1. **PROJECT TITLE:**
   Islamic Center Project; Case No. 03-051-RZ/DP/CUP

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

3. **CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:**
   Jennifer Carman, Planning and Environmental Review Director (805) 961-7541

4. **APPLICANT:**
   Islamic Society of Santa Barbara
   P.O. Box 714
   Goleta, CA 93116

   **AGENTS:**
   Kenneth Mineau
   117 West Micheltorena Street
   Santa Barbara, CA 93101

   MD Wahiduzzaman and
   Mukhtar Khan
   P.O. Box 714
   Goleta, CA 93116

5. **PROJECT LOCATION:**
   The project site is located at the northeast corner of Los Carneros Road and Calle Real (APN 077-160-035) in the City of Goleta (City). The property encompasses 22,854 gross square feet of area (22,716 net square feet). The site is located approximately 650 feet north of the U.S. Highway 101 northbound off-ramp at Los Carneros Road.
6. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project application includes the following requests:

1) A rezone from Highway Commercial (C-H) to Professional and Institutional (PI), which would be consistent with the Office and Institutional (I-OI) land use designation in the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, 2006, as amended, (GP/CLUP);

2) A development plan (DP) for a new 7,572 square foot building with space for a religious institution and a 1,400-square-foot residence. A 2,230-square-foot non-habitable basement is also proposed for a total building size of 9,802 square feet;

3) As part of the DP, (a) a modification of parking screening and landscaping requirements along property lines pursuant to Goleta Municipal Code (“GMC”), § 35-263.3, and (b) a modification to parking setback requirements in the front yard (Calle Real frontage) and the side yard (north property line) pursuant to GMC § 35-262.2.a.; and

4) A minor conditional use permit (CUP) to allow 1,400 square feet of the first floor to be used as a residential unit, which would be a secondary use to the permitted use.

Uses

The following uses are proposed: religious institution with associated assembly, office, education, dining room and residence. The building would include a 4,173-square-foot first floor and a 3,399 square-foot second floor. The first floor includes a lecture hall, offices, meeting rooms and a residential unit. The second-floor includes space for assembly use and a dining room. As food service would either be catered or brought in as a potluck, a kitchen is not proposed on the second floor. The
The basement area would be a non-habitable space that would be used for mechanical equipment and storage for trash and recycling receptacles.

The project would have typical activities associated with a religious institution including worship, fellowship and education. Specific features of the proposed project include the following:

- Activities occurring throughout the year on varying days of the week and times of the day as the building would be a community center for members and guests.

- The number of people would fluctuate depending on the day activity. The maximum number of attendees would be 120 persons including members and guests. Approximately 120 people may attend for Friday mid-day prayers and 10 to 20 people may attend for regular prayer services on other days of the week. The maximum attendance on Friday is 120 persons.

- An ancillary religious education program.

- Weddings, receptions and funerals are also proposed on-site uses. These events would occur throughout the year on various days of the week. These events would involve approximately 10-70 people.

- Up to four special events with approximately 120 persons in attendance are proposed throughout the year. Special events would include events such as interfaith-gatherings, educational speakers, open houses, and pot-lucks.

- The some special events would utilize a carpool, shuttle, or valet parking program when event participation is expected to exceed the site parking capacity.

**Site Plan**

The proposed building is located in the southwest corner of the site. The footprint is basically square and sits within the required setbacks. A 20-foot wide one-way driveway is proposed to curve around the building with forty-two angled parking spaces on either side. The 42 parking spaces would include 32 standard spaces, 8 compact spaces, and 2 ADA compliant spaces. The driveway entrance would be located at Los Carneros Road and the driveway exit would be located at Calle Real. The driveway entrance and exit are sited so that they would not interfere with the flow of traffic in the roundabout at the intersection of Los Carneros Road and Calle Real (Los Carneros roundabout). A new curb cut would be required on Calle Real for the driveway exit. The driveway would be composed of an impermeable material, pursuant to Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD) standards, while the parking spaces would be permeable.
There would be 4,974-square feet of landscaped area, where trees, various shrubs and a variety of ground cover would be planted.

Preliminary estimates of earthwork involve 4,500 cubic yards of excavation, 6,500 cubic yards of fill and 3,000 cubic yards of import. Finished grade would be two to three feet higher than the existing grade to match the Los Carneros roundabout improvements. The entire site would be graded for a driveway, parking and building construction. Stormwater drainage would flow from the northwestern portion of the site to the eastern/southeastern portion. A majority of the stormwater would flow over permeable parking areas and through landscaped areas. Drainage would either percolate back to the underlying groundwater basin through landscaped areas, the bioswale that runs along the west and south sides of the site or the permeable parking spaces throughout the site. Runoff would be collected along the curb and gutter on the eastern edge of the property and directed to the southeast corner of the site for release into an existing drainage ditch located just off the site.

The Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District would provide water and sewer service to the project. All new utilities would be located underground.
7. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Historical Site Information
The project site was originally part of Los Dos Pueblos Land Grant, now called Stow Ranch or La Patera Rancho. As such, the project site and surrounding areas have a long history of agricultural use. For many years, the site has been vacant with no on-site uses. In November 2012, the City constructed the Los Carneros roundabout, at the southwest corner of the project site. During construction, the project site was used to detour traffic around construction and serve as a soil and materials stockpile area and parking for construction vehicles. Paved sidewalks and landscaping abutting the western and southern perimeters of the project site were installed upon completion of construction of the Los Carneros roundabout.

Application Information
The original project application was submitted in 2003. The application, with a revised project description and new technical information, was found complete on July 19, 2007. The project's site plan and architecture were reviewed by the Design Review Board (DRB) at numerous meetings from 2007 through October 2012. In response to DRB input, the project architecture and site plan were revised. The DRB concluded Conceptual review on October 9, 2012. A Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (Draft MND) was prepared and released for circulation from November 25, 2011 through January 3, 2012. The applicant provided a revised project description regarding proposed uses in October 2012. In November 2012, the site plan was revised due to City construction of the Los Carneros roundabout, which included a change in property boundaries on the south and west sides of the site.
The plans were also refined at that time to address vehicle access and maneuvering requirements of the SBCFD and City Public Works Department. The final revised plans were submitted in February 2013. This Final Mitigated Negative Declaration is based upon the February 2013 plans and the revised project description provided in October 2012. The baseline for environmental analysis is the November 2011 Draft MND.

8. APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:

None
9. SITE INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Land Use Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Zone District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Use and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Surrounding Land Uses
This project site is a vacant 0.5-acre parcel, bordered on the north and east by the Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve (Preserve). Los Carneros Road abuts the parcel immediately to the west. Across Los Carneros Road to the west is Bishop Ranch, an approximately 292-acre agricultural property. Calle Real abuts the parcel immediately to the south. Across Calle Real to the south is a vacant 0.5-acre parcel and the adjacent Los Carneros Business Park, a 3.5 acre-lot.

Aesthetics
The west side of the project site abuts Los Carneros Road, which is designated as a Local Scenic Corridor by the GP/CLUP. The Preserve borders the site on the north and east sides and is designated as a Scenic Resource and Public Lands with View Opportunities by the GP/CLUP. Additionally, the Santa Ynez Mountains are designated as a Scenic
Resource by the GP/CLUP. Views of these resources are available from the project site and Los Carneros Road and Calle Real adjacent to the project site and in the general vicinity.

Cultural Resources
No cultural materials were identified on the project site (Dudek, 2008).

Biological Resources and Surface Water Bodies
Three vegetation communities are associated with the project site: Arroyo Willow Shrubland, Coast Live Oak Woodland, and Ruderal. The project site is dominated by ruderal vegetation, which covers approximately 98% of the project site. An arroyo willow is located on the eastern edge of the project site and a small fringe of coast live oak and arroyo willow canopy is located along the northern boundary of the project site, with the trunks rooted in the Preserve. There is no suitable nesting, roosting or foraging habitat for special status raptors within the project limits (Rincon, 2013).

Wildlife species observed or expected to occur in the vicinity of the project site are comprised of widespread species that are known to inhabit a variety of native and non-native habitats found in the Goleta Valley, including a variety of raptors including red-tailed hawks, Cooper’s hawks, American Kestral and White-tailed Kites.

The project site does not contain any hydrological features. Surface elevations range from about 54 feet above sea level in the northwest corner to about 48 feet in the southeast corner, and the site appears to drain in a southeastward direction on the site via sheet flow. Los Carneros Creek and Lake Los Carneros are the nearest water bodies. Los Carneros Creek watershed drains approximately 2,641 acres capable of generating 3,500 cubic feet per second of flood flow during a 100-year return period event. Los Carneros Creek watershed flows into the Goleta Slough and eventually into the Pacific Ocean (Rincon, 2013).

Topography and Soils
The project site is relatively flat with an overall slope of less than 1% across the property. The site is approximately three feet lower than the improvements associated with the Los Carneros roundabout. The most notable topographic feature in the immediate area is a drainage ditch that is located off-site. The drainage ditch runs from approximately 325 feet north of the site near Los Carneros Road to the northeast corner of the site. In addition, a drainage channel approximately three feet deep is located near the southeast corner of the property line and runs east from the site and parallel to Calle Real. The drainage ditch becomes shallow and then completely ends along Calle Real across from the California Highway Patrol Office.

A single soil map unit occurs on the project site: Goleta Fine Sandy Loam, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes. This soil map is not designated as hydric in coastal Santa Barbara County (United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service 2013b). Goleta Fine Sandy Loam, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes, is a well-drained, sandy loam soil formed from alluvium derived from sedimentary rock. It is typically found in valleys and toeslopes at elevations ranging from 20 to 500 feet with slopes ranging from 0 to 2 percent. Common land uses associated with Goleta Fine Sandy Loam, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes include irrigated crops. This soil map unit is found throughout the project site (Rincon, 2013). Site soils are not considered collapsible or expansive. Groundwater was encountered in borings at a depth of about 15 feet below the existing ground surface (Bengal Engineering, 2010).
Transportation/Traffic
The project site is served by two major arterial City streets and US Highway 101. The site is located at the northeastern corner of Los Carneros Road and Calle Real adjacent to the Los Carneros roundabout. Los Carneros Road is a major north/south arterial street and Calle Real is a major east/west arterial street. Signalized on-ramps and off-ramps for US Highway 101 are located to the south of the Los Carneros roundabout. Area roadway segments and intersections currently operate in acceptable ranges, Level of Service A, B or C (Penfield & Smith, November 2012).

11. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

12. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jennifer Carman, AICP
Planning and Environmental Review Director

13. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

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

(e) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(b)(1)(C). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

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

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

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

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

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

AESTHETICS

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

Existing Setting

The project site is currently vacant and supports mainly annual grass/weedy species. It is surrounded on the north and east sides by the undeveloped Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve (Preserve). The undeveloped Bishop Ranch is located to the west of the project site across Los Carneros Road. The project site abuts the Los Carneros roundabout that includes sidewalks along the west and south side of the project site. Landscaping exists in the right-of-way planter between the sidewalks and the roadway on the west and south sides of the project site. Two street light standards exist in the public right-of-way between the Los Carneros roundabout and the project site on the west and south borders of the site that provide night lighting at the site. Figures A-1 and A-2 show the existing site and surrounding setting.
Figure A-1
View of Site Looking North

Figure A-2
View of Adjacent Development Looking South
The GP/CLUP Visual and Historic Element Policy 1.2 designates as a Local Scenic Corridor, Los Carneros Road that is located on the west side of the property. Policy VH 1.1 designates the adjacent Preserve and the more distant foothills and the Santa Ynez Mountains as Scenic Resources. Views of these resources are currently available from the site and public rights-of-way from both Los Carneros Road and Calle Real adjacent to the project site. From the public roadway and sidewalks adjacent to the site, a portion of the views to the Santa Ynez Mountains are obscured by existing tree canopies. No other public views of natural landforms or open space are available from the vicinity of the project site.

The GP/CLUP policies in the Visual and Historic Element address views, scenic corridors, maintenance of neighborhood identity and appropriate building and site design as follows:

VH 1.1 Scenic Resources
VH 1.2 Scenic Resources Map (Figure 6-1)
VH 1.4 Protection of Mountain and Foothill Views
VH 1.5 Protection of Open Space Views
VH 2.1 Designated Scenic Corridors
VH 2.2 Preservation of Scenic Corridors
VH 2.3 Development Projects along Scenic Corridors
VH 3.1 Community Character
VH 3.2 Neighborhood Identity
VH 3.3 Site Design and Building Design
VH 3.4 Building Design
VH 4.9 Landscape Design
VH 4.11 Parking Lots

The City’s Design Review Board (DRB) is required to review the project and grant approval. Aspects of the DRB review relevant to this project include building height, bulk and scale, physical relation to the immediately affected surrounding area, site layout, orientation and location of buildings and relationship with open areas, on-site lighting, as well as location and type of landscaping. The DRB By-Laws include 20 findings related to the aspects described above. These findings must be made by the DRB to grant project approval. The DRB reviewed the project and finalized Conceptual Review based on the architecture shown in Figure A-3 and Figure A-4.
Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) Scenic Resources. Policy VH 1.1 identifies two scenic resources that should be considered for this project: 1) the Santa Ynez Mountains and 2) the Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve (Preserve). Pursuant to GP/CLUP Policy VH 1.4 Protection of Mountain Views and VH 1.5 Protection of Open Space Views, the project design has incorporated many of the specified development practices for minimizing intrusion into scenic resources, as follows:

- No proposal for walls or fencing
- Stepping the height of building elements
- Use of downcast, fully shielded, full cut off lighting.
- Native vegetation removal has been limited to trimming a small portion of one oak tree canopy and an arroyo willow with multiple branches.
- Revegetation of a vacant site that is comprised of weedy plant species.
- Use of landscaping for screening purposes.
- No use of reflective materials and colors on the building and fencing.
- Selection of building materials that harmonize with the surrounding neighborhood.
• Clustering the building components in the southwest corner of the site to minimize any loss of scenic vistas associated with the Santa Ynez Mountains.
• Limitation of building height to 35 feet.

Santa Ynez Mountains: The applicant has provided a photo-simulation that demonstrates the view of the proposed building as seen from Los Carneros Road looking north and northeast toward the Santa Ynez Mountains (Figure A-3). Additionally, architectural illustrations of the proposed building show the elevations including planned landscaping (Figure A-4). These graphics were accepted and utilized by the DRB during their Conceptual Review of the project.

In addition to the photo simulation, the applicant erected story poles for the DRB and public's consideration. Upon review of the story poles and photo simulations, the DRB requested that the proposed building location be moved from the center of the site to the southwest corner of the site. This would keep the height of the building at or below the tree tops located in the background of the north and northeast viewsheds. This relocation of the proposed building on the site minimizes interruption of views from the adjacent areas toward the Santa Ynez Mountains. During the DRB review process, the project’s architecture was designed to be compatible with rural historical Goleta vernacular. The architecture as well as the size, bulk, and scale of the two-story building were deemed to be acceptable by the DRB. The DRB finalized Conceptual Review of the project in November 2012. In completing Conceptual Review, the project’s site design and architecture were determined appropriate to continue through the discretionary permit process. Due to the building’s proposed location at the southwest corner of the site, the background of existing tree canopy and the project’s incorporation of the development standards prescribed by VH 1.4 and 1.5, the impact of views from Los Carneros Road and Calle Real to the Santa Ynez Mountains scenic resource would be less than significant.
Figure A-4
Conceptual Project Architecture with Landscaping
North and West Elevations
(Appleton and Associates Architects)

The Preserve: The General Plan Land Use Element designates the site for Office and Institutional uses and the Zoning Ordinance currently designates the site for Highway Commercial uses. Given that the GP/CLUP and Inland Zoning Ordinance envision development on this small site adjacent to the Preserve, the proposal for a new building is appropriate. Foreground views of the proposed building looking north from Calle Real and also east into the Preserve, a designated Scenic Resource, would be interrupted by the proposed building for persons that pass by. Although the majority of the Preserve dominates the neighborhood as a scenic resource, the interrupted view would result in a potentially significant impact. An important element for this project is the provision of landscaping pursuant to Policy VH 4.9., Landscape Design. Ample screening of the proposed building would allow it to blend with views into the Preserve. A mitigation measure requiring ample landscape screening for the building is required to reduce the potentially significant foreground view impacts of the Preserve Scenic Resource. The requirement for large-scale broad canopy non-deciduous trees that blend with the adjacent natural environment will not only screen the building but will also provide a visual extension of the Preserve vegetation onto the site. Biological Resources mitigation measures require the use of native trees and non-invasive plants for compatibility with the Preserve vegetation. Additionally, a mitigation measure will ensure that the building height is constructed as permitted. This will ensure that views of the Preserve Scenic...
Resource will remain as planned. With these mitigations, potentially significant foreground visual impacts to the Preserve are reduced to less than significant.

Scenic View Corridors. The City’s Visual and Historic Resources Element, Policy VH 2.1 identifies Los Carneros Road from Highway 101 to Cathedral Oaks as a Local Scenic Corridor. The proposed building would be located on the east side of the Los Carneros Road Local Scenic Corridor when traveling north by walking, bicycle or car. View impacts looking to the north along this Scenic Corridor would be considered less than significant due to the proposed building’s location to the east of the view corridor. Foreground views at the roundabout looking north or south along the Scenic Corridor would contain the proposed building. Depending on proximity to the building, its encroachment into the view would vary. The height of the proposed building is important to maintain (an average of 35 feet) to limit the height and scale in foreground views. The view interruption in the Scenic Corridor is a potentially significant impact. With mitigation measures, the impact would be less than significant.

Policy 4.9, Landscape Design, requires landscaping to be incorporated into the site design to soften building masses and provide screening. A mitigation measure requiring landscape screening for the building is necessary. As discussed above, the requirement for large-scale broad canopy non-deciduous trees that blend with the natural environment will not only screen the building but will also provide a visual extension of the Preserve woodland onto the site. Additionally, a landscape maintenance agreement would be required to ensure that the plantings will provide long-term screening. With these mitigations, potential visual impacts are reduced to less than significant.

a) State Scenic Highway. The project site does not lie within, or affect any views from a Scenic Highway as designated by the State of California. As such, the project would not result in significant impacts on scenic resources within a Scenic Highway viewshed.

b) Visual Character of Site and Surroundings. The project site is a 0.5 acre vacant parcel containing mainly of annual grass and weedy species and therefore has an open space character. Visual and Historic Resources Element Policies 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 require new development to be compatible with existing architectural styles and to maintain neighborhood context and scale. The project would change the character of the site from vacant/open space to one that is developed with a two-story building, landscaping and parking. The site is located within a developed suburban Goleta neighborhood. Development on this site would be an extension of neighborhood commercial buildings and parking lots on land south of the project. A church, located on the corner of Los Carneros and Covington Way, is approximately 1,000 feet north of the project site. The South Coast Railroad Museum and the Stow House historic buildings are located approximately 900 feet north of the project site in the Preserve. The proposed building emulates rural historic Goleta architecture and therefore is compatible with the Railroad Museum and Stow House buildings. The project would add some variety and presence to this section the of Los Carneros/Calle Real neighborhood. The project architecture would have a less than significant impact on compatibility with adjacent development. However, the aesthetic quality of the architecture may be compromised if certain unsightly elements, including utilities and mechanical equipment, are not properly concealed. This impact is potentially significant to the visual character of the site. This impact can be mitigated to less than significant with the mitigation measure below.

To the north and east of the project site, is the undeveloped 141-acre Preserve that has a natural environmental character. The project would be developed on a vacant weedy
parcel that is not within the natural environs of the Preserve. The proposed building
would be located on the parcel at the furthest southwestern edge, maximizing the
distance from the building to the Preserve open space. Ample site landscaping with
broad canopy non-deciduous trees, as called for in the mitigation measures outlined
below, would extend the general vegetation character of the Preserve onto the project
site. Therefore, with these mitigations, a less than significant impact to neighborhood
character would occur.
Visual and Historic Resources Element Policy 4.11 requires parking lots to be
adequately designed and landscaped. The proposed 42-space parking lot is designed as
a strip along the one-way driveway located behind the building on the east side. Parking
space proximity to adjacent vegetation from the Preserve, the permeable paving, as well
as the intermittent planting of trees between parking spaces, provide minimal visual relief
to paved parking areas. As the proposed landscaping plan does not provide a significant
number of screening trees or shrubs, a potentially significant impact would be associated
with parking lot landscape screening. With the landscape mitigation below for broad
canopy, non-deciduous trees, the impact would be less than significant.

**d) Lighting.** Visual and Historic Element Policy VH 4.11 addresses parking lot lighting for
selection and location and VH 12 provides standards for outdoor lighting. The project
lighting plan adheres to these standards. It includes two hooded wall scones with frosted
glass at each exterior door and low voltage path lighting on the site. The parking lot
would also be lit with low voltage path lighting in the parking lot planters. All exterior
lighting on the project site is proposed to be of low intensity, low glare design and
hooded to direct light downward and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels (Appleton &
Associates). Given the existing night lighting from the street lights at the roadway
roundabout, project lighting impacts would be less than significant. However, a condition
of approval requires the lighting plan and a photometric analysis be reviewed and
approved by the DRB.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Over time, visual resources have changed and will continue to change as the City lands
develop. Public view losses of the Santa Ynez Mountains have occurred in conjunction with
new development within the City and are anticipated by the GP/CLUP for build-out.
Development of this small parcel would not interrupt mountain views from the immediate
area. The proposed building emulates rural historic Goleta architecture and therefore is
compatible with the Railroad Museum and Stow House buildings located to the north of the
site. The project would add some variety and presence to this section of the Los
Carneros/Calle Real neighborhood. Therefore, the project would not contribute cumulative
significant impacts to the visual character of the City.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

1. The project landscaping must provide ample landscape screening to break up the view
   of the building as seen from public view corridors along Los Carneros Road and Calle
   Real. Plantings must integrate the building and site with the surrounding Lake Los
   Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve. The final landscape plan must include dense
   planting of large-scale and broad canopy non-deciduous trees that provide screening of
   the building and are complementary to the Preserve woodland. (Native tree species to
   be considered are Coast Live Oak and as required in the Biological Resources Section,
   California Bay and/or California Walnut.) **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The
   landscape plan must be submitted for City staff and DRB Preliminary/Final review. This
plan must identify the type, location, size, and number of trees to be planted for screening purposes.

**Monitoring:** Prior to final inspection, City staff must verify that all trees have been planted per the approved landscape plan.

2. During the framing state of construction and prior to placement of roofing materials, the applicant must submit verification from a licensed surveyor demonstrating that the mean height and peak height conform to those shown on issued-LUP plan sets.

**Monitoring:** City staff must verify compliance prior to issuance of a land use permit (LUP), during field inspection, and prior to commencement of roofing.

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

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

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

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

5. The applicant must enter into a maintenance agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, to maintain required landscaping and water-conserving irrigation systems, on private property for an appropriate time period set by the City.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** A draft maintenance agreement must be submitted to the City Attorney for review and approval before the City issues any LUP for the project. The applicant must execute the landscape maintenance agreement before the City issues a certificate of occupancy. Performance securities for installation and
maintenance must be reviewed and approved by the City, before the City issues a certificate of occupancy.

**Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must check maintenance at intervals during the life of the maintenance agreement.

**Residual Impact**

Project specific and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the above-referenced mitigation measures.

