaks/Glen Annie Road—Goleta—LOS B (V/C = 0.62)
- Cathedral Oaks/Alameda Avenue—Goleta—LOS A (V/C = 0.46)

Listed below are the traffic analysis roadway segments located within or adjacent to the service area/sphere of influence. Their jurisdiction and existing LOS is also provided.

#### **Subarea A**

- Hollister Avenue, west of Patterson Avenue—Existing ADT 17,800, which is under LOS C threshold of 34,000 at this location

#### **Subarea E**

- Cathedral Oaks, west of Glen Annie— Existing ADT 9,700, which is under LOS C threshold of 14,300 at this location

### **4.13.2 Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulations for the service areas are the same as those presented in Section 3.13, “Transportation and Circulation.”

### **4.13.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation**

#### **4.13.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

Level of Service (LOS) standards are used to evaluate the transportation impacts of long-term growth. In order to monitor roadway operations, cities and counties adopt standards by which the minimum acceptable roadway operating conditions are determined. The City of Goleta has adopted a standard of LOS C, which is applied citywide to major arterials, minor arterials, collector roadways, and signalized intersections. The City’s LOS standard is more stringent than the SBCAG’s regional Congestion Management Program (CMP) standard of LOS D—which applies to City intersections designated as part of the CMP system.

Other thresholds of significance for the service areas are the same as those presented in Section 3.13, “Transportation and Circulation.”

#### **4.13.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

GP/CLUP policies for the service area/sphere of influence are the same as those identified in Section 3.13, "Transportation and Circulation."

#### **4.13.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation**

##### ***Class I Impacts***

Class I impacts are classified as significant adverse impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated or avoided. For the Transportation Element, significant impacts are defined at locations where: (1) the adopted LOS standard is exceeded; and/or (2) the significance thresholds summarized in Table 3.13-5 are violated. To be classified as a Class I impact, no feasible mitigation can be identified.

##### Short-Term Impacts

No short-term Class I transportation/circulation impacts have been identified that would result from implementation of the 2030 Proposed Land Use in the service area/sphere of influence.

##### Long-Term Impacts

*Impact 4.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways*

One long-term Class I transportation impact has been identified on the border between Area B and Area C:

- Cathedral Oaks/Patterson Avenue—LOS C (V/C = 0.72) projected under the Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS B (V/C = 0.63) but would not be considered significant because it does not exceed thresholds defined in Table 3-13-5. LOS D is expected under cumulative conditions with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), which would exceed the current adopted standard of LOS C at this location. This would be considered a significant and unavoidable (Class I) transportation impact.

##### ***Class II Impacts***

Class II impacts are classified as significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated or avoided. For the Transportation Element, significant impacts are defined at locations where: (1) the adopted LOS standard is exceeded; and/or (2) the significance thresholds summarized in Table 3.13-5 are violated. To be classified as a Class II impact, a significant impact is identified under unmitigated conditions, but the impact is reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of transportation improvement or policy mitigation measures.

##### Short-Term Impacts

No short-term Class II transportation/circulation impacts have been identified that would result from implementation of the Proposed Land Use Plan.

##### Long-Term Impacts

*Impact 4.13-2. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways*

The following long-term Class II transportation impacts have been identified for the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10):

### **Subarea A**

- Hollister Avenue/SR-217 SB Ramp—LOS E is projected under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7).
- Hollister Avenue/Patterson Avenue—LOS D is projected under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7).

### **Subarea C**

- Patterson Avenue/US-101 NB Ramp— LOS D projected under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7), with a V/C increase of 0.04 over existing.
- Patterson Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp— LOS F projected under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS D. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7).

### **Class III Impacts**

For transportation and circulation, Class III impacts (adverse but less than significant) have been identified at locations where traffic volumes are expected to increase as a result of the proposed project, but neither the City LOS standards nor will the threshold criteria defined in Table 3.13-5 would be exceeded.

#### Short-Term Impacts

No short-term Class III transportation/circulation impacts have been identified that would result from implementation of the 2030 Proposed Land Use Alternative.