Although not a required mitigation measure, the following would be a Condition of Approval for the DP:

1. Exterior night lighting must be of low intensity, low glare design, and must be hooded to direct light downward and prevent spill-over onto the Preserve adjacent lands. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The locations of all exterior light fixtures adjacent to Preserve must be shown on a site plan with cut-sheets of the fixtures, and a photometric exhibit showing light levels at the property lines. Plans must be approved by the DRB and City staff prior to LUP issuance.
**AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact.</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

The property is an undeveloped 22,854-square foot parcel and contains weedy plant species. The site does not have land that contains prime agricultural soils as shown in either the GP/CLUP Final Environmental Impact Report (GP/CLUP FEIR, 2006) or by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The Land Use Element of the GP/CLUP designates uses for land within the City. GP/CLUP Land Use Policy LU 1.1 and Figure 2-1 indicates that the project site is not designated for agricultural use but is currently designated Office and Institutional (I-OI). The property zone designation
is Highway Commercial (CH). A 30-acre fruit orchard, zoned AG-I (Agriculture-I) is located to the west of the project site across Los Carneros Road.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact to Agriculture and Forest Resources would occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, a project may pose a significant environmental effect on agricultural resources if it conflicts with The City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds Guidelines and Manual and the goals and policies in the GP/CLUP Land Use Element, which defines as significant any conversion of prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use or impairment of agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land.

Project Specific Impacts

a,c,d) Agricultural Use. The project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as mapped by the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use as it has not been identified as such farmland. The project site does not have agricultural zoning and is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. As no agricultural use occurs on-site, impairment of agricultural productivity would not occur. Therefore, the project would have no impact on agricultural resources in the area.

c,d,e) Forest Use. The project site is not zoned as forest lands or timberlands. No forest lands or timberlands occur on-site. The project would not result in any environmental changes that would involve the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses and therefore, the project would have no impact on forest resources in the area.

Cumulative Impacts

The project would not contribute to any cumulative impact on agriculture or forest resources as the site is not used for agriculture and is not designated as prime agricultural land. The project would not result in any environmental changes that would add to any cumulative loss of farmland to non-agricultural uses. There would be no cumulative impact to agriculture.

Required Mitigation Measures

No potentially significant impacts have been identified. Therefore no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impact

No residual impacts on Agriculture and Forest Resources would occur as a result of project implementation.
AIR QUALITY

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

Existing Setting

The climate in and around the City of Goleta, as well as most of Southern California, is controlled largely by the strength and position of the subtropical high-pressure cell over the Pacific Ocean. This high-pressure cell typically produces a Mediterranean climate with warm summers, mild winters, and moderate rainfall. This pattern is periodically interrupted by periods of extremely hot weather brought on by Santa Ana winds from the northeast. Almost all precipitation occurs between November and April, although during these months, the weather is sunny or partly sunny a majority of the time. Cyclic land and sea breezes are the primary factors affecting the region’s mild climate. The daytime winds are normally sea breezes, predominantly from the west, that flow at relatively low velocities. Additionally, cool, humid, marine air causes frequent fog and low clouds along the coast, usually during the night and morning hours in the late spring and early summer. The effect of wind patterns on air pollution is that locally generated emissions are carried off-shore at night and toward inland Santa Barbara County by day. Dispersion of pollutants is restricted when the wind velocity for nighttime breezes is low. Both summer and winter air quality in the project area is generally very good.

Surface temperature inversions (0 to 500 feet) are most frequent during the winter, and subsidence inversions (1000 to 2000 feet) are most frequent during the summer. Inversions are an increase in temperature with height and directly related to the stability of the atmosphere. Inversions act as a cap to the pollutants that are emitted below or within them. The subsidence inversion is very common during the summer along the California coast, and is one of the principal causes of air stagnation. Poor air quality is usually associated with air stagnation (high stability/restricted air movement).
The Federal Government and the State of California have established air quality standards and emergency episode criteria for various pollutants. Generally, State regulations have stricter standards than those at the Federal level. Air quality standards are set at concentrations that provide a sufficient margin of safety to protect public health and welfare. Air quality at a given location can be described by the concentration of various pollutants in the atmosphere. The significance of a pollutant concentration is determined by comparing the concentration to an appropriate Federal and/or State ambient air quality standard.

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

**Criteria Air Quality Pollutants**

The air quality pollutants of primary concern include ozone ($O_3$), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide ($NO_2$), sulfur dioxide ($SO_2$), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter ($PM_{10}$), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$). Also regulated are sulfates, lead, hydrogen sulfide ($H_2S$), and vinyl chloride.

Ozone air pollution is formed when nitrogen oxides ($NO_x$) and reactive organic compounds/gases (ROC/ROG) react in the presence of sunlight. According to the SBC APCD, the major sources of ozone precursor emissions in Santa Barbara County are motor vehicles, the petroleum industry, and solvent usage (paints, consumer products, and certain industrial processes). Sources of $PM_{10}$ include grading, demolition, agricultural tilling, road dust, mineral quarries, and vehicle exhaust. A fraction of the $PM_{10}$ is comprised of ultra-small particulates capable of being inhaled deep into the lungs ($PM_{2.5}$).

**Existing Air Quality**

The project is located in Santa Barbara County which is within the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB). The SCCAB encompasses San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties. Depending on whether or not standards are met or exceeded, the County is classified as being "in attainment" or as "non-attainment." Santa Barbara County is in non-attainment for the state 8-hour ozone standard and the state standard for $PM_{10}$. The County is unclassified for the state $PM_{2.5}$ standard and the federal $PM_{10}$ standard. The County is in attainment for all other standards. The APCD operates a monitoring station near the project site at North Fairview Avenue in Goleta. Local pollutants that are measured include $O_3$ (ozone), CO (carbon monoxide), $NO_x$ (nitrogen oxides) and particulates ($PM_{10}$ and $PM_{2.5}$). APCD published data from the Goleta monitoring station indicates that between 2010 and 2012 the only exceedence of air quality standards was one day for the state 8-hour ozone standard in 2011.

**Sensitive Receptors**

Pollutant-sensitive members of the population are "sensitive receptors. These sensitive receptors include outdoor workers, children, elderly and the infirm, as well as members of the population that are more likely to be negatively affected by poor air quality. GP/CLUP Conservation Element Policy 12.3 controls emission during construction projects as a method of protecting areas where sensitive receptors may reside or work. Residential neighborhoods are areas where sensitive receptors reside. The closest residential neighborhood to the project site is approximately 1,000 feet to the north.
Air Quality Planning
The APCD is required to prepare an overall plan for air quality improvement, known as the Clean Air Plan (CAP). The 2010 CAP is currently being updated but a 2013 CAP has not yet been adopted. The CAP is designed to meet and maintain Federal clean air standards with a goal of attaining the state 1-hour ozone standard. The adopted 2010 CAP incorporates updated data and is currently the most recent Clean Air Plan for meeting the State ozone standard.

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

1. Interfere with progress toward the attainment of the ozone standard by releasing emissions which equal or exceed 25 lbs/day of NOX (nitrogen oxides) and/or ROC/ROG.
2. Equal or exceed the State or Federal ambient air quality standards for any criteria pollutant (as determined by modeling);
3. Result in toxic or hazardous air pollutants in amounts which may increase cancer risks for the affected population.
4. Causes an odor nuisance problem impacting a considerable number of people.

The APCD has set significance thresholds (Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents, APCD, 2010). While the City of Goleta has not yet adopted any new threshold criteria, these APCD thresholds are considered appropriate for use as a guideline for impact analysis and the determination of significant impacts:

APCD Operational Impact Thresholds & Air Quality Plan Impacts: The project would result in a significant impact, either individually or cumulatively, if it would:

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

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

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

Under APCD Rule 202 D.16 (2012) (www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule202.pdf), if the combined emissions from all equipment used to construct a stationary source which requires an Authority to Construct permit (e.g. generator), have the potential to exceed 25 tons of any pollutant, except carbon monoxide, in a 12-month period, the applicant must provide offsets under the provisions of APCD Rule 804 (2012) (www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule804.pdf) and must demonstrate that no ambient air quality standard will be violated. APCD Rule 345 (www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule345.pdf) regulates generation of dust at demolition and construction sites. According to this rule, earth moving activities must not cause discharge into the atmosphere beyond the property line, visible dust emissions of 20% opacity or greater for a period or periods aggregating more than 3 minutes in any 60 minute period.

**Project Specific Impacts**

The City’s methodology for quantifying criteria pollutant emissions uses the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2011.1.1 for identifying short-term construction and long-term operational impacts.

**Short-Term Construction Impacts:**

### Table AQ-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thresholds</td>
<td>25 tons/year</td>
<td>25 tons/year</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>80 lbs/day</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: CalEEMod v.2011.1.1 model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Construction Impacts to Air Quality Plans.** Short-term air quality impacts may occur during project grading and construction. Preliminary earthwork quantities are estimated at 4,500-cubic yards of cut/excavation, 6,500-cubic yards of fill and 3,000-cubic yards of import. Emissions from equipment also occur. Short-term construction impacts have been modeled in Table AQ-1. As shown, the project results in 0.23 tons/year ROG and 0.85 tons/year NOX from construction equipment. These levels are significantly below the APCD recommended construction standard of 25 tons/year. These impacts are considered less than significant and do not interfere with implementation of air quality plans (discussed in the Air Quality Planning section above).

**b) Short-Term Construction Emissions.** Table AQ-1 also indicates that PM10 dust is projected to be 0.01 tons/year (0.38 pounds/year) year which is significantly below the
APCD 80 pounds per day (lbs/day) threshold standard. APCD Rule 345 (stated in the Thresholds discussed above) would also apply. Due to the area’s non-attainment status for PM$_{10}$, APCD requires fugitive dust control measures as standard practice for any project with earth-moving activities. APCD requested conditions regarding fugitive dust control, diesel particulate and NOx emissions (APCD letter, December 20, 2011) to be incorporated into conditions of approval. Based on the minimal pollutants generated by this project and implementation of standard APCD requirements, construction-related impacts will be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

d) **Sensitive Receptors (Construction).** Construction pollutant concentrations are an air quality issue for sensitive receptors. Because the site is not immediately adjacent to residential or commercial uses, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to construction activities. Health effects may be associated with ultra-small diameter (2.5 microns or smaller) particulate matter known as PM$_{2.5}$. This ultra-small particulate matter is composed of a mixture of particles directly emitted into the air, and particles formed in the air from the chemical transformation of gaseous pollutants such as sulfates, nitrates, or organic material. Currently, APCD guidelines do not list a threshold for PM$_{2.5}$ from construction activities. Construction equipment exhaust contains carcinogenic compounds within the diesel exhaust particulates. Exhaust emissions would be generated by the operation of vehicles and equipment on the construction site. The majority of construction equipment and vehicles would be diesel powered, which tends to be more efficient than gasoline-powered equipment, producing lower carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions than gasoline-powered equipment; however, diesel-powered equipment produces greater amounts of NO$_x$, SO$_x$, and particulates per hour of activity. Due to the project’s very low levels of construction pollutants, as shown in Table AQ-1, and the distance to potential sensitive receptors (approximately 1,000 feet to closest residential neighborhood), construction of the project is not expected to result in a significant public health risk associated with project-related heavy equipment operations exhaust. Therefore, no significant impact is expected and mitigation measures are not required.

e) **Odors (Construction).** Construction of new parking areas onsite would require application of aggregate concrete (AC aka asphalt) that could create objectionable odors. Such odors would be temporary and localized. APCD Rule 329, [www.sbapcd.org/rules/download/rule329](http://www.sbapcd.org/rules/download/rule329) a prohibitory rule governing the application of cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials in the County, would apply to all project paving activities. The site is not located immediately adjacent to existing residential or commercial uses. The closest development is the commercial buildings across Calle Real to the south of the site. As this development is not located in close proximity to the construction site, construction odor impacts would be less than significant.
Long-term Operational Impacts:

Table AQ-2
Project Operations – Mobile and Area Source Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2014</th>
<th>Emissions (lbs/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sources</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCD Threshold</td>
<td>25/55\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Transportation (mobile) sources only/total emissions.

\textsuperscript{**} No APCD thresholds are adopted.

\textit{Source: CalEEMod v.2011.1.1 Model}

a, b) Long-Term Air Plan/Emissions. A long-term pollutant emission analysis for the project was conducted using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2011.1.1 air quality modeling software for the 2014 condition. The model was used to calculate area source emissions from the increased operation of the new buildings and the resulting vehicular emissions for the increase of daily trips to/from the site. The model assumes that operation of the project would begin in 2014. The calculation results are given in pounds per day (lbs/day). The modeling results are shown above in Table AQ-2. ROG and NO\textsubscript{X} total 0.09, significantly less than the APCD threshold standard of 240 lbs/day from all sources. ROG from vehicle trips is 0.01 and NO\textsubscript{X} is 0.02, both well below the APCD threshold standard of 25 lbs/day. Long-term operational project impacts on air quality due to ROG and NO\textsubscript{X} will not impact the region’s ability to meet air quality attainment goals and would be considered less than significant. PM\textsubscript{10} levels are shown to be 0.01 lbs/day, less than the APCD threshold standard of 80 lbs/day. Therefore, no significant impacts are expected and mitigation measures are not required.

c) Cumulative Analysis. (see below)

d, e) Sensitive Receptors/Odors. The project site is not located immediately adjacent to potential sensitive receptors in residential or commercial uses. The closest sensitive receptors would be located in the residential neighborhood located approximately 1,000 feet to the north of the project site. NO\textsubscript{X} emissions from energy sources during project operations are calculated to be 0.01 lbs/day, less than the APCD threshold of 25 lbs/day. The operation of the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and would be a less than significant impact. The proposed building with assembly and related uses and a residential unit would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. The impact from pollution concentrations and odor would be less than significant impact.

Cumulative Impacts

The significance thresholds used for air quality analysis on a project level (25 lbs per day of NO\textsubscript{X} or ROG from transportation sources only) also address cumulative air quality impacts. The project’s operational emissions would not exceed these thresholds; therefore the project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considered less than significant.
Due to the area’s non-attainment status for PM$_{10}$, APCD requires standard fugitive dust control measures for any project with earth-moving activities, as stated above. With implementation of these standard measures and rules, the project would not result in a potentially significant cumulative impact related to PM$_{10}$ emissions.

A project’s consistency with the Clean Air Plan (CAP), the County’s plan to achieve attainment status of the ozone standard, is based on consistency with growth forecasts used in developing the CAP. The current CAP (2010) used forecast data from the 2007 Regional Growth Forecast prepared by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). This forecast is based on development anticipated by general plans, in this case the City’s GP/CLUP, 2006, as amended.

Although the project would increase the number of trips generated at the site, and thus associated air emissions, the assessment of consistency is based on whether or not the project would result in a total population that would exceed the forecast population. The proposed building with assembly related uses and one residential unit, is not anticipated to result in an increase in the City’s residential population that exceeds the forecasts used in the 2010 CAP. Therefore, the project is accounted for in the 2010 CAP growth projections and would not result in an inconsistency with the 2010 CAP. The project’s contribution to regional cumulative air quality impacts is considered less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

No potentially significant impacts have been identified. Therefore no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impact

No residual impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

Although not a required mitigation measure, the following items will be Conditions of Approval:

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

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

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

   c) Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce onsite vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.
d) Gravel pads, knock-off plates, or similar BMPs, must be installed at all access points to the project site to prevent tracking of mud onto roadways.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

c) All commercial diesel vehicles are subject to limitations on idling time (Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9, Section 2485). Idling of heavy-duty diesel construction equipment and trucks during loading and unloading must be limited to five (5) minutes. Electric auxiliary power units must be used, unless (standards or protocol to ensure mitigation occurring without electric auxiliary power units).

d) Diesel construction equipment meeting the CARB Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines must be used. Equipment meeting CARB Tier 2 or higher emission standards must be used, unless (standards or protocol to ensure mitigation occurring without equipment meeting CARB Tier 2).

e) Diesel powered equipment must be replaced by electric equipment, unless (standards or protocol to ensure mitigation occurring without diesel equipment).

f) Diesel construction equipment must be equipped with selective catalytic reduction systems, diesel oxidation catalysts, and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by CARB or the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), unless (standards or protocol to ensure mitigation occurring without selective catalytic reduction systems, diesel oxidation catalysts, and diesel particulate filters).

g) Catalytic converters must be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, unless (standards or protocol to ensure mitigation occurring without catalytic converters).
h) All construction equipment must be maintained in tune per the manufacturer’s specifications.

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

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

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

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

3. If the construction site is graded and construction actively has not commenced in four weeks, the applicant must employ the following methods prior to the commencement of the fifth week to inhibit dust generation:

a) Seeding and watering to revegetate graded areas; and/or
b) Spreading of soil binders; and/or
c) Similar methods to inhibit dust that are deemed appropriate by City staff.

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact.</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

The existing setting for Biological Resources is derived from a recent biology study conducted on the project site (Rincon Consultants, August 2013). This report is on file with the Planning and Environmental Review Department and is incorporated by reference.

Physical Characteristics

The project site is vacant and approximately 22,854 gross square feet in size. The site was originally part of the Los Dos Pueblos Land Grant, now called Stow Ranch or La Patera Rancho. As such, the project site and surrounding areas have a long history of agricultural use according to aerial photographs in the 1920’s and 1930’s (Hunt, 2013). According to a 1971 aerial photograph (Hunt, 2013), Los Carneros Road had been constructed and the site was vacant; and not in agricultural use. The site continues to be vacant as of this time. In 2012, a roadway roundabout was constructed at the intersection of Los Carneros Road and Calle Real, immediately southwest of the project site. During construction of the
roundabout, the project site was used as a roadway to detour traffic around the intersection construction site, as a soil/gravel and materials stockpile area, and as a parking area for construction vehicles. Construction of the roundabout was completed in late November 2012. At that time, the by-pass road was removed from the site as were the construction materials and equipment. A gravel stockpile remains on site. Paved sidewalks and landscaping abutting the western and southern perimeter of the site were installed associated with the roundabout construction. The site elevation is below the roundabout improvements requiring two to three feet of fill to allow site drainage to continue to the southeast corner of the site. Currently, the project site is dominated by ruderal vegetation, which covers approximately 0.49 acres or 98% of the project site. Small fringes of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas are found onsite, including a single arroyo willow rooted on the eastern edge of the project site. Edges of coast live oak and arroyo willow canopy also extend into the northern boundary of the project site. There is no suitable nesting habitat for special status raptors within the project site, but they are known to nest in the adjacent Preserve.

Vegetation

Three vegetation communities are associated with the project site: Arroyo Willow Shrubland, Coast Live Oak Woodland, and Ruderal. Vegetation alliances follow the classification developed by Sawyer et al. (2009). The area of vegetation communities found onsite are shown in Table 1. In addition, Table 1 includes the area and linear extent of canopy extension onto the project parcel from off-site communities.

Table B-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetation Community</th>
<th>Area Rooted Onsite</th>
<th>Canopy Extension Onsite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruderal</td>
<td>0.49 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Willow</td>
<td>0.01 acres/490 square feet, 15 feet in distance</td>
<td>74 square feet in area 4 feet in distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70 square feet in area 4 feet in distance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Arroyo Willow Shrubland Series.** Arroyo willow shrubland occurs in the adjacent Preserve and is found at the east and north project site boundary. These arroyo willows are classified as a distinct plant community, arroyo willow shrubland series, by Sawyer et al. (2009). This community is associated with shallow depressions (< 6 inches deep) that may retain more surface runoff and consequently higher soil moisture than the surrounding areas. The understory of this arroyo willow area is very sparse and consists of annual grasses and forbs that occur in the surrounding grassland and ruderal habitats. An arroyo willow with multiple branches (*Salix lasiolepis*) is rooted within the project site with its branches extending approximately 15 feet into the project site from the eastern boundary. This arroyo willow covers approximately 0.01 acres (490 square feet). In addition, arroyo willows that are rooted off-site have a fringe of canopy that extends 4 feet into the northern edge of the project site with a canopy of 74 square feet.

2. **Coast Live Oak Woodland Series.** This community is not found within the project site, but occurs in the Preserve to the north of the project site and abuts the project site along the northwestern corner. Interspersed among the coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) trees north of the project site is a north-south windrow of Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*) and Monterey cypress (*Cupressus macrocarpa*) trees. The understory in this woodland area
is a mixture of sparse to dense non-native annual grasses, native and non-native forbs, and native woody shrubs, including toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), elderberry (*Sambucus mexicana*), and coyote brush, depending on canopy cover. The canopy of a single coast live oak tree, with a trunk that is off-site, rooted in the Preserve, extends approximately 4 feet into the northern edge of the project site with a canopy of 70 square feet.

3. **Ruderal.** This vegetation alliance dominates the majority of the project site, covering approximately 0.49 acres or 98% of the project site. The site has been maintained in non-native annual grasses and weeds since at least the early 1990s. Consequently, the project site is dominated by non-native grasses and forbs that readily colonize disturbed soils. Sawyer et al. (2009) classifies this vegetation as “semi-natural stands”. Dominant species found on-site include yellow star-thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), summer mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), wild oat (*Avena barbata*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), storksbill (*Erodium botrys*), and bur clover (*Medicago polymorpha*).

**Figure B-1**  
*Project Site and Related Vegetation*

*Special Status Plants*  
No special status plants were found on the project site during the July and August 2013 field surveys. They are also not expected to occur within the project site because of the heavily disturbed condition of the site. The GP/CLUP includes three special status species that have been found within the City limits: Santa Barbara honeysuckle (*Lonicera subspicata* var.
subspicata), black-flowered figwort (Scrophularia atrata), and southern tarplant (Centromadia parryi ssp. australis). Each of these species, if they existed on the project site, would have been easily identifiable, but none were observed in the July and August 2013 field surveys.

Sensitive Plant Communities
No sensitive plant community tracked by the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) within the Goleta, California, United States Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle is present on site.

Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands
No jurisdictional waters and wetlands exist on the site (Hunt, 2013). Field surveys conducted in July and August (Rincon 2013) confirmed that the project site does not contain features potentially subject to the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, or California Department of Fish and Wildlife were observed during the surveys.

Wildlife
While the adjacent Preserve supports a large number of wildlife species, suitable habitat for local wildlife is marginal within the project site. Wildlife species observed within the project site during field surveys in July and August 2013 (Rincon 2013) were limited to Turkey vultures (Cathartes aura) flying overhead and a coast range fence lizard (Sceloporus occidentalis bocourtii), a finding that is consistent with what is expected due to the disturbed condition of the site.

Special Status Wildlife
No special status wildlife species were observed during the site surveys. However, a number of special status wildlife species are known to occur within the project vicinity, including the Preserve. Active white-tailed kites (Elanus leucurus), classified as a State Fully Protected Species by State Fish and Wildlife, were observed nesting within 300 feet of the project site: one in 2006 and one in 2011 (Tierney, 2008 and Collins, 2012). Active Cooper’s hawks (Accipiter cooperi), a State Species of Special Concern, were observed nesting in Preserve, 250 feet north of the project site in 2013. (Hunt, 2013) Nesting frequency and fledging success from nests in the Preserve varies considerably from year to year for unknown reasons (Hunt, 2013). Though these two species may be in the general vicinity of project site, the site itself is predominantly vacant/disturbed and does not provide suitable nesting, roosting, or foraging habitat for either of these species. In addition to the observations and records described above, the California Natural Diversity Data Base and literature review revealed 38 special status wildlife species that are known or have the potential to occur within the vicinity of the project site. Marginally suitable habitat exists on the project site for two special status bird species, that are unlikely to occur on the project site:
• Loggerhead shrike (Lanius ludovicianus) – State Species of Special Concern
• Oak titmouse (Baeolophus inornatus) – State Special Animal

Wildlife Movement Corridors
The project site is not located within any known regional wildlife movement corridors. Given the disturbed nature of the site that is dominated by ruderal vegetation and an abandoned road and parking area and a large gravel pile, ground-dwelling wildlife movement is not anticipated through the site. There is a transit corridor in the project vicinity that was used repeatedly by white-tailed kites nesting in the Preserve, in 2006. White-tailed kites flew over
the project site when moving between these nests and foraging areas on Bishop Ranch (Collins, 2012). Adult Cooper’s hawks were observed flying repeatedly over the project site during similar forays between an active nest located in the Preserve, north of the project, site and riparian vegetation along Los Carneros Creek (Hunt & Associates and Rindlaub, 2013).

**Resources Protected By Local Policies**

**Wetlands.** The Conservation Element Policy CE 3.1, Conservation Element, defines wetlands as: “the identification of a single indicator (soil, hydrology, or plants) to determine the boundary of a wetland”. According to this definition, the eastern on-site arroyo willow with multiple branches that is rooted 15 feet within the eastern boundary of the project site is a wetland. Also, an arroyo willow rooted off-site and its canopy that extends 4 feet into the northern edge of the project site is a wetland under CE 3.1. These arroyo willow areas are designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) pursuant to Policy CE 1.2.

**Native Trees and Woodlands.** Protection of native trees and woodlands within the City is regulated by the GP/CLUP Conservation Element Policy CE 9: Protection of Trees and Native Woodlands and such habitat is designated ESHA (Policy CE 1.2). CE Policy 9.1 that designates protected trees would apply to the coast live oak and arroyo willows associated with the project site. Although the coast live oak tree trunk is rooted off-site, a small fringe of coast live oak canopy extends 4 feet into the northern boundary of the project site with a 70 square foot portion of the canopy. A small off-site arroyo willow stand is rooted outside the site along the north project property line with a canopy that extends 4 feet onto the site for 74 square feet. A small multi-stemmed arroyo willow is rooted on-site with a canopy covering 490 square feet.

**Raptors.** The City’s GP/CLUP provides protection for special status raptor species’ habitat in Conservation Element Policy 8: Protection of Special-Status Species, and such habitat is designated ESHA. While no suitable habitat for special status raptors exists within the vacant project site, white-tail kites and Cooper’s hawks have been documented in the vicinity of the project site as the Preserve provides suitable habitat for special status raptors (Tierney, 2008, Collins, 2012 and Hunt & Associates and Rindlaub, 2013).

**Biology-Related Hydrology and Soils**
The project site does not contain any hydrological features. Surface elevations range from about 54 feet above sea level in the northwest corner to about 48 feet in the southeast corner, and the site appears to drain in a southeasterward direction across the parcel via sheet flow. Los Carneros Creek and Lake Los Carneros are the nearest water bodies. The Los Carneros Creek watershed drains approximately 2,641 acres capable of generating 3,500 cubic feet per second of flood flow during a 100-year return period event (Santa Barbara County, 2010). The Los Carneros Creek watershed flows into the Goleta Slough and eventually into the Pacific Ocean. One soil map unit occurs on the project site: Goleta Fine Sandy Loam, 0 To 2 Percent Slopes. This soil map is not designated as hydric in coastal Santa Barbara County (United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service 2013b). Goleta Fine Sandy Loam, 0 To 2 Percent Slopes, is a well-drained, sandy loam soil formed from Alluvium derived from sedimentary rock. It is typically found in valleys and toeslopes at elevations ranging from 20 to 500 feet with slopes ranging from 0 to 2 percent. Common land uses associated with Goleta Fine Sandy Loam, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes include irrigated crops. This soil map unit is found throughout the project site.

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

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

The GP/CLUP contains the following policies relating to biological resources:

- CE 1.1- 1.9ESHA Policies
- CE 3.1 Protection of Wetlands
- CE 3.2 Wetland ESHA
- CE 3.5 Protection of Wetlands
- CE 3.6 Mitigation of Wetland Fill
- CE 8 Protection of Special Status Raptors and Related ESHA.
- CE 9 Protection of Native Woodlands

**Project Specific Impacts**

a) **Special Status Plants.** The project would have no impacts to special status plant species based on negative findings from the surveys conducted on the project site. The biology surveys also found that the project site is not suitable habitat for special species status plant species because it is vacant and 98% ruderal vegetation. Therefore no mitigation measures for special status plants are required.

**Special Status Nesting Raptors.** Conservation Element Policy CE 8.4 of the GP/CLUP requires protection of special status raptors and other such birds as the Loggerhead shrike by requiring the establishment of a 100-foot development buffer around historic and active nests, for protected species (raptors), if feasible. There is one known historic white-tailed kite nest within 100 feet of the project site and a Cooper’s Hawk nest approximately 250 feet from the site (Hunt, 2013). Due to site constraints relative to the development proposal, it is not feasible to establish a 100-foot development buffer around this nest. However, if active nests are found in the 100-foot buffer they will be protected during construction. Policy CE 8.4 also addresses impacts from construction. Whenever feasible, no construction development activity shall be allowed within a 300-foot buffer from any nest during the nesting and fledging season. Due to the potential for raptors to nest in the vicinity of the project site, a potentially significant impact to off-site nesting raptors may occur during project construction. A 300-foot buffer from any raptor nest would be required in relation to the project site during construction or a biologist may monitor during construction. These mitigation measures are listed below and would reduce potentially significant impacts to nesting raptors to less than significant.

**Nesting Birds.** Nesting birds are protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (CFGC), (16 U.S.C., § 703 et seq.,Fish and Game Code, § 1 et seq.) Such birds may include the American Kestral, Red-tailed Hawk and Lewis’ Woodpecker that have been reported to nest in the Preserve (Ferry, letter,
January 2012; Hanson, letter January 2012; Lewis, letter January 2012.) The construction of the project has the potential to temporarily, indirectly impact nesting birds if active nests are present within the project's 300-foot buffer during construction. Anticipated temporary indirect impacts may include increased traffic, noise, vibrations, and other short-term construction impacts. The arroyo willow present at points along the eastern and northern boundaries of the project site provides marginally suitable habitat for smaller nesting birds. It is unlikely nesting birds would be present in the specified arroyo willows during construction. However, if an active nest is present, the nesting birds would be impacted by the loss of the nest when the arroyo willow is removed. Impacts to nesting birds resulting from construction of the proposed project are potentially significant. To mitigate this potentially significant impact, a 300-foot buffer from any nest site in relation to the project site can be established for construction to provide mitigation as described below. This mitigation would reduce potentially significant impacts to nesting birds to less than significant.

b) **Sensitive Plant Communities.** No sensitive plant communities regulated by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service were present on the project site. Therefore, no mitigation measures for avoidance/minimization are required.

c) **Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands.** No features potentially subject to the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, or California Department of Fish and Wildlife were observed during the surveys. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

d) **Wildlife Movement.** The proposed project is not located within any known ground-dwelling wildlife movement corridors. Although white-tailed kites and Cooper's hawks are known to fly over the project site (Tierney, 2008, Collins, 2012, and Hunt & Associates and Rindlaub, 2013), the proposed project is not anticipated to have a potentially significant impact on wildlife movement corridors due to the small size and disturbed nature of the site, the close proximity of the site to Los Carneros Road and Calle Real, and the single building proposal. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

e) **Biological Resource/Hydrological Policies**

**Non-Native Invasive Plant Species.** Conservation Element Policy CE 1.9 of the GP/CLUP prohibits the planting of non-native, invasive species in ESHAs and buffer areas adjacent to ESHAs. Potentially significant impacts may occur to wetland ESHA adjacent to the project site from non-native invasive plants that disrupt the habitat. Impacts may result from the use of erosion control seed mixes with non-native invasive plant species used for stockpiled dirt during grading and from planting non-native invasive plants for landscaping. With mitigation measures listed below, impacts would be less than significant.

**Wetland ESHA.** The GP/CLUP, Conservation Element Policy CE 1.2 and CE 3.2 designate a wetlands as ESHA. Arroyo willows on and adjacent to the project site meet the definition of wetlands and therefore the arroyo willows are an ESHA. Conservation Element Policy 1.6 Protection of ESHA, restricts development allowed in ESHAs or their 100 foot buffers. The construction of the project would require the placement of one to two feet of fill where a multi-trunk arroyo willow of 490 square feet is rooted within the project site (near the eastern project site boundary) and within the root zone of the arroyo willow canopy that extends approximately 4 feet (total 74 square feet) into the northern project boundary from an off-site arroyo willow stand.
Conservation Element Policy 3.5 prohibits the fill of wetlands. If the following criteria can be met, a wetland area could be filled:

a. The wetland area is small, isolated, not part of a larger hydrologic system, and generally lacks productive or functional habitat value.

b. The extent of the fill is the least amount necessary to allow reasonable development of a use allowed by the Land Use Element.

c. Mitigation measures will be provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, including restoration or enhancement of habitat values of wetlands at another location on the site or at another appropriate offsite location within the City.

Pursuant to Policy CE 3.5, no buffers for the arroyo willow wetland ESHA related to the project site are required, as fill within both these ESHA areas meets criteria a-c as described below:

a. The arroyo willow wetland on the north and east property lines are not contiguous to other stands of arroyo willows as they grow in distinct and separate low spots where moisture collects. They are not adjacent to a creek or drainage channel and do not function as a riparian corridor. These willows generally lack functional habitat.

b. The extent of the fill is the least amount necessary to allow reasonable development of the site so that it is at grade with surrounding public improvements associated with the roadway roundabout.

c. Mitigation measures are required including construction protection and restoration or enhancement of habitat values of wetlands off-site at another location within the City.

The proposed project would require trimming of the off-site arroyo willow canopy that extends approximately 4 feet over the site’s northern boundary. The area that would be trimmed is approximately 74 square feet. The trimming of the arroyo willow canopy is not expected to threaten the continued survival of the arroyo willow. This temporary construction impact is less than significant and therefore no mitigation is required.

Construction of the proposed project would also include the removal of an on-site arroyo willow with multiple trunks rooted on the east side of the site that covers approximately 490 square feet of the project site as it extends 15 feet into the eastern project limits. Project activities within this ESHA involve the placement of approximately one-foot of fill and the creation of permeable parking spaces. The removal of 490 square feet of arroyo willow rooted within the project site is a potentially significant impact. Therefore, a mitigation measure of a 3:1 replacement is required unless the applicant provides evidence that a lesser area will be sufficient, but no less than minimum 2:1 replacement is required pursuant to Policy CE 3.6. The amount of off-site mitigation would measure from 490 square feet for a 2:1 replacement up to 1,470 square feet for a 3:1 replacement. Implementation of the mitigation measures listed below would reduce potentially significant impacts due to removal of the eastern arroyo willow wetland ESHA to less than significant levels.
Oak Woodland ESHA: The project will require pruning limbs of a coast live oak that is rooted in the Preserve. These limbs encroach into the northwest corner of the project site. Project-related activities within the root zone located under the canopy of this coast live oak include the placement of approximately one-foot of fill and the creation of permeable parking spaces. These project activities may have a negative effect on the tree and therefore a potentially significant impact may occur. Implementation of the mitigation measure below would reduce this impact to less than significant. With the mitigation measure, pruning of the oak as well as the placement of fill and permeable parking spaces are not expected to threaten the continued survival of the tree. Therefore, no buffer is required to protect this ESHA. This determination is based on the relatively small percentage of canopy and root zone within the project site as compared with the total canopy and root zone of this coast live oak tree.

f) Regarding habitat management plans, the CEQA Guidelines Initial Study states that a proposed project would have a significant effect on biological resources if it would:

Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan

The project site is not covered under any conservations plans. Therefore, no avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures are required.

Cumulative Impacts

Some projects in the Goleta area will have a cumulative impact on biological resources including wetlands, raptors and oak woodlands. All such project impacts will be required to be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. This project’s biological resource impacts will be mitigated to less than significant levels with the mitigations listed below. Therefore the project’s contribution to cumulative biological impacts is less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. Active Bird Nesting. To avoid construction impacts to nesting special status raptors, other special status nesting birds such as loggerhead shrike and oak titmouse, as well as general nesting birds, vegetation removal and initial ground disturbance must occur outside the bird nesting season, which is approximately March – September for raptors and February – August for general bird species, but can vary based on local and annual climatic conditions. If construction must begin within the breeding season, a special status raptor and general nesting bird pre-construction survey must be conducted within the disturbance footprint plus a 300-foot buffer that must be established. Subsequent nesting raptor and general bird nesting surveys must be required prior to each phase of construction within the bird nesting season. If no active raptor or general bird nests are observed during construction surveys, no further mitigation is required. Plan Requirements: The grading plans must include notes specifying the requirement for a pre-construction field survey for nesting raptors and general nesting birds within a 300 foot buffer from the project site. Timing: The applicant or its contractors must retain a qualified biologist, approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, to conduct pre-construction nest surveys. The name, qualifications, scope, and contact information for the surveying biologist must be submitted to the City in advance of the surveys. The surveys must be conducted no more than two weeks prior to initiation of ground disturbance. Pre-construction nesting surveys must be conducted during the time
of day when birds are active and must be of sufficient duration to reliably conclude presence/absence of nesting birds within the 300 foot buffer. A report of the nesting survey(s) must be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to site grading.

Monitoring: The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee will review any biological reports in consultation with resource/trustee agency as needed.

2. Active Bird Nesting Buffer. If active special status raptor nests or other special species birds, as well as general bird nests are found within 300 feet of the project site during a survey, their locations must be flagged and mapped. If active nests, including white-tailed kite or Cooper’s hawk are found, an avoidance buffer must be determined and demarcated by a City-approved biologist with bright orange construction fencing. If feasible, the buffer must be 300 feet. If the 300 foot buffer is infeasible, the City-approved biologists may reduce the buffer as appropriate, dependent upon the species and the proposed work activities. Plan Requirements: Active nests must be mapped onto an aerial photograph of the project site and buffer at a scale no less than 1”=200’ and/or recorded with the use of a GPS unit. The map must include the active nest site(s), topographic lines, parcel boundaries, adjacent roads, known historical nests for special status species, known roosting or foraging areas and the appropriate buffer area determined by the City-approved biologist. A report of the raptor and nesting bird survey(s), if applicable, must be submitted to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to grading. Notes regarding this requirement must be placed on grading plans. Timing: Nesting site flagging and mapping must be completed prior to start of ground disturbance. Placement of bright orange construction fencing must be completed prior to ground disturbance. No ground disturbance must occur within the buffer until the City-approved biologist confirms that the breeding/nesting is completed and all the young have fledged. Alternately, a City-approved biologist must monitor the active nest(s) within the buffer on a full-time basis, during construction activities to ensure project activities are not indirectly impacting special status nesting raptors or other nesting birds.

Monitoring: The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must review and approve the nest flagging and mapping. If there is ongoing nest monitoring by the City-approved biologist, reports from the biologist must be provided to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee as required. Monitoring by the City approved biologist must commence on a set schedule determined by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee, with monitoring to occur at a minimum of once per week until it has been determined that the nest is no longer being used by either the young or adults. City Staff must make on-site inspections and supervise biologist work on a schedule determined by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee.

3. Wetlands. Orange construction fencing must be installed along the eastern surveyed property line prior to any ground disturbance to avoid impacts to arroyo willow wetlands outside the project area. The fencing must remain in place for the duration of construction. A City-approved biologist must supervise the fence installation and subsequent pruning and removal of the arroyo willows. All pruning must be done by hand tools. The removal of the arroyo willow on the eastern edge of the project site must also be done with hand tools. Plan Requirements: The grading plans must include notes specifying the requirement for placement of construction fencing along north, northeast and east property lines. Timing: Fence placement, arroyo willow removal and arroyo willow pruning by hand must be completed prior to initiation of grading.
Monitoring: Fencing and pruning to be supervised by a City-approved biologist.

4. Compensatory Measure Wetlands ESHA. Compensatory on-site replacement of the multi-trunk arroyo willow (wetlands ESHA) is not feasible due to the small size of the project site. Therefore, arroyo willow must be replaced at an offsite location. Permanent impacts must be compensated by planting arroyo willows off-site at a 3:1 ratio, unless the applicant provides evidence to the satisfaction of the Planning and Environmental Review Director that a lesser amount would fully mitigate the identified impact. However, no less than a minimum of a 2:1 ratio of off-site replacement arroyo willows. At the time of the biological study (August 2013), from approximately 980 square feet to 1,470 square feet of arroyo willow mitigation would be required to achieve a 2:1 or 3:1 ratio. As required by GP/CLUP 2006, as amended, Conservation Element Policy CE 1.7, this compensatory mitigation must be monitored for a minimum period of 5 years. Annual monitoring reports must be prepared by a City-approved biologist to document the success of the mitigation site. The applicant must implement any and all remedial measures required by the City. Plan Requirements: An off-site arroyo willow replacement plan must be developed in coordination with the applicant and City staff. Timing: The off-site arroyo willow planting must be completed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the new structure on the project site.

Monitoring: The arroyo willow planting plan must be carried out by a City-approved biologist. On-going monitoring must continue for five years after planting. The Planning and Environmental Review Director and the Public Works Director or designees must periodically inspect the arroyo replacement site to ensure compliance.

5. Oak Tree (ESHA). Orange construction fence must be installed along the surveyed north property line prior to any ground disturbance to avoid impacts outside the project area. The fencing must remain in place for the duration of construction. A City-approved biologist must supervise the fence installation and subsequent pruning of coast live oak limbs. All pruning must be done by hand tools and must be limited to the minimum amount necessary to complete the project. Plan Requirements: The grading plans must include notes specifying the requirement for placement of construction fencing along north and northeast property line. Timing: Fence placement and oak trimming must be completed prior to initiation of grading.

Monitoring: Fencing and pruning of the coast live oak tree must be supervised by a City-approved biologist.

6. Non-Native Invasive Plant Species. Such plant species must not be included in any erosion control seed mixes used on stockpiled soil during grading and/or planted on-site pursuant to landscaping plans associated with the proposed project. The plant species used cannot be any of those listed on the California Invasive Plant Inventory Database, which contains a list of nonnative, invasive plants (California Invasive Plant Council, 2006, Updated 2011). Plan Requirements: Grading plans must specify that erosion control seed mixes must not contain non-native invasive species. Also, the project landscaping plan must not include plant species identified as “non-native and invasive.” Timing: Landscape plans must be approved prior to issuance of land use clearance.

Monitoring: The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must monitor seed mix and on-site plantings prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
7. Contaminants. During construction, the washing of concrete, paint, or equipment must occur only in areas where polluted water and materials can be contained for subsequent removal from the site. Washing must not be allowed near sensitive biological resources. An area designated for washing functions must be identified on the plans submitted for issuance of any LUP for the project. The wash-off area must be in place throughout construction. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The wash off area must be designated on all plans and must be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff must site inspect the wash-off area throughout the construction period to ensure compliance and proper use.

**Residual Impacts**
Implementation of these measures would reduce potential significant impacts to biological resources to less than significant. No residual impacts would occur.
CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:  

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

Existing Setting

The existing setting and impact analysis for Cultural Resources are derived from the Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation (Dudek, 2008). This report is on file with the Planning and Environmental Review Department and is incorporated by reference.

The project site is located within the Santa Barbara Channel cultural area. Evidence of cultural activity along the coastline extends over 9,000 years. As provided in the City’s “General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final Environmental Impact Report,” State Clearinghouse #2005031151 (GP/CLUP Final EIR), Section 3.5 Cultural Resources, the City is known to contain prehistoric, ethnographic, historical, and paleontological resources. The GP/CLUP Final EIR identifies areas where known archaeological resources exist. Figure 3.5-1 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR shows areas containing sensitive historic/cultural resources. The Sexton Museum, Goleta Depot, Stow House and Stow Ranch Outbuildings are significant historical resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places. These resources are located approximately 500 feet to the north of the project site on the Preserve. According to information in the records of the Central Coast Information Center, University of California, Santa Barbara, there are ten known archaeological sites within a 2,000-foot radius of the project site.

A Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation was conducted for the project site (Dudek, 2008). No cultural materials were identified within the project site during an intensive archaeological field survey conducted for the Phase 1 Investigation.

The City’s GP/CLUP provides policies that govern the protection of historic and cultural resources. GP/CLUP Open Space Element policies OS-8.4 and 8.6 provide protection for Native American and Paleontological Resources.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on cultural resources would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. The City’s adopted thresholds indicate that a project would result in a significant impact on a cultural resource if it results in
the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of such a resource would be materially impaired. The GP/CLUP Visual and Historic policies (listed above) require studies to determine significance and the GP/CLUP Open Space Element Policy OS-8 addresses impacts and mitigation for Native American and Paleontological Resources. Evaluation of significance is to be determined by a Phase 1 study.

Project Specific Impacts

a,b,d) Although the records of the Central Coast Information Center indicated the presence of one historical site on the project site (CA-SBA-2585H) containing historic trash deposits, the “Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation” prepared by Dudek, 2008 determined that the historic site is not located on the project site. The field survey and shovel scrapes completed at 45-foot intervals found no historic resources on-site. However, given the historic presence of Chumash in the Goleta area and the location of several archaeological sites within a 2,000-foot radius of the project site, there remains the potential for cultural resources to be uncovered during construction activities. While the potential for disturbance of cultural resources and/or human remains onsite is low, unknown resources may be encountered during construction. With mitigation, potential impacts to cultural resources are considered less than significant.

The Sexton Museum, Goleta Depot, Stow House and Stow Ranch Outbuildings are significant historical resources that are located approximately 500 feet to the north of the project site on the Preserve. The project is not in the immediate vicinity of these historic resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant impact to historical resources.

c) A records search through the Central Coast Information Center as well as the Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation conducted on the project site indicated that the project site does not contain any paleontological or geological sites, including those that could be considered unique. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to these resources.

Cumulative Impacts

As no cultural resources were identified on-site and the project will have no impact on the historic buildings located to the north of the project site, there would be no cumulative cultural impacts.

Required Mitigation Measure

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

With implementation of this mitigation measure, residual project impacts on cultural resources would be less than significant.

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

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

**Existing Setting**

Currently, the project site is relatively flat that gently slopes to the southeast. The most notable topographic feature, a drainage ditch, occurs off-site. The drainage begins approximately 325 feet north of the site near Los Carneros Road and ends near the northeast property corner. The drainage ditch begins again near the southeast corner of the property line, where it turns east, away from the site, and runs along Calle Real. The ditch ends along Calle Real across from the California Highway Patrol Office.

A *Foundation Recommendation Report* (Bengal Engineering, Inc. April 2010) was prepared to assess the geology and site soils. This report is on file with the Planning and
Environmental Review Department and is incorporated by reference. The following information is summarized from that report. The project area was found to be on the Santa Barbara coastal plan, which lies near the terminus of the Transverse Ranges of Southern California. The closest identified seismic source to the project site is the Mission Ridge Fault System. The active More Ranch fault which is a component of the Mission Ridge Fault is located approximately one mile south of the project site. The active Red Mountain Fault is located offshore, approximately 3 miles from the site. Two borings were performed on-site to a depth of 51.5 feet to assess the subsurface conditions as described in the Foundation Recommendation Report (Bengal Engineering, Inc. April 2010). The top 3-4 feet are natural soils over 6-21 feet of alluvium which is located over marine terrace deposits. The alluvial soils are medium dense/stiff and Silty/SandyClay. The underlying marine deposits consist of dense/hard Sandy Silt. Lab testing of soils from the borings indicate that the site soils are not considered collapsible or expansive. These tests also indicated that the soils have low corrosion potential for common building materials. Groundwater was encountered in both borings at a depth of 15 feet.