#### Long-Term Impacts

*Impact 4.13-3. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a LOS standard established by local jurisdictions for designated roadways or highways*

The following long-term Class III transportation impacts have been identified for the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10):

### **Subarea A**

- Hollister Avenue/SR-217 NB Ramp— Intersection projected to operate at LOS B (V/C = 0.70) under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), with an expected increase in V/C of 0.02 over the existing condition. LOS A is projected at this location with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7).
- Hollister Avenue, west of Patterson Avenue—Increase in ADT is projected to result from the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan, compared to existing conditions. However, with implementation of planned transportation improvements, ADT is projected to be under the LOS C thresholds.

**Subarea B**

- Cathedral Oaks/Cambridge Drive—On the border with Area C (see following section).
- Cathedral Oaks/Kellogg Avenue—On the border with Area C (see following section).

**Subarea C**

- Cathedral Oaks/Cambridge Drive— Intersection projected to operate at LOS A (V/C = 0.35) under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), with an expected increase in V/C of 0.04 over the existing condition. LOS A (V/C = 0.36) is projected at this location with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7). The expected V/C increase of 0.05 over the existing condition is less than the significance threshold defined in Table 3.13-5. (On the border with Service Area B.)
- Cathedral Oaks/Kellogg Avenue— Intersection projected to operate at LOS A (V/C = 0.39) under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), with an expected increase in V/C of 0.02 over the existing condition. LOS A (V/C = 0.41) is projected at this location with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7). The expected V/C increase of 0.04 over the existing condition is less than the significance threshold defined in Table 3.13-5. (On border with Service Area B.)
- Patterson Avenue/University Drive— LOS B projected under Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS A (V/C = 0.63). LOS C (V/C = 0.71) is expected under cumulative conditions with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7). The expected V/C increase of 0.08 over the existing condition is less than the significance threshold defined in Table 3.13-5.
- Patterson Avenue/Calle Real— Intersection projected to operate at LOS B (V/C = 0.65) under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), with an expected increase in V/C of 0.06 (from LOS A) over the existing condition. LOS B (V/C = 0.69) is projected at this location with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7). The expected V/C increase of 0.10 over the existing condition is less than the significance threshold defined in Table 3.13-5.

**Subarea D**

- Storke Road/Phelps Road— Intersection projected to operate at LOS A (V/C = 0.46) under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), with an expected increase in V/C of 0.04 over the existing condition. LOS A (V/C = 0.57) is projected at this location with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7). The expected V/C increase of 0.15 over the existing condition is less than the significance threshold defined in Table 3.13-5.

**Subarea E**

- Cathedral Oaks/Glen Annie Road— Intersection projected to operate at LOS B (V/C = 0.69) under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), with an expected increase in V/C of 0.07 over the existing condition. Improvement to LOS B (V/C = 0.66) is expected with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7). The expected V/C increase of 0.04 over the existing condition is less than the significance threshold defined in Table 3.13-5.
- Cathedral Oaks/Alameda Avenue— Intersection projected to operate at LOS A (V/C = 0.51) under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan (GP-10), with an expected decrease in V/C of 0.05 over the existing condition. Improvement to LOS A (V/C = 0.45) is expected with implementation of planned transportation improvements (GP-7).

- Patterson Avenue/University Drive—The intersection is projected to operate at LOS C under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan, with an expected increase in V/C of 0.02 over the No Action land use alternative.
- Cathedral Oaks, west of Glen Annie —Increase in ADT is projected to result from the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan, compared to existing conditions. However, with implementation of recommended transportation improvements, ADT is projected to be under the LOS C thresholds.

#### ***Class IV Impacts***

For the Transportation Element, Class IV impacts are defined at locations where 2030 conditions are projected to either remain unchanged or improve, with the proposed project in place.

#### **Short-Term Impacts**

No short-term Class IV transportation/circulation impacts have been identified that would result from implementation of the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan for the future service area/sphere of influence.

#### **Long-Term Impacts**

Class IV impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.13, "Transportation and Circulation."

#### **4.13.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.13, "Transportation and Circulation."

#### **4.13.3.5 Mitigation**

#### ***Modifications to GP/CLUP Policies***

No modifications are required.