The GP/CLUP Safety Element includes seismic hazards in Policy SE-4 and Soil Stability in Policy SE-5 which address setback and building criteria for geologic hazards. The project site is not designated as subject to potential hazards on the “Geologic Hazards Map” contained in the GP/CLUP, 2006 Safety Element. The California Building Code and the City of Goleta require buildings to be built to such seismic safety standards. These standards would apply to the proposed building.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) There are no Alquist-Priolo mapped earthquake faults or zones within the City of Goleta; however, the non-active Glen Annie Fault is located approximately 0.6 miles to the northeast of the project site (GP/CLUP, 2006 Safety Element), the active More Ranch Fault is located approximately 0.9 miles south of the project site and the active Red Mountain fault is located at a distance of approximately 3 miles. According to the report (Bengal Engineering, Inc. April 2010), the site is not considered to be susceptible to surface rupture due to fault movements. However, the region has experienced numerous major earthquakes in the past and is likely to experience similar earthquakes in the future. Due to the site’s proximity to potentially active fault zones, impacts from seismic ground shaking are considered potentially significant. As the project will be required to be built to current seismic standards, potentially significant impacts are reduced to less than significant.

Based on the soil content, the soil density, and the type of soil deposit below the water table, the site is considered to have low potential for collapsible, or expansive soils that could contribute to soil liquefaction during an earthquake. According to the report,
(Bengal Engineering, Inc. April 2010), the potential for any significant seismically induced ground settlement, slope failure, landslides or other secondary seismic hazards at the site is considered to be low. This would result in a less than significant impact.

b) The site soils were not identified as highly erodible or having landslide potential (Bengal, Inc 2010). Site grading for the project could temporarily increase erosion on-site during rains. Soil erosion during rain events may cause increased silt in the surface water runoff and siltation of adjacent sensitive habitats. Such temporary, site grading erosion impacts are considered potentially significant. With a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan as required mitigation, potential impacts are reduced to less than significant.

c) The topography of the site and surrounding parcels is relatively flat and the site is not mapped in an area with a high landslide potential in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, Figure 3.6-4. Therefore, impacts due to landslides are less than significant.

d) The site soils of alluvium over marine terrace deposits were not found to be expansive in the report (Bengal, Inc. 2010). Impacts due to expansive soils are less than significant.

e) The project would connect to the Goleta West Sanitary District. Therefore, no potentially significant geological hazards are posed by the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development in the area would increase the overall potential for exposure to seismic hazards. The number of people exposed to seismic hazards would be increased with new developments in the City. This project, as well as cumulative projects, would be subject to established regulations pertaining to building design for seismic safety thereby reducing the potential for cumulative hazards to less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. Applicant must submit drainage and grading plans with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for review and approval by Public Works and Building staff. The SWPPP must incorporate appropriate Best Management Practices to minimize stormwater impacts during construction in accordance with the City’s Stormwater Guidance Document and the City’s GP/CLUP. Plan Requirements and Timing: The SWPPP must include an erosion control plan for review and approval by Public Works staff prior to Land Use Permit issuance.

   Monitoring: City staff must verify construction of all stormwater quality/control facilities per the City approved grading and erosion control plans prior to issuance of Land Use Permit.

2. The applicant must prepare a Stormwater Maintenance Plan for ongoing maintenance of all improvements in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications, the approved plans and conditions of approval for review and approval by City staff. Plan Requirements and Timing: Said maintenance plan must be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit for the project. The plan must include provisions for the submittal of an annual maintenance report to City staff pursuant to a Stormwater Maintenance Agreement.
Monitoring: City staff must verify compliance prior to Land Use Permit issuance. City staff must review each annual maintenance report and maintenance records, if problems with the installation are observed.

3. The applicant must prepare a Stormwater Maintenance Agreement that addresses maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with the Stormwater Maintenance Plan. Plan Requirements: At a minimum the maintenance agreement must include inspection of all drainage infrastructure per manufacturer specifications prior to September 30th of each year. Additional inspections, repairs and maintenance must be performed after storm events as needed throughout the rainy season (November 1st to April 15th) and/or per manufacturer specifications. Any necessary major repairs must be completed prior to the next rainy season. Prior to September 30th of each year, the applicant must submit to the City for its review and approval a report summarizing all inspections, repairs, and maintenance work done during the prior year. Timing: The applicant must submit the required maintenance agreement to City staff for review, approval and execution, prior to Land Use Permit issuance.

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

Residual Impacts:

With the mitigation measures stated above, impacts would be less than significant.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

Existing Setting

The following information is summarized from “Greenhouse Gas Emissions Background Information” Attachment A:

Parts of the Earth’s atmosphere act as an insulating “blanket” for the planet. This “blanket” of various gases traps solar energy, which keeps the global average temperature in a range suitable for life (if this “blanket” were to suddenly disappear, the planet would be approximately 60°F colder). The collection of atmospheric gases that comprise this blanket are called “greenhouse gases” (GHG) based on the idea that these gases trap heat like the glass walls of a greenhouse. These gases, mainly water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), ozone (O₃), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), all act as effective global insulators, reflecting visible light and infrared radiation back to earth. Most
Scientists agree that human activities, such as producing electricity and driving internal combustion vehicles, have contributed to the elevated concentration of these gases in the atmosphere. As a result, the Earth's overall temperature is rising.

Climate change could impact the natural environment in California by triggering, among others things:

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

According to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a GHG is any gas that absorbs infrared radiation in the atmosphere. This absorption traps heat within the atmosphere creating a greenhouse effect that is slowly raising global temperatures. California law defines GHG to include the following: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) (Health and Safety Code, § 38505(g)).

The effect each GHG has on climate change is measured as a combination of the volume of its emissions, and its global warming potential (GWP), and is expressed as a function of how much warming would be caused by the same mass of CO₂. Thus, GHG emissions are typically measured in terms of pounds or tons of CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e), and are often expressed in metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MT CO₂e) or millions of metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MMT CO₂e).

Global climate change issues are addressed through the efforts of various federal, state, regional, and local government agencies as well as national and international scientific and governmental conventions and programs. These agencies work jointly and individually to understand and regulate the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and resulting climate change through legislation, regulations, planning, policy-making, education, and a variety of programs. The significant agencies, conventions, and programs focused on global climate change are listed below. (Detailed information is provided in Attachment B.)

Federal U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
California Air Resources Board
California Executive Order S-3-05
California Executive Order S-13-08  
California Global Warming Solutions Action of 2006 (AB 32)  
Senate Bill (SB) 97. SB 97, enacted in 2007  
State of California Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan  
Senate Bill (SB) 375. SB 375  
Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD)  
City of Goleta Energy Efficiency Standards

Thresholds of Significance

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

A. Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or  
B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

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

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

In addition, a lead agency should consider the following factors, among others, when assessing the significance of impacts from GHG emissions on the environment:

1. The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;  
2. Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project; and  
3. The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

The amendments encourage lead agencies to establish significance thresholds for their respective jurisdictions and clarify that the effects of GHG emissions are cumulative, and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA’s requirements for cumulative impact analysis.

Currently, neither the City of Goleta nor the State of California has adopted significance thresholds for GHG emissions. Establishment of thresholds at the State and/or local level
has been a point of discussion and analysis by various agencies and boards (i.e., OPR, ARB, CAPCOA [California Air Pollution Control Officers Association]).

In June 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) became the first regulatory agency in the nation to approve guidelines that establish thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. These thresholds are summarized in Table GHG-2.

**Table GHG-2**  
Bay Area Air Quality Management District GHG Thresholds of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Emission Source Category</th>
<th>Operational Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Residential (land use projects)</td>
<td>1,100 MT CO₂e/yr or 4.6 MT CO₂e/SP/yr&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Sources&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10,000 MT CO₂e /yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>a</sup> SP = Service Population (residents + employees).

<sup>b</sup> Stationary Sources include stationary combustion sources (industrial-type uses) regulated by the APCD.

On June 10, 2010, the Santa Barbara County Planning & Development Department produced a memorandum “Support for Use of Bay Area Air Quality Management District Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards,” which states, “While Santa Barbara County land use patterns differ from those in the Bay Area as a whole, Santa Barbara County is similar to certain Bay Area counties (in particular, Sonoma, Solano, and Marin) in terms of population growth, land use patterns, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies, and average commute patterns and times. Because of these similarities, the methodology used by BAAQMD to develop its GHG emission significance thresholds, as well as the thresholds themselves, have applicability to Santa Barbara County and represent the best available interim standards for Santa Barbara County.” In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §§15064.4(b)(2), and 15064.7(c), the City has consistently relied upon Santa Barbara County’s “Support for Use of Bay Area Air Quality Management District Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards,” as the expert recommended threshold for establishing greenhouse gas impacts of a project. The City of Goleta is located in Santa Barbara County and shares meteorological attributes, as well as similar land use patterns and policies, and thresholds deemed applicable in Santa Barbara County would also reasonably apply to projects within the City Goleta. In addition, the City of Goleta would rely upon the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD), as a commenting agency, to review the GHG analysis, and these thresholds would represent a consistent approach and uniformity for impact determinations for City and County projects under the District's review. Therefore, this analysis uses the BAAQMD/Santa Barbara County Interim Thresholds of Significance to determine the significance of GHG emissions related to this project, based on the 1,100 MT CO₂e/year or 4.6 MT CO₂e per service population per year threshold for commercial and residential land uses. There is no BAAQMD threshold of significance for construction emissions.

In 2012, a court judgment determined that the BAAQMD GHG emissions thresholds of significance were not properly adopted under CEQA and cannot be readopted until...

---

compliance with CEQA occurs. Nevertheless, thresholds of significance that are adopted or recommended by other public agencies or by experts may be considered as appropriate thresholds of significance. As previously explained, a significant amount of public and expert opinion and input went into the development of the BAAQMD thresholds of significance. Moreover, since adoption of these thresholds, there have been numerous expert opinions and evaluations of these thresholds, including the applicability within Santa Barbara County.

According to the applicable thresholds for this project, the project would result in a significant impact if it:

A. Generates operational emissions in an amount more than 1,100 MT CO$_2$e/yr$^3$, and/or results in significant construction or operational GHG emissions based on a qualitative analysis.
B. Fails to employ reasonable and feasible means to minimize GHG emissions in a manner that is consistent with the goals and objectives of AB 32.

It is also noted that the use of the BAAQMD threshold does not imply that it is a threshold that the City has formally adopted or should adopt as a GHG emissions significance threshold.

a,b) Project Specific and Cumulative Impacts

Project-related GHG emissions would include emissions from direct and indirect sources. The project would result in construction and operational emissions of CO$_2$, N$_2$O, and CH$_4$; however, it would not result in the emission of other GHGs such that it would facilitate a meaningful analysis. Therefore, this analysis focuses on these first three forms of GHG emissions. Table GHG-3, below presents the project's estimated emissions of CO$_2$, N$_2$O, and CH$_4$. The CalEEMod computer model outputs were used to calculate mobile source, area source, and construction GHG emissions. Operational GHG estimations are based on energy emissions from electricity usage and automobile emissions.

Construction Emissions. Using estimated annual emissions for demolition, grading, construction, painting, and paving, project-related annual construction emissions were converted from CO$_2$ pounds per year (without mitigation) to CO$_2$ equivalent (CO$_2$e) emissions. For the estimated duration of construction (14 months), the project’s construction would generate approximately 497 MT CO$_2$e. These emissions are temporary during construction and the construction would not conflict with CARB’s greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets under AB 32 (as described above in the Regulatory Framework section). The project’s construction emissions would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

Operational Emissions. As listed below in Table GHG-3, operational emissions were calculated using the CalEEMod model and FLIR Project-specific land use data. Electricity would be provided to the FLIR Project site by Southern California Edison.

---


3 The other threshold option would result in a higher threshold (4.6 MT CO$_2$e/service population/yr X 308 average daily visits [employees or patients] = 1,417 MT CO$_2$e/yr). (Visits are estimated based on data from the project’s traffic impact study.) Therefore, the lower, more conservative threshold is being applied to the project.
Table GHG-3
Estimated Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>Unmitigated CO₂e (MT/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>33.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-transportation Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Metric Tons CO₂(e)</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project would generate approximately 44.87MT CO₂e under the unmitigated condition, which is below the 1,100 MT CO₂e threshold of significance. Therefore, the project’s operational emissions are less than significant and would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The following recommended mitigation measures would further reduce the project’s related emissions through increased energy efficiency and alternative modes of transportation.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

No potentially significant impacts would occur. Therefore no mitigation measures would be required.

**Residual Impact**

No residual impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

Although not a required mitigation measure, the following item will be a Condition of Approval:

1. Include energy conservation measures in the project pursuant to the 2013 California Green Building Code, as adopted by Goleta Municipal Code.

**Plan Requirements**: Include the following appropriate energy conservation measures in the plans to the satisfaction of the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee:

   a) solar-ready system;
   b) electrical vehicle ready system;
   c) passive cooling strategies such as passive or fan aided cooling plan designed into the structure and/or a roof opening for hot air venting or installation of underground cooling tubes;
   d) high efficiency outdoor lighting and/or solar powered lighting;
   e) installation of Energy Star roofs, furnaces, and appliances;
   f) use of water-based paint on exterior surfaces
g) use of solar-assisted water heating for tankless hot water on demand systems if their energy efficiency is demonstrated to exceed that of a central storage tank water heating system;

h) use of passive solar cooling/heating;

i) use of natural lighting in lieu of artificial lighting;

j) installation of indoor energy efficient lighting;

k) use of water-efficient landscapes; water-efficient irrigation systems and devices; and use of reclaimed water (if available);

l) installation of cool pavements

m) provision of segregated waste bins for recyclable materials;

n) zero waste/high recycling standards.

**Timing:** Appropriate requirements must be shown on plans before the City issues any LUP for the project.
### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

#### Existing Setting

The project is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Airport safety policies are contained in the GP/CLUP Safety Element (Airport-Related Hazards). Policies require the enforcement of zoning regulations of the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan. These regulations provide use restrictions for new development. The project site is located in the vicinity of the north/south Santa Barbara airport runway but is not within the Airport Approach or Clear Zones for this runway. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity. The Central Coast Regional Water Quality Board and Santa Barbara County Fire Site Mitigation Unit enforce
State and Federal hazard site remediation. City GP/CLUP Safety Element policies SE-1, SE-4, SE-5.2, SE-7, SE-9 and SE-10 require hazard studies and safety regulations.

**Thresholds of Significance**

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

**Project Specific Impacts**

a-c) The project would not involve the use, transport, release, or disposal of hazardous materials during the construction and operation of the project. Therefore, the project would have no related hazard impact on public safety or the environment.

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

e-f) There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. The project site is located outside of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Approach and Clear Zones as defined by the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan for all runways. Therefore, no safety impacts are anticipated.

f-h) The project would not result in the construction of any new facilities or establishment of new uses that could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is located well outside of the City’s Wildland Fire Hazard Area; therefore, there would be no exposure to risks involving wildland fires. No impacts are anticipated.

**Cumulative Impacts**

As no on-site or off-site hazards are anticipated with the proposed project, the project’s contribution to cumulative hazards risks is less than significant.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Residual Impact**

No residual project hazards and hazardous materials impacts are anticipated.
# HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Existing Setting

The project site is vacant and undeveloped. The project site is relatively flat with slight surface drainage flowing from the northwestern portion of the site to the east/southeast. There is an overall slope of less than 1% across the property. The site is slightly lower in elevation from the improvements associated with the adjacent Los Carneros roundabout. The most notable topographic feature in the site vicinity is a drainage ditch that occurs...
offsite. The drainage channel runs off-site along the east property line then turns eastward and runs along Calle Real. The drainage channel ends along Calle Real across from the Highway Patrol Office approximately 600 feet to the southeast of the project’s property lines. The City of Goleta Storm Water Guidance Document governs stormwater management during construction and post-construction activities on a development site.

The City’s GP/CLUP, 2006, as amended, addresses water resource issues:
CE-2 Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
CE-3 Protection of Wetlands
CE-10 Watershed Management and Water Quality
CE-15 Water Conservation and Materials Recycling

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on hydrology and water quality would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (Manual) states that a significant impact on hydrology and water resources would occur if a project would result in a substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns, alter the course of a stream or river, increase the rate of surface runoff to the extent that flooding, including increased erosion or sedimentation, occurs, create or contribute to runoff volumes exceed existing or planned stormwater runoff facilities, or substantially degrade water quality. The Manual contains standards for surface and groundwater quality. A project would result in a significant surface/groundwater quality impact if the project disturbs more than 1 acre of land, increases the impervious surfaces on a site by 25% or more, channelizes or relocates a natural drainage, discharges pollutants into a waterbody, substantially degrades groundwater quality or if the project does not comply with the City of Goleta Stormwater Guidance document. An evaluation of the project’s impacts pursuant to City GP/CLUP policies on hydrology and water quality, as described above is included in threshold analysis.

Project Specific Impacts

a, c-f) As the site is currently vacant and undeveloped, the drainage pattern of the site would change as a result of the project. Onsite development would include adding two to three feet of fill to gain proper drainage to the southeast, relative to the roundabout improvements. A building with a footprint covering 4,173 square feet of the lot would be constructed. Additional impermeable surfaces total 6,600 square feet and including the entry walkway, patio and driveway/fire lane. The project site’s impermeable surfaces equal 10,773 square feet or just less than 50% of the site. In order to maximize ground percolation of stormwater runoff, approximately 4,974 square feet of the site is landscaped. Permeable parking spaces along the driveway account for 6,831 square feet of the site. The impermeable portions of the site equal approximately 11,805 just over 50% of the site. The decrease in permeable areas as a result of the construction of the building could contribute to a potentially significant increase in stormwater runoff volumes over baseline conditions. The required mitigation below would reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

Preliminary earthwork quantities are estimated at 4,500 cubic yards of cut/excavation, 6,500 cubic yards fill and 3,000 cubic yards of import. Due to excavation, import and fill during grading operations, erosion on the site could temporarily increase silt in the surface water runoff. Also, the parking and driveway areas are prime sources for the
introduction of petroleum and other vehicular pollutants to stormwater runoff while landscape irrigation runoff can potentially be contaminated with fertilizers, herbicides, insecticides, etc. Considered together, the impacts of stormwater runoff volumes and water quality as a result of construction activities and impermeable development on the site would be potentially significant. The required mitigation measures below, would reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

b) The project would be served by the Goleta Water District and as such, no groundwater use would be involved with project implementation. No impact is anticipated.

g,h No new development is proposed within an area mapped as a 100-year flood hazard area as denoted on the Federal Emergency Management Agreement Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Therefore, no associated flooding impacts as a result of project implementation would occur. No impact is anticipated.

i,j) There are no levees or dams from the project site to the top of its watershed. The entirety of the site lies outside the City's Potential Tsunami Run-Up Area as mapped by the City's GP/CLU. Therefore, no impacts to people and property associated with a tsunami or the failure of an upstream levee and/or dam would occur. No impact is anticipated.

Cumulative Impacts

Due to on-going new development in the City, cumulative increases in stormwater runoff will occur. During grading, soil erosion on these sites could temporarily increase silt in the surface water runoff. The contribution of potential project specific impacts to cumulative runoff/flooding and water quality impacts within the City would be considered potentially significant. However, the mitigation measures required below would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

1. The Applicant must submit drainage and grading plans with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for review and approval by Public Works and Building staff. The SWPPP must incorporate appropriate best management practices to minimize stormwater impacts during construction in accordance with the City’s Stormwater Guidance document and the City’s GP/CLUP. Plan Requirements and Timing: The SWPPP must include an erosion control plan for review and approval by Public Works staff prior to Land Use Permit issuance.

   Monitoring: City staff must verify construction of all stormwater quality/control facilities per the City approved grading and erosion control plans prior to issuance of Land Use Permit.

2. The applicant must prepare a Stormwater Maintenance Plan for ongoing maintenance of all improvements in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications, the approved plans and conditions of approval for review and approval by City staff. Plan Requirements and Timing: Said maintenance plan must be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit for the project. The plan must include provisions for the submittal of an annual maintenance report to City staff pursuant to a Stormwater Maintenance Agreement.
Monitoring: City staff must verify compliance prior to Land Use Permit issuance. City staff must review each annual maintenance report and maintenance records, if problems with the installation are observed.

3. The applicant must prepare a Stormwater Maintenance Agreement that addresses maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with the Stormwater Maintenance Plan. **Plan Requirements:** At a minimum the maintenance agreement must include inspection of all drainage infrastructure per manufacturer specifications prior to September 30th of each year. Additional inspections, repairs and maintenance must be performed after storm events as needed throughout the rainy season (November 1st to April 15th) and/or per manufacturer specifications. Any necessary major repairs must be completed prior to the next rainy season. Prior to September 30th of each year, the applicant must submit to the City for its review and approval a report summarizing all inspections, repairs, and maintenance work done during the prior year.

**Timing:** The applicant must submit the required maintenance agreement to City staff for review, approval and execution, prior to Land Use Permit issuance.

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

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative impacts on Hydrology and Water Resources would be less than significant.
LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:  

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

Existing Setting

The project is proposed on an approximately one-half acre parcel north of Calle Real and east of Los Carneros Road, adjacent to the Los Carneros roundabout. The site is vacant. The GP/CLUP land use designation for the site is Office and Institutional (I-OI). According to GP/CLUP Land Use Element Policy LU 4.3, the intent of the Office and Institutional designation is to provide for existing and future office-based uses. Uses allowed include moderate-density business and professional offices, medical and medical-related uses, hospitals, research and development, religious institutions, and other similar uses. With Minor Conditional Use Permit, a residence as a secondary use to the primary on-site use may be approved.

The current zoning designation for the site is Highway Commercial (CH). In this zone designation, permitted uses include various commercial and retail services oriented to the traveling public, including, but not limited to, gas stations, convenience markets, highway-oriented restaurants, and similar uses.

As indicated throughout this document, surrounding uses adjacent to the site include the Preserve to the north and east. The South Coast Railroad Museum and the Stow House are located in the northern portion of the Preserve. A church and residential neighborhood are located 1,000 feet north of the project site. A vacant parcel and an office use are located to the south and agriculture to the west across Los Carneros Road. The project site and surrounding area land uses and designations are presented in Table LU-1 below:
Table LU-1

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

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) **Communities.** The project would not result in the physical division of any established community or neighborhood due to the existing roadways and neighborhood configuration. The neighborhood is defined by Los Carneros Road that borders the site on the west with agricultural uses west of Los Carneros Road. Calle Real borders the site on the south with commercial uses along the south side of Calle Real. The project would be an extension of the Calle Real commercial development to the south. The closest residential neighborhood is over 1,000 feet north of the project site. The Preserve borders the project site on the north and east with the Stowe House and Train Museum in the northern portion. This large Preserve area will not be divided by development on the project site, which is a one-half acre parcel on the edge of the preserve. The project does not divide the established neighborhood as it would not change the existing circulation network within the neighborhood. The development will not change the layout, orientation and function of the neighborhood. Therefore, there would be less than significant impacts to land use with respect to the project’s potential to divide an established community.
b) General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Consistency

**General Plan/Local Coastal Plan**

**Land Use Element:** Land Use Element LU Policy 1.1 designates the project site as Office and Institutional (I-OI). The designation permits a variety of uses, including, but not limited to, religious institutions, public and quasi-public uses, residential units, business services and personal services (GP/CLUP, Land Use Element Policy 4.3 and Table 2-3). Pursuant to Table 2-3, which shows specific land uses and development standards, new structure heights are limited to 35 feet and the maximum lot coverage ratio for the site is 0.40. The project use is consistent with Table 2-3: the average building height is 35 feet and the lot coverage ratio is 0.18. Other applicable Land Use Element policies include:

- LU 1.8 New Development and Neighborhood Compatibility
- LU 1.9 Quality Design
- LU 1.13 Adequate Infrastructure

With respect to LU 1.8 and 1.9, see the Aesthetics Section for analysis of how the project design is appropriate and compatible with the neighborhood with mitigation incorporated. With mitigation measures for landscape screening, the project can be found consistent with design and development related policies of the Land Use Element. With respect to LU 1.13, see the Public Services and Utilities Section for analysis on how the infrastructure is adequate with mitigation incorporated.

The project includes a rezone from Highway Commercial to Professional and Institutional (PI) to make the site’s zoning consistent with the GP/CLUP Office and Institutional (I-OI) designation. (See further discussion in Rezone below.)

**Open Space Element:** To determine if archaeological sites or cultural resources exist on-site, a Phase 1 report is required pursuant to Policy OS 8.4. A Phase 1 study was performed and no resources were identified (Dudek 2008). Pursuant to Policy OS 8.6, on-site monitoring is required during grading to account for the potential of uncovering unexpected cultural resources. On-site monitoring was not determined to be necessary in the Phase 1 report as the site’s location makes it very unlikely that cultural materials would be encountered. With the mitigation measure to stop or redirect grading operations if unknown archeological resources are encountered as discussed in the Cultural Resources Section, the project is consistent with related policies of the GP/CLUP Open Space Element.

**Conservation Element:** Policies related to protection of biological resources include:

- CE 1.1-1.9 ESHA Policies
- CE 3.1 Protection of Wetlands
- CE 3.2 Wetland ESHA
- CE 3.5 Protection of Wetlands
- CE 3.6 Mitigation of Wetland Fill
- CE 8.4 Protection of Special Status Raptors and Related ESHA
- CE 9.1 Protection of Native Woodlands

Additional policies relate to development standards:
Studies of biological resources on the project site found that off-site nesting by sensitive raptor and general bird species may be affected by site development. Mitigation measures involve monitoring birds during nesting season when the site is being graded and provide a construction buffer for active bird nests. With these mitigation measures, the project is consistent with the Conservation Element, CE 1.1-1.9, CE 3, CE 3.2, CE 3.5, CE 3.6, CE 8.4 and CE 9.1. In addition, the biological resources study identified an arroyo willow cluster on the project site that would be removed. Also, an arroyo willow canopy and a coast live oak tree canopy that hangs over the project site would be trimmed during construction. With mitigation, including 3:1 or 2:1 ratio replacement of the willow and biologist oversight of fencing and pruning, the project is consistent with the Conservation Element 3.5 and 9.1. Pursuant to Conservation Element Policies 10.3, 12.3, 13.1 and 13.2, project design includes limiting disturbance of natural drainage features and vegetation as described above. Stormwater best management practices include permeable pavers in parking areas and a bioswale that would run along the western and southern borders of the site. Through the use of these measures, the City’s water quality standards will be met during construction. Post-development runoff will closely match pre-development runoff. Plans for stormwater construction and post construction protection plans are required mitigation measures. Therefore, the project is consistent with Conservation Element Policies 10.3, 12.3, 13.1 and 13.2.

Safety Element: Review of soil, geotechnical, fire safety and hazards, including distance from airport runways for new development, was conducted pursuant to Safety Element Policies SE 1.3, 4.3, 7.2, 9.1 and SE 10.5. With mitigation measures, including a plans for pre- and post-construction stormwater plans and a placement of a new fire hydrant, the project is consistent with related policies of the Safety Element.

Visual and Historic Resources Element: The policies in the Visual and Historic Element addresses views, scenic corridors, maintenance of neighborhood identity and appropriate building and site design as follows:

Scenic Resources/Scenic Vistas
VH 1.1 Scenic Resources
VH 1.2 Scenic Resources Map (Figure 6-1)
VH 1.4 Protection of Mountain and Foothill Views
VH 1.5 Protection of Open Space Views

Scenic Corridors
VH 2.1 Designated Scenic Corridors
VH 2.2 Preservation of Scenic Corridors
VH 2.3 Development Projects along Scenic Corridors

Community Character
VH 3.1 Community Character
VH 3.2 Neighborhood Identity
VH 3.3/3.4 Site Design and Building Design
VH 3.4 Building Design
VH 4.9 Landscape Design
VH 4.11 Parking Lots

As analyzed in the Aesthetics Section, the project site plan and proposed building have been designed to minimize impacts to the Preserve and Santa Ynez Mountains Scenic Resources. Additionally, impacts to the Los Carneros Scenic Corridor and community character have been reviewed. The project has incorporated development practices and design pursuant to Visual and Historic Resources Policies VH 1.4, VH 1.5, VH 4.9 and VH 4.11. Proposed exterior lighting would be low intensity and shaded downward. Other mitigation measures include landscaping for screening and blending the building with Preserve. With these mitigation measures, the project is consistent with the Visual and Historic Element.

Transportation Element: Transportation Element Policy TE 3.3 addresses major arterials, including Los Carneros Road and Calle Real, that serve the project site. The Los Carneros roundabout supports the traffic flow on these major arterials. The project has been designed to interface with the round-about design. TE 4.1 sets Level of Service (LOS) standards for roadways and intersections. TE 13.3 establishes standards for maintaining adequate intersection operation. TE 4.1 sets a standard LOS C for major arterials including Los Carneros Road and Calle Real and other major arterials in the project vicinity. According to a traffic and parking study (Penfield & Smith, November 2012), the project will not degrade arterial or intersection ILOS in the project vicinity. TE 9.2 addresses adequacy of parking supply. The parking study determined that the proposed parking supply is adequate and the use of valet and offsite parking arrangements per the project description would be appropriate. A condition of approval would be imposed for an off-site shared parking agreement. Policy TE 9.5 addresses parking lot design. TE 11.4 requires bicycle parking in new developments. A condition of approval would be imposed to require on-site bicycle parking. With the approval of modification requests relating to parking lot setbacks and landscape planters, the project’s parking design would be consistent with this policy. With these mitigation measures and conditions of approval, the project’s traffic and parking is consistent with the Transportation Element.

Public Facilities Element: Public Facilities Policies PF 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, and 9.7 address new development and provision of essential public services. Services including fire and police protection, water and sewer facilities and infrastructure are available to serve the proposed development. Additionally, installation of a new fire hydrant is a required as mitigation (See Public Services section). The results of the project’s public facilities review can be found consistent with related policies of the GP/CLUP Public Facility Element, with mitigation.

Noise Element: Policy NE 1.1 Table 9-2 sets noise and land use compatibility criteria. Appropriate mitigation for construction noise is addressed in NE 6.4. The results of the project’s noise review can be found consistent with related policies of the GP/CLUP Noise Element, with construction mitigation.

Housing Element: Policy HE 3.2 requires new non-residential development to contribute to the provision of affordable housing. The project includes residential use; therefore, the project is consistent with Housing Element Policy HE 3.2.
Rezone
The site’s current zoning designation is Highway Commercial (CH). According to the Inland Zoning Ordinance, permitted uses include various commercial and retail services oriented to the traveling public, including hotels, restaurants, automobile service stations, and mini-mart/convenience stores. The project includes a request for a rezone from CH to PI zone. Permitted uses for the PI zone include religious institutions, professional offices, banks, community buildings, special care homes, churches, libraries, schools, museums, government buildings, and retail stores and restaurants.

Both zones require a development plan permit for permitted uses. Environmental impacts associated with the development of uses in the CH zone and the PI zone may be comparable. However, uses in the CH zone tend to be uses that generate heavy traffic, such as automobile service stations, mini-marts and fast food restaurants. CH commercial uses are designed to service the traveling public, and therefore, may bring a higher number of new vehicle trips into the neighborhood. Additionally, these uses generally are open late at night or for 24-hours such as gas stations or convenience stores. Bright all night lighting could create significant impacts for nesting birds in the adjacent Preserve.

Zoning Ordinance Development Standards
The PI zone limits building height to an average of 35 feet and building coverage on a site to 40%. The proposed project is designed with an average building height of 35 feet and building coverage of 18%. The PI zone also requires that landscaping occur on at least 10% of the site. The project proposes landscaping on 22% of the site. With the rezone, the project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance permitted uses and site standards.

The project site is a corner lot with two front yards, one on Los Carneros Road and one on Calle Real. A side property line occurs on the north side of the site and the east property line is the rear yard. The parcel also has one short diagonal property line in the northeast corner that is considered a portion of the rear property line. The front setback (Los Carneros Road and Calle Real) is 15 feet. The proposed building is set back at least 15 feet as required. The side and rear yard setback for buildings is 15-feet. The proposed building is set back a minimum of 60 feet from both the rear and side property lines. The building location is consistent with the PI stands for building setbacks.

The project includes discretionary modifications to several Inland Zoning Ordinance development standards that related to the screening/landscaping requirements for parking areas and parking setback requirements. Such modifications may be approved if they are justified. Several proposed parking spaces (two on either side of the driveway) are within the required 15-foot front yard setback along Calle Real (south property line). A small triangular landscaping island is proposed between these angled parking spaces and the property line. Parking spaces are aligned along the north property line where the 15-foot side yard setback would be required. A modification to Goleta Municipal Code Section 35-262.2a is requested to allow the proposed parking spaces to encroach on the 15-foot side yard setback. The location of these encroaching parking spaces allow the proposed building to be located in the lower (southwest) corner of the property so it would be furthest away from the Preserve, thereby minimizing interruption of views to the Santa Ynez mountains and the Preserve. The resulting site plan is justified as it is superior to an alternative site.
plan that meets all of the development standards. A less than significant impact is anticipated with the parking space encroachments.

During the Conceptual review process, the DRB made positive comments on the quality of the conceptual landscape plan and also recommended specific improvements such as increasing plant sizes. The Zoning Ordinance requirement (Section 35-263.3) for a landscape strip or fence along property lines serves to visually break up continuous expanses of asphalt parking lots. There are no asphalt parking spaces on the project site. The Preserve borders the project side on the east and north. The proposed parking spaces along the north, east and south property lines are designed with permeable materials that will provide a more natural appearance to the site’s parking areas. The Preserve borders the project site on its northern and eastern boundary lines thereby providing landscaping around edges of the project site where parking spaces are located. The resulting site plan is justified as adjacent Preserve vegetation provides landscape screening and no fence or wall would inhibit wildlife movements. A less than significant impact related to parking space screening is anticipated.

Parking Regulations
The Penfield & Smith Traffic and Circulation Report, 2012 (incorporated by reference) addresses parking issues. This report was reviewed by City Consultant Traffic Engineer. Table LU-2 below, summarizes the parking requirements for the project, applying the Inland Zoning Ordinance parking standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Floor Area (SF)</th>
<th>Required Parking Formula</th>
<th>Parking Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence with Home Office</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>2 spaces per unit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Room 1</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1 space per 10 participants/students plus 1 space per 2 teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Use 2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1 space per 300 SF (commercial/office standard)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Use 3</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1 space per 30 SF</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Use/Dining Area 4</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1 space per 300 SF</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Spaces Required** 42

1. School Use per Goleta Inland Zoning Ordinance 35-257.3
2. Professional Office per Goleta Inland Zoning Ordinance 35-258.3
3. General Assembly per Goleta Inland Zoning Ordinance 35-257.1
4. Places of Amusement without fixed seats per Goleta Inland Zoning Ordinance 35-257.2

Table LU-2 below summarizes the parking demand for the project with the proposed uses incorporated. This parking calculation methodology is considered conservative because it adds the projected parking needed for all the different types of spaces as if they were all to be used at the same time. In the Zoning Ordinance, “stairways and
open, unenclosed corridors shall be excluded” in parking demand calculations (Section 35-255.4). The gross building square footage is used in the parking calculations to provide a second conservative calculation. Using this conservative methodology, the parking requirement is 42 spaces. The project includes 42 parking spaces, fulfilling the Inland Zoning Ordinance parking requirement for the project. The parking spaces would support the typical uses that would be expected to occur throughout the year as presented in the project description. The project description includes a proposal for a carpool, shuttle, or valet parking for uses that may exceed the parking lot capacity.

Penfield & Smith (2012) also analyzed the project parking requirement based on the maximum number of attendees proposed in the project description. A separate parking calculation was performed based on 120 attendees. The City’s Zoning Ordinance states that the parking rate for churches, general auditoriums, lodges, halls and other places of general assembly is one parking space for each four fixed seats, which was translated into a parking rate of one space per four attendees. To be conservative this analysis adds the parking requirement for the single-family home, the library and the lecture room into the parking demand. The parking requirements per the City’s Zoning Ordinance based on attendance are summarized in Table LU-3. As shown, the total parking demand based on attendance is projected to be 40 parking spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Equivalent City Use</th>
<th>Parking Requirement</th>
<th>Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>1,400 SF</td>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>2 spaces/unit</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Center</td>
<td>120 Attendees</td>
<td>Church/General Assembly</td>
<td>1 space/4 attendees</td>
<td>30 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General use/Library area</td>
<td>1,200 SF</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1 space/300 SF +</td>
<td>4 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Room (30 students/ 1 teacher)</td>
<td>1,300 SF</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>1 space/10 students + 1 space/2 teachers</td>
<td>4 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parking analysis indicates that the proposed parking supply is consistent with the projected parking requirement for the proposed project, under a scenario that all spaces in the building would be used at the same time. Including two parking spaces for the library employees (per Zoning Code Parking Requirements), the proposed parking supply of 42 spaces is projected to provide sufficient parking for the proposed project. Additionally, on-street parking is available along the west side of Los Carneros Road north of the round-about. This on-street parking is used during special events at the Railroad Museum or Stow House. A less than significant parking impact is anticipated. There are no required mitigation measures. However, a condition of approval would be imposed for the provision of carpool, shuttle, or valet parking when uses are anticipated to exceed parking capacity.

c) Management Plans. The project is located adjacent to the Preserve. There are two plans for this land: the Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve Plan
(1987) and the Lake Los Carneros County Park Updated Management Plan (1999). These plans outline Preserve features and discuss management recommendations, areas for non-native vegetation removal and habitat restoration. As the project will not be developed in the Preserve, direct impacts with the 1987 and 1999 Lake Los Carneros Plans are less than significant. Biological impacts to the Preserve associated with the project are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures described in the Biological Resources section above. Impacts to cumulative construction noise are mitigated to less than significant with mitigation measures in the Noise section above.

Cumulative Impacts

Considering that other development projects in the City, the project’s contribution to cumulative biological impacts is mitigated with the biological and construction noise mitigation measures required in the Biological Resources section above and Noise section below.

Residual Impact

Upon implementation of the mitigation measures associated with biological resources and construction noise, residual Land Use and Planning impacts would be less than significant.

Although not a required mitigation measure, the following regulations will be a Condition of Approval:

1. Enter into a shared parking agreement to allow the Islamic Society of Santa Barbara to use private, developed, off-site parking for special events, when it can be anticipated that additional parking will be needed, beyond that provided on-site. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Provide an agreement acceptable to the City Attorney prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

2. A total of five (5) bike parking spaces must be provided. Bicycle racks must be the “Inverted U” type in compliance with the SBCAG Traffic Solutions recommended style of bicycle racks. Minor adjustment in bicycle parking locations may be approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Department. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Final plans showing bicycle parking locations and type must be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta prior to LUP issuance. **Monitoring.** The City staff must perform site inspections to ensure implementation according to approved plan prior to occupancy clearance.
MINERAL RESOURCES

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

Existing Setting

No known mineral resources have been identified on the project site nor is an important mineral resource recovery site located on the parcel.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a,b) There are no known mineral resource or identified resource recovery site on the project land. As such project development would not result in the loss of mineral resources, no important significant impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

Very few, if any, proposed projects in the City have effects on mineral resources. This project is no different and would have no cumulative impact on loss of mineral resources or resource recovery sites.

Required Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

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

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

Existing Setting

Noise exposure contours are mapped points of average noise levels along a noise source (e.g. railroad). The project site lies within the 60 decibels A-rated (dBA) noise contour for US Highway 101, Calle Real and Los Carneros Road for both the existing 2005 contour and the projected future 2030 contour, GP/CLUP Noise Element, 2006. The site is located outside all existing or projected future contours of airport and railroad noise. The use of the proposed building is considered to be a sensitive receptor (users that are interrupted by relatively low levels of noise e.g. residences, libraries, and churches, per the Noise Element. Off-site sensitive receptors include the surrounding Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve, as well as the church and residential areas along Covington Road (approximately 1,000 feet to the north of the project site). The historic Stow House and the South Coast Railroad Museum are located approximately 900 feet north of the project site. Special events at these sites that attract a large number of people are regularly held outdoors. Noise associated with crowds, music and speakers affect the area surrounding the historic sites.

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

The frequency of a sound relates to the number of times per second the sound vibrates. One vibration/second equals one hertz (Hz). Normal human hearing can detect sounds ranging from 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz. Duration is a measure of the time to which the noise receptor is exposed to the noise. Because noise levels in any given location fluctuate during the day, it is necessary to quantify the level of variation to accurately describe the noise environment. A measure to describe the noise environment is the Community Noise Equivalent Level or CNEL. CNEL is a noise index that attempts to take into account differences in the intrusiveness of noise between daytime hours and nighttime hours. Specifically, CNEL weights average noise levels at different times of the day as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Weighting Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daytime—7 am to 7 pm</td>
<td>1 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening—7 pm to 10 pm</td>
<td>5 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nighttime—10 pm to 7 am</td>
<td>10 dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City GP/CLUP Noise Element, 2006, as amended provides maps of noise contours along roadways, the railroad and airport. The Goleta Municipal Code, Chapter 9.0 regulates noise affecting outdoor areas during certain times of the day and certain days of the week.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant noise impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*. The City’s adopted thresholds assume that outdoor CNEL noise levels in excess of 65 dBA are considered to pose significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors. The City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* also notes construction noise poses a potentially significant impact on sensitive receptors if such receptors are within 1,600 feet of the construction site. Impact analysis would include GP/CLUP Noise Element Policy NE 1.1 Table 9-2 which provides noise and land use compatibility criteria. Policy NE 6.1 requires enforcement of the City’s noise ordinance.

**Project Specific Impacts**

a,c) The project site lies within the 60 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise exposure contour within the City. This 60dB CNEL noise contour for the site covers current and 2030 conditions. The primary sources of noise in the area are vehicular traffic on U. S. Highway 101, Calle Real and Los Carneros Road and train noise along the Union Pacific Railroad Right of Way parallel to U.S. Highway 101. The GP/CLUP Noise Element indicates that the range of normally acceptable noise levels for schools, libraries, and churches (the proposed on-site uses) is 50-60 dBA CNEL. “Normally acceptable” for a specified land use is defined as:

“The environment should be suitable for the intended use of the property. “Suitable” means that the property should be useable for its intended use. Both the noise exposure levels and the duration of exposure must be considered. “Suitable” means that the property should be useable for its intended use.

The proposed on-site uses are considered sensitive receptors according to the GP/CLUP Noise Element, 2006. The limit of acceptable exterior noise exposure for sensitive receptors is 60 dBA CNEL.
Future noise contours at build-out of the City’s General Plan indicate that the anticipated exterior noise levels to be experienced at the project site remain at the 60dBA CNEL level. With conventional construction techniques, the interior noise levels would decrease by 20 dB (GP/CLUP Noise Element) to a level of 40 dBA. Acceptable interior noise limits are 45dBA CNEL or less. Therefore, the impact on the project due to ambient noise is considered less than significant.

b) The project would not expose neighboring sensitive receptors to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels as such impacts are not associated with assembly related and residential uses. Since construction of the project would not require such vibration generating construction techniques, activities in the proposed building including assembly and related uses as well as residential use, would not be sources of vibration. No significant vibration impacts are expected to occur.

d) A temporary increase in ambient noise may be associated with construction for the proposed project. The Preserve would be considered an open space sensitive receptor (GP/CLUP Noise Element) regarding noise from construction. Noise associated with heavy equipment operation and construction activities can average as high as 95 dB or more measured 50 feet from the source. At an attenuation rate of 6 dB for each doubling of distance from the source, construction equipment noise levels at 95 dB would decrease to below the 65 dB threshold for sensitive receptors (e.g. the Preserve) until the distance between the source and receptor reach 1,600 feet. With the open space sensitive receptor in the immediate vicinity of the project site (within 1,600 feet), construction noise would therefore be considered to pose a potentially significant impact on such sensitive receptors. As presented in the Biological Resources Section, construction may create a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measures as outlined in NE 6.4 to reduce potential construction noise impacts are required.

Assembly and related uses as well as residential use, are indoor uses and would therefore generate interior sounds. Such sounds are not anticipated to result in a significant permanent increase in ambient outdoor noise levels. Additionally, sounds may occur through outdoor activities. The only useable outdoor gathering space is a small patio on the south side of the building facing Calle Real Road. Due to the isolated location of the site and the small size of the outdoor gathering area, outdoor noise associated with ongoing site use would be less than significant.

e,f) While the project site is within the Airport Influence Area of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, it lies outside of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Approach Zone, as defined by the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan. The Noise Contour Maps in the Noise Element indicate that the project site is not within the airport’s noise influence area. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

Cumulative Impacts

The GP/CLUP Noise Element indicates that the noise level (60dBa CNEL) in the vicinity of the project site is currently acceptable for sensitive receptors and it is expected to remain acceptable through 2030 with the addition of cumulative build-out. As the project will not increase the ambient noise level, a cumulative impact would not occur.
Required Mitigation Measures

1. All noise-generating project construction activities must be limited to Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Construction must not be allowed on weekends and state holidays unless exceptions are approved by the City. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (e.g. in the event of an emergency) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Planning and Environmental Review Director. The applicant must post the allowed hours of construction near the entrance to the site, so that workers on site are aware of this limitation. Plan Requirements and Timing: Three (3) signs stating these restrictions must be provided by the applicant and posted on site. Such signs must be a minimum size of 24” x 48.” All such signs must be in place prior to beginning commencement of any grading/demolition and maintained through to occupancy clearance. Is this noise ordinance??

Monitoring: City staff must monitor for the presence of signage and compliance with restrictions on construction hours, as well as investigating and responding to complaints.

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

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

3. The following measures must be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise:

a. All construction equipment must have properly maintained sound-control devices, and no equipment must have an unmuffled exhaust system.

b. Contractors must implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including but not limited to changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, and installing acoustic barriers around significant sources of stationary construction noise.