#### ***Other Mitigation***

No additional mitigation is identified.

#### **4.13.3.6 Residual Impacts**

Residual impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.13, "Transportation and Circulation."

*This page intentionally left blank*

Chapter 4.0.....	1
FUTURE CITY Service Area/sphere of influence .....	1
4. 1          Visual Resources.....	2
4.1.1      Existing Conditions.....	2
4.1.2      Regulatory Framework .....	3
4.1.3      Service Area Impacts and Mitigation .....	3
4.2          Agriculture and Farmland.....	5
4.2.1      Existing Conditions.....	5
4.2.2      Regulatory Framework .....	6
4.2.3      Service Area Impacts and Mitigation .....	6
4.3          Air Quality .....	7
4.3.1      Existing Conditions.....	7
4.3.2      Regulatory Framework .....	7
4.3.3      Service Area Impacts and Mitigation .....	8
4.4          Biological Resources .....	9
4.4.1      Existing Conditions.....	9
4.4.2      Regulatory Framework .....	10
4.4.3      Service Area Impacts and Mitigation .....	11
4.5          cultural resources .....	12
4.5.1      Existing Conditions.....	12
4.5.2      Regulatory Framework .....	14
4.5.3      Service Area Impacts and Mitigation .....	14
4.6          Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources.....	15
4.6.1      Existing Conditions.....	15
4.6.2      Regulatory Framework .....	17
4.6.3      Service Area Impacts and Mitigation .....	18
4.7          hazards and Hazardous materials.....	22
4.7.1      Existing Conditions.....	22
4.7.2      Regulatory Framework .....	22
4.7.3      Project Impacts and Mitigation.....	23
4.8          Population and housing.....	27
4.8.1      Existing Conditions.....	27
4.8.2      Regulatory Framework .....	29
4.8.3      Project Impacts and Mitigation.....	29
4.9          Water Resources .....	31
4.9.1      Existing Conditions.....	31
4.9.2      Regulatory Framework .....	31
4.9.3      Service Area Impacts and Mitigation .....	32
4.10         Land Use and Recreation.....	33
4.10.1     Existing Conditions.....	33
4.10.2     Regulatory Framework .....	34
4.10.3     Project Impacts and Mitigation.....	34
4.11         Noise .....	36
4.11.1     Existing Conditions.....	36
4.11.2     Regulatory Framework .....	37

4.11.3	Project Impacts and Mitigation.....	37
4.12	Public Services and Utilities.....	38
4.12.1	Existing Conditions.....	38
4.12.2	Regulatory Framework.....	38
4.12.3	Project Impacts and Mitigation.....	39
4.13	Transportation and Circulation.....	40
4.13.1	Existing Conditions.....	40
4.13.2	Regulatory Framework.....	41
4.13.3	Project Impacts and Mitigation.....	41

## Acronyms

Planned Residential Development (PRD).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Recreation (REC).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Agriculture I (AG-I).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Agriculture II (AG-II).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Limited Commercial (C-1).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
General Commercial (C-3).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Design Residential (DR).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Public Works, Utilities and Private Service Facilities (PU).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Residential Ranchette (RR).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Single Family Residential (R-1/E-1).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## Citations

City of Goleta 2004a.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Bezore and Wills 2000.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2006a.....	21
County of Santa Barbara 2005.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
County of Santa Barbara, 2005.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
County of Santa Barbara, 2004a.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
USCB, 2004.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
SBA website, 2006.....	26
source: <a href="http://www.countyofsb.org/plandev/comp/programs/661/default.html">http://www.countyofsb.org/plandev/comp/programs/661/default.html</a> . Accessed: March 30, 2006.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan 1992.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
RBF Consulting 2004.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## Tables

Table 4.4-1 Habitat Types in The Potetnial Future Service Areas.....	10
--	----

## Figures

Figure 4-1.....	1
Table 4.4-1 Habitat Types in The Potetnial Future Service Areas.....	10

Miscellaneous

**Error! No table of figures entries found.**

Glossary

**Error! No table of figures entries found.**