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

Monitoring: City staff must periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance
Residual Impact

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

### POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

Existing Setting

The existing site is vacant and does not contain housing. The 2005-2010 American Communities Survey of the U. S. Census estimates a total of 21,764 workers working in the City of Goleta, and 14,932 workers living in the City of Goleta. The population figure for the City from the 2010 U. S. Census is 29,888. Household information from the State Department of Finance indicates that there are an average of 2.7 persons per household within the City. The Housing Element Policy HE 3.2 requires new non-residential development to contribute to the provision of affordable housing.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) The project would create a building to be used for assembly related use and one residential unit. The provision of an on-site residence associated with the on-site use, is consistent with Housing Element Policy HE 3.2. Due to the residential unit, the project has the potential to add 2-3 people (2.7 persons/household). This represents a minor increase (0.1%) in a city of nearly 30,000 residents. Proposed infrastructure connections would serve the project site and would not be growth-inducing. Therefore project impacts on population and growth would be considered less than significant.
b,c) The project would not displace any existing housing units or require the displacement of any people, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no such impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

As an assembly use, which generally serves local populations, the project’s contribution to cumulative population growth as well as adverse impacts on the area’s housing supply would be less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

Residual impacts on population growth and the area’s housing supply, as well as the project’s contribution to such cumulative population of housing impacts would be less than significant.
PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Existing Setting

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

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

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

Fire protection services for the project site would be provided by the SBCFD. The closest station to the project site is Fire Station 14 located at 320 Los Carneros Road, approximately 900 feet to the north of the project site. Station 14 has a staff of three personnel, consisting of an engine company captain, engineer and fire fighter. This station provides immediate response to incidents as determined by the type of call. Fire Station 14 currently meets the NFPA and SBCFD guidelines as follows:

1. The current ratio of firefighters to population is 1:1,987.
2. The station currently serves a population of 5,960 which is below the ratio of one engine company (3-person crew) per 12,000 population by approximately 6,040 people.

3. Response time from Fire Station 14 is typically within 5 minutes.

The SBCFD has also recently implemented a dynamic deployment system, for its fire engines, in addition to the traditional static deployment system from fire stations when the station’s engine is “in-house”. Dynamic deployment allows for the dispatching of engines already on the road to emergency calls rather than dispatching by a station’s “first in area”, as has been the previous practice. Basically, dynamic deployment uses a Global Positioning System (GPS) to monitor the exact location of each engine in real time. Previously, when an engine was out on routine (non-emergency) activities, such as inspections or training, the engine company was considered “in-service” and its exact location at any given moment in time was not known to County Dispatch. However, with dynamic deployment using the County’s GPS, County dispatch has real-time information on the exact location of each engine at all times and can dispatch the closest, un-engaged engine to an emergency incident, regardless of which fire station’s service area the call originates. This precludes the need for an in-service engine to have extended run times when another fire engine would be closer (Fidler; telecom with S. Kolwitz 8/16/11). The Fire Department has also added a battalion chief as the fourth fire fighter on scene, in order to meet the “two-in-two-out rule.”

**Police Protection**

Police services are provided by the Santa Barbara County Sheriff’s Department under contract to the City. The Santa Barbara County Sheriff’s Department provides 24-hour police protection services to the area. The City of Goleta is divided into 3 patrol units with 1 police car assigned to each unit. Additional police services are available from Santa Barbara County to supplement City of Goleta police in an emergency. City of Goleta police operate from three locations: the City of Goleta offices, an office located in Old Town on Hollister Avenue, and a third location at the Camino Real Marketplace.

**Schools**

Public schools serving the project site and vicinity include La Patera Elementary, Goleta Valley Junior High, and Dos Pueblos High School. In general, school enrollment has been declining in the past several years and area schools are operating below capacity. The City and area school districts have implemented Development Impact Fees for new development, consistent with the State government and education code section.

**Parks**

Park facilities in proximity to the project site include the surrounding Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve. (See further park information in Recreation section.)

**Libraries**

Services at the Goleta Public Library are provided by contract with the City of Santa Barbara in a facility owned by the City of Goleta at 500 North Fairview Avenue. In 2010/2011, approximately 34,500 library cards were held by area residents. The library is staffed by 5 full-time and 2 part-time employees.

The City of Goleta Development Impact Fee program requires development to pay fees that support recreation, transportation, fire, library, public administration and police fees to offset impacts to public services. Area schools have also adopted a Development Impact Fee based on a program that is pursuant to the education code and is independent of the City fee program.

Thresholds of Significance

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

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) Governmental Facilities and Services.

*Fire Protection*

The project would result in a 7,572 square foot building including one residential unit with approximately 2-3 new household members (2.7 household members/unit State Department of Finance). The building is proposed for assembly and related use by up to 120 persons during various times of the day and various days of the week. Fire protection requirements would include, structural fires, emergency medical services, public assistance, and other requests.

The additional project population would not exceed the Fire Station 14 maximum firefighter-to-population ratio and would also not exceed the engine company per population ratio. The project site is located approximately 900 feet from Fire Station 14. Due to this proximity, response time to the project would meet the 5-minute standard.

The project site plan was reviewed by the SBCFD for conformance with emergency vehicle access requirements and was deemed acceptable. The existing fire hydrant infrastructure in the area is substandard as there are no hydrants capable of serving the project. No hydrant exists on Los Carneros Road in the vicinity of the site. There is an existing hydrant on the south side of Calle Real to service the existing commercial development, however, the SBCFD will not lay hoses across a major roadway such as Calle Real (telephone conversation with Dwight Peppin, SBCFD, October 15, 2013). Therefore, impacts to fire protection services are considered potentially significant. With the fire provision of a fire hydrant at the driveway entrance on Los Carneros Road, impacts would be less than significant.
Police Services

The project would result in structural development, personal property and a new residential unit that could generate an increased demand for police services. The site provides adequate building and parking lot lighting plus an on-site residence for security measures. Demand for police services resulting from the project would not change measurably from baseline levels, resulting in a less than significant impact.

Schools

As the project includes one new residential unit, the possible number of school-aged children would be very limited based on an average household size of 2.7 persons per household (State Department of Finance). Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact due to increased student enrollment within either the Goleta Union or Santa Barbara School Districts.

Parks

Parks and recreation issues are discussed in the Recreation section below. The impacts were determined to be less than significant.

Library

The project includes the development of one residential unit with a potential population of 2-3 persons in the household limited based on an average household size of 2.7 persons per household (State Department of Finance). The project is unlikely to generate new library users that would cause an impact to library services. The project would result in a less than significant impact due to library services.

Cumulative Impacts

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

The deficiency in fire protection service in western Goleta would be addressed by the construction of future Fire Station 10 on property owned by the City at 7952 Hollister Avenue. Such construction is identified in the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, 2006, as amended.

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

Police Services

The project would be subject to payment of Development Impact Fees (DIFs) adopted for the purpose of requiring projects to pay a fair share of police services and facilities
associated with cumulative development. Fees are due at final inspection. As a result of payment of this fee, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on police protection would be less than significant.

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

**Required Mitigation Measure**

1. One new fire hydrant must be installed. The fire hydrant must be located per fire department specification and must flow 1250 gallons per minute at a 20 psi residual pressure. The commercial fire hydrant must consist of one 4-inch outlet and two 2-1/2-inch outlets. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Fire Department sign-off required on fire hydrant plan prior to Land Use Permit and/or building permit issuance, as applicable. Hydrant to be installed prior to vertical construction on-site.

**Monitoring:** Prior to permit issuance, City staff must verify Fire Department review and approval of Land Use Permit plan set and/or building plans, as applicable. Monitor site improvements prior to vertical construction.

**Residual Impact**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact.</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact.</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

The City’s 16 public parks, 4 private parks, and 18 public open space areas comprise a total of 507 acres, which equate to approximately 17 acres per thousand residents. The three larger City-owned regional open space preserves, the Sperling Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, and Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve collectively account for 363 acres of that total. Approximately 40 percent of the City’s two miles of Pacific shoreline is held in City ownership. Together with the neighborhood open space areas, these preserves provide many opportunities for passive recreation activities and enjoyment of natural areas. Areas specifically developed for active recreational uses however are less abundant with about three acres of land per thousand residents. The City’s single recreation center, the Goleta Valley Community Center, is insufficient to fulfill all the needs of community groups and residents. Although privately owned and managed, Girsh Park provides much-needed facilities for active recreation but there remains a shortage of public facilities for active recreation such as sports fields, tennis courts, swimming pools, and dedicated trails. GP/CLUP Open Space Element Policy 6 designates the park and open space needs and plans. The City of Goleta Development Impact Fee program requires new development to pay fees that support public services including recreation, transportation, fire, library, public administration and police fees to offset impacts to public services.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a) The project is a building for assembly and related uses intended to be used by existing area residents. The new residential unit may provide housing for 2-3 persons, (2.7 persons/household per State Department of Finance). These residents may already reside in Goleta or adjacent communities. Therefore, few new residents to Goleta would be associated with the development of the project site. Therefore, the project would create insignificant demand on existing regional parks and recreational facilities. This would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of community resources. Therefore, project specific recreation impacts are considered less than significant.
b) No recreational facilities are proposed with this project; therefore no impacts associated with the construction of such facilities would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

New development in the City and surrounding areas would result in an incremental increase in demand for parks and recreation facilities. The required payment of park and recreation facility fees as per Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 16.14, for new development would fund public park facilities that would meet the incremental demand for recreational facilities created by the project and other new development. The project’s contribution to this impact is considered less than significant.

**Required Mitigation**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impact**

As no mitigation is required there will be no residential impact.
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

Existing Setting

The traffic/circulation setting information is derived from the *Islamic Center Updated Traffic and Circulation Study*, Penfield & Smith, November 30, 2012 (incorporated by reference), that was peer-reviewed by City staff. The existing traffic and circulation information in the report was collected prior to the construction of the Los Carneros Road and Calle Real round-about but the calculations accounted for the roundabout (Dennis Lammers, Penfield &
Smith, Memo, July 2013). The project site is served by two major arterial streets and US Highway 101. The site is located at the northeastern corner of Los Carneros Road and Calle Real, adjacent to the Los Carneros Road/Calle Real roundabout. Los Carneros Road is a major north/south arterial street and Calle Real is a major east/west arterial street. Signalized on-ramps and off-ramps for US Highway 101 are located to the south of the Los Carneros Road round-about.

**Existing Roadway Operations**
Penfield & Smith obtained existing (2012) average daily traffic (ADT) volumes from the City of Goleta and compared the existing traffic volumes to the capacity of the critical roadway segments in the study area. Los Carneros Road and Calle Real are designated major arterials in the GP/CLUP Transportation Element Policy TE 3.3.

As a major north/south roadway, Los Carneros Road carries 3,000 ADT between Cathedral Oaks and Calle Real, 11,200 ADT between Calle Real and U.S. 101, and 24,300 ADT south of U.S. 101. As a major east/west roadway, Calle Real carries 6,900 ADT from Los Carneros Road east to Fairview. Comparisons of the existing roadway volumes to the City's roadway capacity standards indicate that these roadway segments currently operate in the Level of Service (LOS) A range.

**Existing Intersection Operations**
The following intersections were included in the traffic analysis:

1. Los Carneros Road /Cathedral Oaks Road
2. Los Carneros Road/ Calle Real
3. Los Carneros Road /U.S. 101 NB Ramps (CMP intersection)
4. Los Carneros Road /U.S. 101 SB Ramps (CMP intersection)
5. Los Carneros Road /Hollister Avenue (CMP intersection)
6. Fairview Avenue/ Calle Real (CMP intersection)
7. Storke Road/ Hollister Avenue (CMP intersection)

As the PM peak hour is the more impacted period in the project area, PM peak hour intersection information was analyzed in the Penfield & Smith report. Table T-1 shows the existing levels of service at the study area intersections based on the most conservative volumes collected within the 2008 to 2012 time period.
Table T-1
Existing PM Peak Hour Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>V/C Ratio or Seconds of Delay</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/Cathedral Oaks Rd</td>
<td>One-way Stop</td>
<td>11.7 sec/veh</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/Calle Real</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>11.9 sec/veh</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/U.S. 101 NB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/U.S. 101 SB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/Calle Real</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storke Rd/Hollister Ave</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information in Table T-1 shows the study area intersections currently operate at LOS C or better during the PM peak hours, which is considered acceptable based on City standards. This information was collected prior to construction of the round-about.

Thresholds of Significance

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (including project)</th>
<th>Increase in V/C Greater than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or the addition of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (including project)</th>
<th>Increase in V/C Greater than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Transportation Element Policy TE 4.1 sets a standard LOS C for major arterials including Los Carneros Road and other major arterials in the project vicinity. Maintenance of LOS Standards is addressed in TE 13.3. Transportation Element Policy TE 9.2 addresses adequacy of parking supply.

Project Specific Impacts

a,c) The site-specific trip generation estimates for the new traffic generated by the project when compared to the baseline were calculated based on average trip generation rates provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation (7th and 8th Editions).

Roadway Analysis

Table T-2 below summarizes the project’s trip generation used to calculate project impacts to study area roadways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Trips (Total)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Trips (Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly/Church Use (6,200 sf)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Unit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-School Program 30 students</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Trips</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existing plus project roadway LOS are shown in Table T-3 below. The road segments in the study area operate in the LOS A range under existing conditions. As shown, the project’s ADT additions would not change the LOS at the area roadways. Project impact to roadway LOS would be less than significant.
**Table T-3**

Existing Plus Project Roadway Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Existing ADT</th>
<th>Existing + Project ADT</th>
<th>LOS C Threshold</th>
<th>Existing + Project LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Oaks Rd</td>
<td>w/o Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>6,812</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calle Real</td>
<td>e/o Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>6,912</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>n/o U.S. 101</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,321</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s/o U.S. 101</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>24,344</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Ave</td>
<td>w/o Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>21,223</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e/o Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>17,311</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Intersection Analysis*

The existing plus project intersection analysis illustrates the LOS for the study area intersections with the addition of project-related trips. This scenario is illustrated in Table T-4 below. (The LOS calculations below for Los Carneros Road and Calle Real assume that the roundabout is in place.) As shown in Table T-4, study area intersections would continue in the LOS C range or better under existing plus project conditions. Therefore, the project’s impacts at the study area intersections would be less than significant.

**Table T-4**

PM Peak Hour
Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>Existing + Project LOS</th>
<th>Change in V/C</th>
<th>Project - Added Trips</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/Cathedral Oaks Rd</td>
<td>11.7 sec/LOS B</td>
<td>11.8 sec/LOS B</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/Calle Real</td>
<td>11.9 sec/LOS B</td>
<td>8.7 sec/LOS A¹</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/U.S. 101 NB Ramps</td>
<td>0.56/LOS A</td>
<td>0.56/LOS A</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>5 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/U.S. 101 SB Ramps</td>
<td>0.77/LOS C</td>
<td>0.77/LOS C</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>4 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>0.66/LOS B</td>
<td>0.66/LOS B</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/Calle Real</td>
<td>0.75/LOS C</td>
<td>0.75/LOS C</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storke Rd/Hollister Ave</td>
<td>0.74/LOS C</td>
<td>0.74/LOS C</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Assumes the one-lane roundabout construction under existing plus project conditions.

b,d) Per the Santa Barbara County Association of Government’s (SBCAG) Guidelines, a Congestion Management Analysis should be conducted to identify potential impacts to the Congestion Management Program (CMP) system if total trip generation exceeds 50 peak hour trips or 500 daily trips. Since the project would generate fewer trips than this threshold, a CMP analysis does not need to be conducted. The impact of traffic
generated by the project on the CMP system intersections is therefore considered to be less than significant.

e) The project site is not located within the Airport Approach Zone of the Santa Barbara Airport or in the vicinity of any private airfields. Therefore, the project would generate no changes to existing air traffic patterns.

f) Access to the project site would be provided by a 20-foot wide one-way ingress driveway from Los Carneros Road located just north of the round-about. This driveway follows the perimeter of the site and provides egress onto Calle Real just east of the round-about. A curb cut would be required to provide egress for the driveway. This design has been reviewed and approved by the City for conformity with the round-about location. Additionally, the project site plan was reviewed by the County Fire Department for conformance with emergency vehicle access requirements and was deemed acceptable. Site access would be a less than significant impact.

h) No existing or planned bus routes or stops are in the project vicinity. The nearest existing bus routes are on Cathedral Oaks Road and Hollister Avenue. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the bus transit system operated by the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District. Public sidewalks have been constructed with the round-about, on the west and south sides of the project site. Due to the presence of the LLCNHP to the north and east of the project site, the sidewalks on the project site do not connect to other area sidewalks.

   No bike parking area is indicated on the plans, as required by the parking standards of the City’s Inland Zoning Ordinance and Transportation Element policy TE 11.4. Impacts on alternative transportation plans, policies, and programs would therefore be considered adverse, but not significant. A recommended mitigation measure would require on-site bicycle parking to be provided.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative Plus Project Roadway Operations

Project ADT volumes were added to the cumulative traffic forecasts to determine cumulative roadway LOS. Table T-5 shows the cumulative plus project ADT volumes for the study area roadway segments:
Table T-5
Cumulative Plus Project Roadway Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Cumulative ADT</th>
<th>Cumulative + Project ADT</th>
<th>LOS C Threshold</th>
<th>Cumulative + Project LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Oaks Rd</td>
<td>e/o Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>8,102</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calle Real</td>
<td>e/o Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>9,191</td>
<td>9,203</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>n/o U.S. 101</td>
<td>13,511</td>
<td>13,632</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s/o U.S. 101</td>
<td>33,967</td>
<td>34,011</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Ave</td>
<td>w/o Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>24,083</td>
<td>24,106</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e/o Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>17,092</td>
<td>17,103</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Increased roadway capacity due to programmed construction of third NB lane.

The data presented in Table T-5 indicates that the study area roadway segments would continue to operate in the LOS B range or better under cumulative plus project conditions, which is considered acceptable based on City standards. The project would generate less than significant cumulative roadway impacts.

Cumulative Plus Project Intersection Operations

The cumulative analysis includes near future roadway and intersection improvements. The cumulative plus project intersection traffic volumes and LOS are illustrated in Table T-6 below:

Table T-6
PM Peak Hour
Cumulative Plus Project Intersection Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Cumulative LOS</th>
<th>Cumulative + Project LOS</th>
<th>Change in V/C</th>
<th>Project - Added Trips</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/Cathedral Oaks Rd</td>
<td>14.6 sec/LOS B</td>
<td>14.6 sec/LOS B</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/Calle Real</td>
<td>14.5 sec/LOS B</td>
<td>14.6 sec/LOS C</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/U.S. 101 NB Ramps</td>
<td>0.71/LOS C</td>
<td>0.71/LOS C</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>5 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/U.S. 101 SB Ramps</td>
<td>1.04/LOS F</td>
<td>1.04/LOS F</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>4 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Rd/Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>0.76/LOS C</td>
<td>0.76/LOS C</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>3 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/Calle Real</td>
<td>0.78/LOS C</td>
<td>0.78/LOS C</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storke Rd/Hollister Ave</td>
<td>0.86/LOS D</td>
<td>0.86/LOS D</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2 trips</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bolded values exceed City level of service standard.
The data in Table T-6 indicates that the Los Carneros Road/U.S. 101 Southbound Ramps intersection is expected to operate in the LOS F range with cumulative projects. The proposed project would add less than V/C 0.01, which does not exceed the City’s cumulative impact threshold. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on cumulative traffic intersection operations in the study area.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Residual Impact**

No residual project hazards and hazardous materials impacts are anticipated.

Although not a required mitigation measure, the following regulation will be a Condition of Approval:

1. A total of five (5) bicycle parking spaces must be provided. Bicycle racks must be the “Inverted U” type in compliance with the SBCAG Traffic Solutions recommended bicycle rack. Minor adjustment in bicycle parking locations may be approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Department. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Final plans showing bicycle parking locations and type must be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring**: The City staff must perform site inspections to ensure implementation according to approved plan prior to occupancy clearance.

### UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

Existing Setting


Wastewater Treatment

The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) provides sewer service in the project area. Sewage travels along gravity-fed collection lines to a main trunk line. The trunk line terminates at the GWSD pump house located on the UCSB campus Lot 32, at which point the waste is transferred via a pressurized line running parallel to the Santa Barbara Airport, to the Goleta Sanitary District’s (GSD) treatment plant located on William Moffett Place next to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. Treatment of wastewater collected by GWSD is provided through a contract with the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD).

The GSD treatment plant has a capacity of 9.7 million gallons per day (mgd, based on average daily flow) but is currently limited to a permitted discharge of 7.64 million gallons per day under the facility’s National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (Permit No. CA0048160), a Clean Water Act Requirement (RWQCB, 2010). This permit can be renewed regularly to reconsider discharge needs of the facility. It was last renewed in 2010 and would be reconsidered again in 2015. GWSD is allocated 40.78% of the capacity at the GSD sewage treatment plant, which is 3.12 million gallons per day. GWSD currently generates approximately 1.71 mgd of sewage that is treated at the GSD plant, resulting in about 1.41 mgd of remaining capacity in the GWD’s existing system (“City of Goleta GP/CLUP Final Environmental Impact Report, 2006, Wastewater Management Services 3.12.1.4”). The GSD treatment facilities are in the process of a major upgrade from the current partial secondary blended process to full secondary treatment with construction occurring from 2011 to 2014. The upgrade will allow the plant to increase its permitted discharge rate when construction is completed in 2014.

Water Supply

The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water purveyor within the City of Goleta. The GWD currently has four sources of water: surface water from the Lake Cachuma Project (9,322 AFY); surface water from the State Water Project (4,500 AFY) plus 450 AFY drought buffer
and 2,500 AFY special drought buffer; ground water from the Goleta basin (2,350 AFY) and conjunctive use from injection of 280 AFY; and recycled water from GSD wastewater treatment plant (up to 1,100 AFY). This is a total projected water supply of 16,622 AF under normal conditions through the year 2035 (GWD 2010, Urban Water Management Plan, Table 3-1).

Water demand for 2010 was 14,649 AF. Total water demand for the year 2015 is expected to be 15,999 AF and 18,143 AF in the year 2035 (GWD 2010 UWMP). These projections indicate there will be an adequate supply of water for the immediate future but a potential long-term (2035) demand may result in a projected shortfall of 1,521 AFY. This shortfall could be eliminated through conservation, enhancing water supplies and by making use of GWD’s 2,000 AFY unused capacity for recycled water, as new pipelines are installed for new customers.

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

The 80-acre Tajiguas Landfill, located 26 miles west of Santa Barbara, has a permitted capacity of 23.3 million cubic yards and an operation area of 357 acres with an approved and permitted waste disposal footprint of 118 acres and is permitted to operate through 2020. The South Coast Recycling and Transfer Station processes 550 tons of waste per day (City of Goleta GP/CLUU Final Environmental Impact Report, 2006, Solid Waste 3.12.1.5). The annual per capita residential waste in Goleta is estimated to be 0.95 tons per person. The City averages about 2,400 tons each month which is approximately 8% of solid waste that goes to the Landfill. The currently permitted landfill disposal capacity is 23.3 million cubic yards of waste of which 71 % is already utilized. The City participates in recycling programs to achieve a minimum 50% diversion of solid waste and currently diverts 69% of its solid waste.

Drainage Facilities
The project site is relatively flat with surface drainage flowing from the northwestern portion of the site east/southeast. There is an overall slope of less than 1% across the property. The most notable topographic feature, an apparent artificial drainage ditch, occurs offsite. A drainage channel picks up near the southeast corner of the property line, where it turns away from the site and runs along Calle Real.

Goleta Water District Water Conservation Plan (2010) requires implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to conserve water which would reduce demand on the District’s water treatment plant capacity. Proposed developments are required to incorporate feasible BMPs into its water system design, including the use of water conserving fixtures and water efficient landscape irrigation.

Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 8.10 (Solid Waste Services) regulates the collection and disposal of solid wastes to maintain compliance with State regulations that require the diversion of at least 50% of all waste generated. The City specifically requires 50% of all construction and demolition waste to be recycled.
City of Goleta Inland Zoning Ordinance requires a finding that adequate public services are available to serve new developments prior to approval.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

a,b,e) Sewage disposal service for the project would be provided by the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD). The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) would collect wastewater generated by the project and convey it to the GSD’s main treatment plant. The GWSD owns 40.78 percent of the capacity rights at the GSD treatment plant, which gives GWSD an allotment of 3.12 mgd of treatment capacity. GWSD currently collects approximately 1.71 mgd of sewage and its system has a remaining allocated capacity of 1.41 mgd pursuant to its contract with GSD. Applying the GWSD’s wastewater generation rate of 100 gallons/day (gpd) per 1,000 square feet for commercial uses, project-generated wastewater effluent would be 757 gpd. This represents approximately 0.054% of the 1.41 mgd remaining allocated capacity of the GSD treatment plant. A District Sewer Service Connection Permit from the GWSD is required to ensure its capacity can be utilized for this project. The quantity of wastewater generated by the project would not exceed GWSD’s sewage collection and treatment capacity. Therefore, project-related impacts on the wastewater system are considered less than significant.

c) No new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities are proposed. The project will use current area drainage facilities. Therefore, storm water drainage impact associated with this project is considered less than significant.

d) Water service to the project site would be provided by the Goleta Water District (GWD). Applying the water consumption rates in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, projected water demand for the residence would be 0.73 AFY and the assembly and related use would be 1.1 AFY. The total water demand would be 1.83 AFY (not including recycling or other water savings). This represents approximately 0.01% of the 2015 15,999 AFY demand for GWD water and 0.11% of the 16,622 AFY GWD water available to the year 2035 (not including unused recycled water). Given these projections, the GWD has sufficient supply to service this project. A Can and Will Serve Letter from the GWD may be required to ensure that sufficient supply exists to serve the project. Project impacts on water supplies are less than significant.

Additionally, the project would not contribute to groundwater overdraft as no wells are proposed onsite. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact to groundwater.
f,g) The City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* provides solid waste generation factors. As no total solid waste generation rate is provided for religious institutions, the rate for educational institutions (0.0010) can be used, which results in approximately 7.57 tons solid waste per year. Using the rate for office use (0.0013), would result in approximately 9.8 tons per year of total solid waste. The quantity of solid waste to be disposed of at landfills (non-recycled waste) is typically estimated at 50 percent of the total solid waste generation. The non-recycled waste from the project is therefore estimated at 3.79 to 4.8 tons per year. This amount does not exceed the City’s project specific threshold of 196 tons per year. The project’s specific impact on solid waste disposal capacity at the Tajiguas Landfill would be considered less than significant. The project would comply with regulatory statutes regarding solid waste.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative development in the City, including the proposed project would add 2,922 residential units and approximately 1.5 million square feet of commercial and industrial space (City of Goleta Cumulative Project List, May 2013). At the same time, cumulative development in non-City areas in the Goleta vicinity would add 1,497 housing units and approximately 125,000 square feet of commercial and industrial space (City of Goleta, Non-City Projects, April 2013). Using conservative water demand rates based on these land use categories prepared for the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, the total additional cumulative water demand would be 822.36 AFY. This amount would be approximately 4.99 percent of the 16,622 AF of water available to the GWD annually through the year 2035 (not including GWDs unused recycled water capacity or other potential sources). The GWD forecasts regional water demand to increase to about 16,617 AFY using a “Moderate Estimate” or to 18,143 AFY under “High Estimate” by the year 2035 (GWD; UWMP, 2011). The cumulative demand of related projects could exacerbate a shortfall in water supply over the current planning period in the area served by the GWD under a worst-case scenario. Based on normal weather annual water supplies, by developing the required infrastructure to deliver the GWDs unused recycled water supplies for landscaping or other non-potable uses, water conservation, and other potential sources, supply could provide for the year 2035 forecast demand plus the cumulative increase in demand from new projects. Therefore, the total cumulative demand for water would be considered less than significant and the project’s contribution to that cumulative demand would be less than significant.

Based on calculations from the GWSD for cumulative development, the additional wastewater generation with the project would be 415,267 gallons per day or 29.5 percent of the extra 1.41 mgd of wastewater treatment capacity that GWSD maintains. Although cumulative development would reduce GWSD’s remaining capacity, ongoing upgrades to wastewater treatment facilities would improve treatment capacity. No cumulative impacts to wastewater facilities are anticipated.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

No potentially significant impacts have been identified. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

**Residual Impact**

No residual impacts on utilities would occur as a result of project implementation.
Although not a required mitigation measure, the following regulations will be a Condition of Approval:

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

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

2. Indoor water use efficiency measures must be implemented. **Plan Requirements:** The following measures must be implemented in project building plans:

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

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

3. Reclaimed/non-potable water, if available, must be used for all dust suppression activities during grading and construction. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This measure must be included as a note on all plans submitted for any LUP, grading, and/or building permit. Evidence of availability or lack thereof, must be provided to the City.

4. The applicant must develop and implement an operational Solid Waste Management Program (SWMP). The program must identify the amount of ongoing waste generated onsite. **Plan Requirements:** the SWMP must include the following measures:

   a. Provide that solid waste enclosure areas on the project site are approved by Marbarg and include dedicated space for recyclable materials storage of at least 50% of the total enclosed area, not less than 50 square feet.
   
   b. Implementation of a green waste source reduction program focusing on recycling all green waste generated onsite.
c. Development of a source reduction plan, describing the recommended programs(s) and the estimated reduction of the solid waste disposal by the project.

d. Implementation of a program to purchase materials that have recycled content for project construction and/or operation (e.g. plastic lumber, office supplies, etc.). The program could include requesting supplies to show recycled materials content. To ensure compliance, applicant must develop an integrated solid waste management program including recommended source reduction, recycling, composting and/or a combination.

**Timing:** The permittee must submit a SWMP to the Public Works Department for review and approval prior to any Land Use Permit issuance for construction. All program components must be implemented prior to occupancy clearance and must be maintained in perpetuity.

Monitoring: Prior to occupancy clearance, City staff must ensure compliance with the SWMP. Once the project is occupied, the applicant must be responsible for implementation of the SWMP. City staff must inspect the site periodically for the first five years after completion of project construction to verify compliance with the SWMP. The applicant must be responsible for funding such inspections through a permit compliance account to be established with the City to verify compliance.
### MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

**a)** The Biological Resources Section of this study, addresses potential project impacts on arroyo willow wetland ESHA, coast live oak ESHA, special species raptors and general nesting birds. With mitigations including construction buffers, biologist monitoring and timing of construction, impacts would be less than significant. The information in the Cultural Resources Section of this study indicates that no cultural resources were found on-site. However, in the event archaeological resources are encountered during grading, a mitigation measure requires that work must be stopped or re-directed for evaluation by a City-approved archaeologist and Native American representative. With this mitigation, cultural resource impacts would be less than significant.

**b)** The project’s cumulative impacts for each issue area were analyzed and determined to be less than significant.

**c)** Project effects on human beings related to air quality, noise, land use planning, geology and soils, hazards, public services and utility service systems have been analyzed in this study. Impacts on human beings would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures, where required.
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ATTACHMENT A
GREENHOUSE GAS BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Existing Setting

Introduction/Background

Parts of the Earth’s atmosphere act as an insulating “blanket” for the planet. This “blanket” of various gases traps solar energy, which keeps the global average temperature in a range suitable for life (if this “blanket” were to suddenly disappear, the planet would be approximately 60°F colder). The collection of atmospheric gases that comprise this blanket are called “greenhouse gases” based on the idea that these gases trap heat like the glass walls of a greenhouse. These gases, mainly water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), ozone (O₃), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), all act as effective global insulators, reflecting visible light and infrared radiation back to earth. Most scientists agree that human activities, such as producing electricity and driving internal combustion vehicles, have contributed to the elevated concentration of these gases in the atmosphere. As a result, the Earth’s overall temperature is rising.

Scientists have observed a global warming trend beginning around the late 1800s. The global temperature record shows an average warming of about 1.3°F over the past century. The most rapid warming has occurred in recent decades. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), seven of the eight warmest years on record have occurred since 2001. Within the past 30 years, the rate of warming across the globe has been approximately three times greater than the rate over the last 100 years. Past climate information suggests the warmth of the last half-century is unusual in at least the previous 1,300 years in the Northern Hemisphere. The preponderance of scientific evidence indicates that most of this recent warming is very likely the result of human activities.

In 1988, the United Nations and the World Meteorological Organization established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to assess the scientific, technical, and socioeconomic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts, and options for adaptation and mitigation. In February 2007, the IPCC issued a report on global climate change. The IPCC concluded that warming of the Earth’s climate system is now “unequivocal” (i.e., “definite”) and that changes in climate are now affecting physical and biological systems on every continent. The IPCC bases these conclusions on observations of increases in average air and ocean temperatures, melting of snow and ice, and rising average sea level across the globe.

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

Climate change could impact the natural environment in California by triggering, among others things:

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

These changes in California’s climate and ecosystems could occur at a time when California’s population is expected to increase from 34 million to 59 million by the year 2040 (California Energy Commission, 2005).

In 2004, total worldwide greenhouse gas emissions were estimated to be 20,135 Million Metric Tons (MMT) of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e), excluding emissions/removals from land use, land use change, and forestry (Association of Environmental Professionals AEP, 2007). In 2004, greenhouse emissions in the U.S. were 7,074.4 MMT CO₂e (Association of Environmental Professionals, 2007). California is a substantial contributor of greenhouse gas as it is the second largest contributor in the U.S. and the sixteenth largest in the world (California Energy Commission, 2006). In 2004, California produced approximately 500MMT CO₂e, which is approximately seven percent of U.S. emissions (California Energy Commission, 2006). The major source of greenhouse gas emissions in California is transportation, contributing 41 percent of the State’s total greenhouse emissions. Electricity generation is the second largest source, contributing 22 percent of the State’s greenhouse gas emissions. In 2009 the United States GHG emissions were 6,633.2 MMT CO₂e (US Environmental Protection Agency, 2011), of which California’s emissions represents 6.9 percent, and indicating a decreasing trend.

**Climate Change and Global Warming**

The term climate change is often used interchangeably with the term global warming, but according to the National Academy of Sciences, “the phrase ‘climate change’ is growing in preferred use to ‘global warming’ because it helps convey that there are [other] changes in addition to rising temperatures.” When used in this analysis, the term climate change refers to any distinct change in measures of climate lasting for a long period of time. In other words, “climate change” means major changes in temperature, rainfall, snow, or wind patterns lasting for decades or longer. Global warming is an average increase in temperatures near the Earth’s surface and in the lowest layer of the atmosphere. Increases in temperatures in our Earth’s atmosphere can contribute to changes in global climate patterns. Global warming can be considered part of climate change along with changes in precipitation, sea level, etc. Global change is a broad term that refers to changes in the global environment, including climate change, ozone depletion, and land use change.

**Primary Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

According to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a GHG is any gas that absorbs infrared radiation in the atmosphere. This absorption traps heat within the atmosphere creating a greenhouse effect that is slowly raising global temperatures.
California law defines GHG to include the following: carbon dioxide (CO\textsubscript{2}), methane (CH\textsubscript{4}), nitrous oxide (N\textsubscript{2}O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF\textsubscript{6}) (Health and Safety Code, § 38505(g)).

Although CO\textsubscript{2} is the most common of these gases, the other gases usually have a higher global warming potential (GWP). CO\textsubscript{2} equivalent (CO\textsubscript{2}e) is a measure of GHG emissions that compares the global warming potential (GWP) of the individual greenhouse gases with the GWP of CO\textsubscript{2}. CO\textsubscript{2}e emissions are calculated by multiplying the metric tons of a gas by the appropriate GWP factor and are commonly expressed as metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MTCO\textsubscript{2}e). Below is a description of each GHG, as described by the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) General Reporting Protocol, including their sources of emissions and GWP.

**Carbon Dioxide (CO\textsubscript{2}).** Consisting of a single carbon and two oxygen atoms. CO\textsubscript{2} is the most common of the six GHGs and provides the reference point for the GWP of other gases. Thus, the GWP of CO\textsubscript{2} is equal to one.

The production and absorption of carbon dioxide occurs through the burning of fossil fuels (e.g., oil, natural gas, and coal), solid waste, trees and wood products, and as a result of other chemical reactions, such as those required to manufacture cement. Globally, the largest source of human based CO\textsubscript{2} emissions is the combustion of fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and gas in power plants, automobiles, and industrial facilities. A number of specialized industrial production processes and product uses, such as mineral or metal production, and the use of petroleum-based products, leads to CO\textsubscript{2} emissions.

CO\textsubscript{2} is removed from the atmosphere (or sequestered) when it is absorbed by plants as part of the biological carbon cycle. Natural sources of CO\textsubscript{2} occur within the carbon cycle where billions of tons of atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} are removed by oceans and growing plants and are emitted back into the atmosphere through natural processes. When in balance, total CO\textsubscript{2} emissions and removals from the entire carbon cycle are roughly equal. Since the Industrial Revolution in the 1700s, most scientists agree that human activities, including burning of oil, coal, and gas and deforestation, increased CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations in the atmosphere by 35 percent as of 2005.

**Nitrous Oxide (N\textsubscript{2}O).** Consisting of two nitrogen atoms and a single oxygen atom, N\textsubscript{2}O possesses a GWP of 310. Concentrations of nitrous oxide began to rise at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution reaching 314 parts per billion (ppb) by 1998. Microbial processes in soil and water, including those reactions that occur in fertilizer containing nitrogen, produce nitrous oxide. In addition to agricultural sources, some industrial processes (fossil fuel-fired power plants, nylon production, nitric acid production, and vehicle emissions) also contribute to the atmospheric load of N\textsubscript{2}O.

**Methane (CH\textsubscript{4}).** Consisting of a single carbon atom and four hydrogen atoms. CH\textsubscript{4} possesses a GWP of 21. Methane is emitted from a variety of both human-related and natural sources. CH\textsubscript{4} is emitted during the production and transport of coal, natural gas, and oil, from livestock and other agricultural practices, and from the decay of organic waste in municipal solid waste landfills. It is estimated that 60 percent of global CH\textsubscript{4} emissions are related to human activities. Natural sources of CH\textsubscript{4} include wetlands, gas hydrates\textsuperscript{4}, permafrost, termites, oceans, freshwater bodies, non-wetland soils, and wildfires. CH\textsubscript{4}

\textsuperscript{4} Gas hydrates are crystalline solids that consist of a gas molecule, usually methane, surrounded by a “cage” of water molecules.
emissions levels from a particular source can vary significantly from one country or region to another. These variances depend on many factors, such as climate, industrial and agricultural production characteristics, energy types and usage, and waste management practices. For example, temperature and moisture have a significant effect on the anaerobic digestion process, which is one of the key biological processes resulting in CH₄ emissions from both human and natural sources. Also, the implementation of technologies to capture and utilize CH₄ from sources such as landfills, coalmines, and manure management systems affects the emissions levels from these sources.

**Chlorofluorocarbons.** Chlorofluorocarbons (CFC) are not naturally occurring. They were synthesized for uses as refrigerants, aerosol propellants, and cleaning solvents. Since their creation in 1928, the concentrations of CFCs in the atmosphere have risen. Due to the discovery that they are able to destroy stratospheric ozone, a global effort to halt their production was undertaken and levels of the major CFCs are now remaining static or declining. However, their long atmospheric lifetimes mean that some of the CFCs will remain in the atmosphere for over 100 years. Since they are also a GHG, along with such other long-lived synthesized gases as CF₄ (carbontetrafluoride) and SF₆ (sulfurhexafluoride), they are of concern. Another set of synthesized compounds called HFCs (hydrofluorocarbons) are also considered GHGs, though they are less stable in the atmosphere and therefore have a shorter lifetime and less of an impact. CFCs, CF₄, SF₆, and HFCs have been banned and are no longer available. Therefore, these GHGs are not included further in this analysis.

**Potential Effects of Global Climate Change**

Climate change could have a number of adverse effects. Although these effects would have global consequences, in most cases they would not disproportionately affect any one site or activity. In other words, many of the effects of climate change are not site-specific. Emission of GHGs would contribute to the changes in the global climate, which would in turn, have a number of physical and environmental effects. A number of general effects are discussed below.

**Sea Level Rise and Flooding.** The California Climate Change Center predicts that sea level in California would rise between 10.9 to 71.6 centimeters (cm) (0.36 to 2.3 feet) above existing mean sea level (MSL) by 2099 as a result of climate change. Measurements taken in the City of Alameda indicate that the current rate of sea level rise is about 0.29 foot per century. Therefore, projected climate change effects on sea level would increase the existing rate of sea level rise by 0.07 to 1.94 feet per century. When combined with astronomical tides, even a 1-foot increase in MSL would result in the 100-year event high tide peak occurring at the 10-year event frequency. In other words, the frequency of a
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current 100-year high tide (about 9.5 feet above current MSL) would occur 10 times more often if sea levels increase by 1 foot above current MSL.

In the future, precipitation events are predicted to vary in terms of timing, intensity, and volume according to many climate change models. Extreme storm events may occur with greater frequency. Changes in rainfall and runoff could affect flows in surface water bodies, causing increased flooding and runoff to the storm drain system.

**Water Supply.** Health and Safety Code § 38501(a) recognizes that climate change “poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California,” and notes, “the potential adverse impacts of [climate change] include…reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack.”

Most of the scientific models addressing climate change show that the primary effect on California’s climate would be a reduced snow pack and a seasonal shift of peak flows in streams. A higher percentage of the winter precipitation in the mountains would likely fall as rain rather than as snow in some locations, reducing the overall snowpack. Further, as temperatures rise, snowmelt is expected to occur earlier in the year. As a result, peak runoff would likely come a month or so earlier. The end result of this would be that the state may not have sufficient surface storage to capture the early runoff, and so, absent construction of additional water storage projects, a portion of the current supplies would flow to the oceans and be unavailable for use in the state’s water delivery systems.

**Water Quality.** Climate change could have adverse effects on water quality, which would in turn affect the beneficial uses (habitat, water supply, etc.) of surface water bodies and groundwater. The changes in precipitation discussed above could result in increased sedimentation, higher concentration of pollutants, higher dissolved oxygen levels, increased temperatures, and an increase in the amount of runoff constituents reaching surface water bodies. Sea level rise, discussed above, could result in the encroachment of saline water into freshwater bodies.

**Ecosystems and Biodiversity.** Climate change could have effects on diverse types of ecosystems, from alpine to deep-sea habitat. As temperatures and precipitation change, seasonal shifts in vegetation would occur, which would potentially have an effect on the distribution of associated flora and fauna species. As the range of species shifts, habitat fragmentation could occur, with acute impacts on the distribution of certain sensitive species. The IPCC states that “20 percent to 30 percent of species assessed may be at risk of extinction from climate change impacts within this century if global mean temperatures exceed 2 to 3°C (3.6 to 5.4°F) relative to pre-industrial levels.”

Shifts in existing biomes could also make ecosystems vulnerable to invasive species encroachment. Wildfires, which are an important control mechanism in many ecosystems, may become more severe and more frequent, making it difficult for native plant species to repeatedly re-germinate. Climate Change on California’s Water Resources), Table 2-6 (Relative Sea Level Trends for Eight Tide Gauges Along the Coast of California with 50 Years or More of Record) (March 2006).


A biome is a major ecological community classified by the predominant vegetation, and hence animal inhabitants.
change would put a number of stressors on ecosystems, with potentially catastrophic effects on biodiversity.

**Human Health Impacts.** Climate change may increase the risk of vector-borne infectious diseases, particularly those found in tropical areas and spread by insects—malaria, dengue fever, yellow fever, and encephalitis. While these health impacts would largely affect tropical areas in other parts of the world, effects would also be felt in California. Warming of the atmosphere would be expected to increase smog and particulate pollution, which could adversely affect individuals with heart and respiratory problems, such as asthma. Extreme heat events would also be expected to occur with more frequency, and could adversely affect the elderly, children, and the homeless. Finally, the water supply impacts and seasonal temperature variations which could occur as a result of climate change could affect the viability of existing agricultural operations, making the food supply more vulnerable.

**Potential Effects of Human Activity on Climate Change**

The burning of fossil fuels, such as coal and oil, especially for the generation of electricity and powering of motor vehicles, has led to substantial increases in CO₂ emissions (and thus substantial increases in atmospheric concentrations). In 1994, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations were found to have increased by nearly 30 percent above pre-industrial (c. 1760) concentrations.

The effect each GHG has on climate change is measured as a combination of the volume of its emissions, and its global warming potential (GWP), and is expressed as a function of how much warming would be caused by the same mass of CO₂. Thus, GHG emissions are typically measured in terms of pounds or tons of CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e), and are often expressed in metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MT CO₂e) or millions of metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MMT CO₂e).

**Global Emissions.** Worldwide emissions of GHGs in 2004 were nearly 30 billion tons of CO₂e per year (including both on-going emissions from industrial and agricultural sources, but excluding emissions from land-use changes).^{11}

**U.S. Emissions.** In 2004, the United States emitted 7.1 billion tons of CO₂e. Of the four major sectors nationwide—residential, commercial, industrial, and transportation—transportation accounts for the highest percentage of GHG emissions (approximately 35 to 40 percent); these emissions are entirely generated from direct fossil fuel combustion. In 2008, the United States emitted 6.9 billion tons of CO₂e, with transportation accounting for the highest percentage of GHG emissions, approximately 32 percent.^{12}
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State of California Emissions. In 2004, California emitted approximately 483 million tons of CO\textsubscript{2}e, or about 6 percent of the U.S. emissions. This large number is due primarily to the sheer size of California compared to other states. By contrast, California has one of the fourth lowest per-capita GHG emission rates in the country, due to the success of its energy-efficiency and renewable energy programs and commitments that have lowered the state’s GHG emissions rate of growth by more than half of what it would have been otherwise. Another factor that has reduced California’s fuel use and GHG emissions is its mild climate compared to that of many other states. In 2008, California’s GHG emissions were approximately 478 MMT CO\textsubscript{2}e, generally attributed to the reduced travel, and therefore, transportation emissions.\textsuperscript{13}

The California Energy Commission found that transportation is the source of approximately 41 percent of the state’s GHG emissions, followed by electricity generation (both in-state and out-of-state) at 23 percent, and industrial sources at 20 percent. Agriculture and forestry is the source of approximately 8.3 percent, as is the source categorized as “other,” which includes residential and commercial activities.\textsuperscript{14}

Various aspects of constructing, operating, and eventually discontinuing (demolition and disposal of waste) the use of industrial, commercial and residential development will result in GHG emissions. Operational GHG emissions result from energy use associated with heating, lighting, and powering buildings (typically through natural gas and electricity consumption), pumping and processing water (which consumes electricity), as well as fuel used for transportation and decomposition of waste associated with building occupants. New development can also create GHG emissions in its construction and demolition phases in connection with the use of fuels in construction equipment, creation and decomposition of building materials, vegetation clearing, and other activities. However, new development does not necessarily create entirely new GHG emissions. Occupants of new buildings are often relocating and shifting their operational-phase emissions from other locations.

Regulations

Global climate change issues are addressed through the efforts of various federal, state, regional, and local government agencies as well as national and international scientific and governmental conventions and programs. These agencies work jointly and individually to understand and regulate the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and resulting climate change through legislation, regulations, planning, policy-making, education, and a variety of programs. The significant agencies, conventions, and programs focused on global climate change are discussed below.

Federal U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The USEPA is responsible for implementing Federal policy to address global climate change. The federal government administers a wide array of public-private partnerships to reduce GHG emissions generated by the United States. These programs focus on energy efficiency, renewable energy, methane and other non-CO\textsubscript{2} gases, agricultural practices, and implementation of technologies to achieve GHG reductions.


Currently, there are no federal regulations that address GHG emissions. However, in *Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 579 U.S. 497, 127 S. Ct. 1438 (2007), the United States Supreme Court found that the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has statutory authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate “greenhouse gas” emissions (including CO$_2$ emissions) from new motor vehicles. In response to this court case’s decision, the EPA is drafting regulations that address GHG emissions.

**California Air Resources Board.** The California Air Resources Board (ARB), a part of the California EPA, is responsible for the coordination and administration of both federal and state air pollution control programs within California. In this capacity, ARB conducts research, sets state ambient air quality standards, compiles emission inventories, develops suggested control measures, and provides oversight of local programs. ARB establishes emissions standards for motor vehicles sold in California, consumer products (such as hairspray, aerosol paints, and barbecue lighter fluid), and various types of commercial equipment. It also sets fuel specifications to further reduce vehicular emissions. ARB has primary responsibility for the development of California’s State Implementation Plan (SIP), for which it works closely with the federal government and the local air districts.

**California Executive Order S-3-05.** In 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger issued California Executive Order S-3-05 establishing the following emission targets for California: 1) reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels by 2010; 2) reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels (427 MMT CO$_2$e) by 2020; and 3) reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (85 MMT CO$_2$e) by 2050 (see Chart GHG-1, below). Executive Orders are binding on State agencies. Accordingly, S-3-05 will guide State agencies’ efforts to control and regulate GHG emissions but will have no direct binding effect on local efforts.

![Chart GHG-1](chart_link)
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California Executive Order S-13-08
This Executive Order requests that the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) convene an independent panel to complete the first California Sea Level Rise Assessment Report and initiate an independent sea level rise science and policy committee made up of state, national and international experts.

It also requires that (before release of the final Sea Level Rise Assessment Report from the NAS) all state agencies that are planning construction projects in areas vulnerable to future sea level rise consider a range of sea level rise scenarios for the years 2050 and 2100 in order to assess project vulnerability and, to the extent feasible, reduce expected risks and increase resiliency to sea level rise. The order does not specify sea level rise scenarios.

The Executive Order also directs the California Resources Agency, through the Climate Action Team, to develop a state Climate Adaptation Strategy. The strategy will summarize the best known science on climate change impacts to California, assess California’s vulnerability to the identified impacts and then outline solutions that can be implemented within and across state agencies to promote resiliency.

California Global Warming Solutions Action of 2006 (AB 32). In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Health and Safety Code se § 38500, et seq.). AB 32 establishes regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions and a cap on statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 also includes guidance to institute emission reductions in an economically efficient manner and conditions to ensure that businesses and consumers are not unfairly affected by the reductions. AB 32 demonstrates California’s commitment to reducing the rate of GHG emissions and the State’s associated contribution to climate change, without intent to limit population or economic growth. Although AB 32 did not amend CEQA, it identifies the environmental problems in California caused by global warming (see e.g., Health and Safety Code § 38501).

Senate Bill (SB) 97. SB 97, enacted in 2007, amends the CEQA statute to clearly establish that GHG emissions and the effects of GHG emissions are appropriate subjects for CEQA analysis. In March 2010, the California Office of Administrative Law promulgated CEQA amendments that provide regulatory guidance with respect to the analysis and mitigation of the potential effects of GHG emissions, as found in CEQA Guidelines § 15183.5. To streamline analysis, CEQA provides for analysis through compliance with a previously adopted plan or mitigation program under special circumstances.

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

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

Senate Bill (SB) 375. SB 375, which establishes mechanisms for the development of regional targets for reducing passenger vehicle greenhouse gas emissions, was adopted on September 30, 2008. On September 23, 2010, California ARB adopted the vehicular greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets that had been developed in consultation with the metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs); the targets require a 7 to 8 percent reduction by 2020 and between 13 to 16 percent reduction by 2035 for each MPO. SB 375 recognizes the importance of achieving significant greenhouse gas reductions by working with cities and counties to change land use patterns and improve transportation alternatives. Through the SB 375 process, MPOs will work with local jurisdictions in developing sustainable communities strategies (SCS) designed to integrate development patterns and the transportation network in a way that reduces greenhouse gas emissions while meeting housing needs and other regional planning objectives. The MPOs will prepare their first SCS according to their respective regional transportation plan (RTP) update schedule.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in Santa Barbara County. In order to provide GHG emission guidance to the local jurisdictions, the APCD to date has been developing a proposal to adopt greenhouse gas thresholds of significance for stationary source projects. A public workshop was held on February 2011, and the District's Community Advisory Council received a briefing on this topic on May 2011. Additional public review for consideration and adoption of greenhouse gas thresholds is expected, but the timing of the adoption of but the timing of the adoption of greenhouse gas thresholds for stationary source projects is unknown.

they exceed the energy efficiency standards of the California Energy Code (Title 24 California Code of Regulations, Part 6) by 15 percent, or, in the case of nonresidential buildings, that a permit applicant may use an alternative Envelope Only or Lighting Only compliance path that requires exceeding the standards by 10 percent according to prescriptive envelope and lighting metrics.
ATTACHMENT B

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
### Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party Obligation</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A-1. The project landscaping must provide ample landscape screening to break up the view of the building as seen from public view corridors along Los Carneros Road and Calle Real. Plantings must integrate the building and site with the surrounding Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve. The final landscape plan must include dense planting of large-scale and broad canopy non-deciduous trees that provide screening of the building and are complementary to the Preserve woodland. (Native tree species to be considered are Coast Live Oak and as required in the Biological Resources Section, California Bay and/or California Walnut.) | A-1a. The applicant must prepare and submit a final landscape plan for DRB review and approval. Plan must identify type, location, size and number of trees to be planted for screening purposes.  
A-1b. Applicant must install trees per approved landscape plan. | A-1a. The landscape plan must be approved prior to issuance of Land Use Permit (LUP).  
A-1b. Trees to be installed prior to issuance of certification. | A-1a. Planning and Environmental Review Staff (PER).  
A-1b. PER |
<p>| A-2. The applicant must submit stamped verification from a licensed surveyor demonstrating that the mean height and peak height conform to those shown on issued-LUP plan sets. | A-2. The applicant must provide mean height verification at points in the construction process. | A-2. During construction framing and prior to installation of roofing, provide documentation. | A-2. PER/Building |
| A-3. All new utility service connections and above-ground mounted equipment such as backflow devices, etc, must be screened from public view and/or painted in a soft earthtone color(s) to blend in with the project. Screening may include a combination of landscaping and/or fencing/walls/berming. Utility transformers must be placed in underground vaults, unless otherwise approved by the City, and then must be completely screened from view. All | A-3a. The applicant must secure DRB approval of a screening and color plan that screens utility connections and above ground mounted equipment from public view. | A-3a. The screening plan must be approved prior to issuance of LUP. | A-3a. PER |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party Obligation</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gas and electrical meters must be concealed and/or painted to match the building. All gas, electrical, backflow prevention devices and communications equipment must be completely concealed in an enclosed portion of the building, on top of the building, or within a screened utility area. All transformers and vaults that will be located within the right-of-way must be installed below grade unless otherwise approved by the City, and then must be completely screened from view. The plans submitted for City staff and DRB Preliminary/Final review must identify the type, location, size and number of utility connections and above-ground mounted equipment.</td>
<td>view. Color(s) to blend in with the project and surrounding area. A-3b. The applicant must install screening in accordance with the approved plans</td>
<td>A-3b. Screening to be installed prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy permit</td>
<td>A-3b. PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4. To address views of roof-top equipment, the applicant must submit a composite utility plan for City staff and DRB Preliminary/Final review. All external/roof mounted mechanical equipment (including HVAC condensers, switch boxes, etc.) must be included on all building plans and must be designed to be integrated into the structure and/or screened in their entirety from public view.</td>
<td>A-4a. As part of the screening plan required in Mitigation Measure A-3, the plans submitted by the applicant must include measures to screen any external/roof-mounted mechanical equipment. The applicant must secure DRB approval of said plan. A-4b. The applicant must install screening in accordance with the approved plans.</td>
<td>A-4a. The screening plan must be approved prior to issuance of LUP. A-4b. Screening of roof-top equipment must be completed prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy.</td>
<td>A-4a. PER A-4b. PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5. The applicant must enter into a maintenance agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, to maintain required landscaping and water-conserving</td>
<td>A-5a. The applicant must prepare and secure City Attorney</td>
<td>A-5a. Approval and execution of the agreement must be</td>
<td>A-5a. City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irrigation systems, on private property for an appropriate time period set by the City.</td>
<td>approval of a detailed landscape maintenance agreement. Once the document is acceptable to the City Attorney, then the applicant must execute the document.</td>
<td>secured prior to approval LUP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance securities for installation and maintenance must be review and approved by the City before the city issues a certificate of occupancy. The applicant must provide performance securities for installation and maintenance of the landscaping to</td>
<td>A-5b. The applicant must provide performance securities for installation and maintenance of the landscaping</td>
<td>A-5b.Performance securities for the landscaping to be provided prior to issuance a certificate of occupancy.</td>
<td>A-5b. PER/Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee, must check maintenance at intervals during the life of the maintenance agreement.</td>
<td>A-5c. The applicant must allow staff on the property to perform inspections</td>
<td>A-5c.City must check maintenance at intervals during life of the maintenance agreement.</td>
<td>5c.PER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biology**

<p>| B-1. To avoid construction impacts to nesting special status raptors, other special status nesting birds such as loggerhead shrike and oak titmouse, as well as general nesting birds, vegetation removal and initial ground disturbance must occur outside the bird nesting season, which is approximately March – September for raptors and February – August for general bird species, but can vary based on local and annual climatic conditions. If construction must begin within the breeding season, a special status raptor and general nesting bird pre-construction survey must be conducted within the | B-1a.Applicant must not start ground disturbance between February and September unless a bird pre-construction survey is conducted within 300 feet of project boundaries and survey concludes there is no nesting activities. | B-1. During nesting season. | B-1a .PER/Building |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party Obligation</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disturbance footprint plus a 300-foot buffer that must be established. Subsequent nesting raptor and general bird nesting surveys must be required prior to each phase of construction within the bird nesting season. If no active raptor or general bird nests are observed during construction surveys, no further mitigation is required.</td>
<td>B-1b. The applicant must ensure the required notes are included on the grading plan.</td>
<td>B-1b. Prior to issuance of grading permits</td>
<td>B-1b.PER/Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit, the grading plans must include notes specifying the requirement for a pre-construction field survey for nesting raptors and general nesting birds within a 300 foot buffer from the project site, if required</td>
<td>B-1c. Applicant must secure City approval of the survey biologist and said City-approved biologist must conduct bird nesting surveys.</td>
<td>B-1.c Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td>b-1c. PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further the applicant or his/her contractors must retain a qualified biologist, approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, to conduct pre-construction nest surveys. The name, qualifications, scope, and contact information for the surveying biologist must be submitted to the City in advance of the surveys. The surveys must be conducted no more than two weeks prior to initiation of ground disturbance. Pre-construction nesting surveys must be conducted during the time of day when birds are active and must be of sufficient duration to reliably conclude presence/absence of nesting birds within the 300 foot buffer.</td>
<td>B-1d. The applicant must submit nesting survey to the City for review and concurrence.</td>
<td>B-1d. Prior to commencement of grading</td>
<td>B-1d. PER in consultation with resource/trustee agencies as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A report of the nesting survey(s) must be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to site grading.</td>
<td>B-2 The applicant must provide a buffer for active bird nesting, if active special status raptor nests or other special species birds, as well as general bird nests are found</td>
<td>B-2a The applicant must submit a buffer plan if active nests are found</td>
<td>B-2a PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2a Prior to issuance of grading permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within 300 feet of the project site during a survey, their locations must be flagged and mapped. If active nests, including white-tailed kite or Cooper’s hawk are found, an avoidance buffer must be determined and demarcated by a City-approved biologist with bright orange construction fencing. If feasible, the buffer must be 300 feet. If the 300 foot buffer is infeasible, the City-approved biologists may reduce the buffer as appropriate, dependent upon the species and the proposed work activities. Active nests must be mapped onto an aerial photograph of the project site and buffer at a scale no less than 1”=200’ and/or recorded with the use of a GPS unit. The map must include the active nest site(s), topographic lines, parcel boundaries, adjacent roads, known historical nests for special status species, known roosting or foraging areas and the appropriate buffer area determined by the City-approved biologist.</td>
<td>during the nesting survey required by Mitigation Measure B-1.</td>
<td>B-2 b. Prior to issuance of grading permit, the grading plans must include notes specifying the requirement for a nesting buffer based on the nesting bird survey findings if required.</td>
<td>B-2b. PER/ Public Works staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A report of the raptor and nesting bird survey(s), if applicable, must be submitted to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to grading. Notes regarding this requirement must be placed on grading plans.</td>
<td>B2-b. The applicant or his representative must have the appropriate notes included on the grading plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesting site flagging and mapping must be completed prior to start of ground disturbance. Placement of bright orange construction fencing must be completed prior to ground disturbance. No ground disturbance must occur within the buffer until the City-approved biologist confirms that the breeding/nesting is completed and all the young have fledged. Alternately, a City-approved biologist must monitor B-2b. The applicant or his representative must flag the site based on the nesting survey and not allow grading within the buffer until the young have fledged.</td>
<td>B2-c. During grading activities if nesting activities are present within 300 feet of the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>B2-c – PER and Public Works staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the active nest(s) within the buffer on a full-time basis, during construction activities to ensure project activities are not indirectly impacting special status nesting raptors or other nesting birds.</td>
<td>B2-d - The applicant or his representative must ensure that the biologist is on-site during grading activities as required and monitoring reports are submitted</td>
<td>B2-d – During grading activities if nesting activities is present within 300 feet of the site</td>
<td>B2-d – PER and Public Works staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must review and approve the nest flagging and mapping. If there is ongoing nest monitoring by the City-approved biologist, reports from the biologist must be provided to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee as required. Monitoring by the City approved biologist must commence on a set schedule determined by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee, with monitoring to occur a minimum of once per week until it has been determined that the nest is no longer being used by either the young or adults. City Staff must make on-site inspections and supervise biologist work on a schedule determined by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee.</td>
<td>B2-d – During grading activities if nesting activities is present within 300 feet of the site</td>
<td>B2-d – PER and Public Works staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3 Orange construction fencing must be installed along the eastern surveyed property line prior to any ground disturbance to avoid impacts to arroyo willow wetlands outside the project area. The fencing must remain in place for the duration of construction. A City-approved biologist must supervise the fence installation and subsequent pruning and removal of the arroyo willows. All pruning must be done by hand tools. The removal of the arroyo willow on the eastern edge of the project site must also be done with hand tools.</td>
<td>B-3 The applicant or his representative must install construction fencing along the eastern property line.</td>
<td>B-3 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, notes specifying the requirement for the placement of construction fencing along the north, northeast, and east property lines must be included on the plans. In addition, the fencing must be shown on the grading plans.</td>
<td>B-3 – City approved Biologist/PER/Public Works staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to the commencement of grading the fence must be installed and the arroyo willow removal and arroyo willow pruning by hand must be completed.</td>
<td>B-4. Compensatory on-site replacement of the multi-trunk arroyo willow (wetlands ESHA) is not feasible due to the small size of the project site. Therefore, arroyo willow must be replaced at an offsite location. Permanent impacts must be compensated by planting arroyo willows off-site at a 3:1 ratio, unless the applicant provides evidence that a lesser amount would fully mitigate the identified impact. However, no less than a minimum of a 2:1 ratio of off-site replacement arroyo willows. At the time of the biological study (August 2013), from approximately 980 square feet to 1,470 square feet of arroyo willow mitigation would be required to achieve a 2:1 or 3:1 ratio. The off-site arroyo willow replacement plan must be developed in coordination with the applicant and City staff. The applicant must implement any and all remedial measures required by the City. The arroyo willow planting plan must be carried out by a City-qualified biologist. As required by GP/CLUP 2006, as amended, Conservation Element Policy CE 1.7, this compensatory mitigation must be monitored for a minimum period of 5 years. Annual monitoring reports must be prepared by a City-approved biologist to document the success of the mitigation site. The Planning and Environmental Review Director and the</td>
<td>B-4a. The applicant must provide offsite willow mitigation and have the City-approved biologist carry out the willow planting plan.</td>
<td>B-4a. The off-site arroyo willow planting must be completed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4a. The city-approved biologist must prepared annual monitoring reports for five years.</td>
<td>B-4b. The monitoring of the off-site planting must continue for five years after planting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Director or designees must periodically inspect the arroyo replacement site to ensure compliance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5. Orange construction fence must be installed along the surveyed north property line prior to any ground disturbance to avoid impacts outside the project area. The fencing must remain in place for the duration of construction. A City-approved biologist must supervise the fence installation and subsequent pruning of coast live oak limbs. All pruning must be done by hand tools and must be limited to the minimum amount necessary to complete the project.</td>
<td>B-5. The applicant or his representative must install the construction fencing have the oak tree pruning completed under the supervision of the project biologist.</td>
<td>B-5 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, notes specifying the requirement for the placement of construction fencing along the north, northeast, and east property lines must be included on the plans. In addition, the fencing requirement must be denoted on the grading plans. Prior to the commencement of grading, the fence must be installed and the oak tree trimming by hand must be completed.</td>
<td>B-5. The City approved Biologist/ PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6. Non-native Invasive plant species must not be included in any erosion control seed mixes used on stockpiled soil during grading and/or planted on-site pursuant to landscaping plans associated with the proposed project. The plant species used cannot be any of those listed on the California Invasive Plant Inventory Database. Said database contains a list of nonnative, invasive plants (California Invasive Plant Council, 2006, Updated 2011). Grading plans must specify that erosion</td>
<td>B-6. The applicant must ensure that the erosion control seed mixes and landscaping plans do not include non-native invasive plant species. Further the applicant must secure approval of a landscape plan and</td>
<td>B-6. Prior to issuance of the grading permit, a note must be included on the grading plan that prohibits the use of non-native invasive species as part erosion control seed mixes.</td>
<td>B-6 PER/ Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party Obligation</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-7 The applicant or his representative must designate a wash off area as required.</td>
<td>Landscape plan must be approved prior to issuance of land use clearance. Installation of on-site plantings and seed mix must be monitored prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy.</td>
<td>B-7 The area must be designated on the plans and approved as part of the LUP.</td>
<td>B7 - PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1. In the event archaeological resources are encountered during grading, work must be stopped immediately or redirected until the City-approved archaeologist and Native American representative can evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigation standards set forth in the City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 2 must be funded by the applicant. If resources are found to be significant, they must be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 3 must be funded by the applicant. City staff must conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground disturbing activities and must ensure preparation of any necessary Phase 2 and/or Phase 3 investigation.</td>
<td>The applicant must prepare the necessary plans which include the required notes and abided by the Mitigation Measure if archaeological resources are encountered.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of any permit, notes regarding the halting of construction in the event the archaeological resources are encountered must be provided on each type of plans as noted in Mitigation Measure C-1. Monitoring must be ongoing during grading activities.</td>
<td>PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geology/ Soils and Hydrology/Water Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS/HW1. The applicant must submit drainage and grading plans with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for review and approval by Public Works and Building staff. The SWPPP must incorporate appropriate Best Management Practices to minimize stormwater impacts during construction in accordance with the City’s Stormwater Guidance Document and the City’s GP/CLUP. The SWPPP must include an erosion control plan and City staff must verify construction of all stormwater quality/control facilities per the City approved grading and erosion control plans.</td>
<td>GS/HW 1. The applicant must prepared and secure approval of a SWPPP.</td>
<td>GS/HW-1. SWPPP approved prior to the issuance of a LUP and then Ongoing monitoring during construction.</td>
<td>GS/HW-1. Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS/HW-2 The applicant must prepare a Stormwater Maintenance Plan for ongoing maintenance of all improvements in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications, the approved plans and conditions of approval for review and approval by City staff. Said maintenance plan must be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit for the project. The plan must include provisions for the submittal of an annual maintenance report to City staff pursuant to a Stormwater Maintenance Agreement. City staff must verify compliance prior to Land Use Permit issuance. City staff must review each annual maintenance report and maintenance records, if problems with the installation are observed</td>
<td>GS/HW-2. The applicant must prepare and secure approval of the required plans and then submit annual maintenance report.</td>
<td>GS/HW-2. Maintenance plan approved prior to issuance of LUP. Provision of maintenance report provided annually.</td>
<td>GS/HW-2 – Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS/HW3 The applicant must prepare a Stormwater Maintenance Agreement that addresses maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with the Stormwater Maintenance Plan. At a minimum the maintenance agreement must include inspection of all</td>
<td>GS/HW3. The applicant must prepared and secure approval of a stormwater</td>
<td>GS/HW3. Secure maintenance agreement approval and execute said document prior to issuance of LUP.</td>
<td>GS/HW3. Public Works Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage infrastructure per manufacturer specifications prior to September 30th of each year. Additional inspections, repairs and maintenance must be performed after storm events as needed throughout the rainy season (November 1st to April 15th) and/or per manufacturer specifications. Any necessary major repairs must be completed prior to the next rainy season. Prior to September 30th of each year, the applicant must submit to the City for its review and approval a report summarizing all inspections, repairs, and maintenance work done during the prior year. City staff must periodically verify compliance with the provision of the agreement and respond to instances of non-compliance with the agreement.</td>
<td>Maintenance agreement and prepared annual reports in accordance with the Mitigation Measure GS/HW-3.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Noise**

N-1. All noise-generating project construction activities must be limited to Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Construction must not be allowed on weekends and state holidays unless exceptions are approved by the City. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (e.g. in the event of an emergency) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Planning and Environmental Review Director. The applicant must post the allowed hours of construction near the entrance to the site, so that workers on site are aware of this limitation. Three (3) signs stating these restrictions must be provided by the applicant and posted on site. Such signs must be a minimum size of 24” x 48”. All such signs must be in place prior to beginning commencement of any grading/demolition and maintained through to occupancy clearance. City staff must monitor for the presence of signage and compliance with restrictions on construction hours, as well as investigating and responding to violations.

N-1. The applicant must install signs and advised contractors of the noise restrictions and allowed construction hours.

N-1. Signs installed prior to commencement of grading. The signs can be removed when the occupancy permit is issued.

N-1. PER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party Obligation</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>complaints.</td>
<td>N-2. Applicant must provide the required information and ensure that the stationary equipment is shielded as needed.</td>
<td>N-2. Information must be provided prior to the approval of the LUP.</td>
<td>N-2. PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-2. Stationary construction equipment that generates noise which exceeds 65 dBA measured 50-feet from the source in an unattenuated condition must be shielded to reduce such noise levels to no more than 65 dBA at project boundaries. The applicant must submit a list of all stationary equipment to be used in project construction which includes manufactures specifications on equipment noise levels as well as recommendations from the project acoustical engineer to shielding such stationary equipment so that it complies with this requirement for review and approval by City staff. All City-approved noise attenuation measures for stationary equipment used in any construction and/or demolition activities must be implemented and maintained for the duration of the period when such equipment is onsite. City staff must periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance with all noise attenuation requirements.</td>
<td>N-2. Applicant must provide the required information and ensure that the stationary equipment is shielded as needed.</td>
<td>N-2. Information must be provided prior to the approval of the LUP.</td>
<td>N-2. PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-3. The following measures must be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise: a. All construction equipment must have properly maintained sound-control devices, and no equipment must have an un-muffled exhaust system. b. Contractors must implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including but not limited to changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, and installing acoustic barriers around significant sources of stationary construction noise. City staff must periodically inspect the site to ensure</td>
<td>N-3. The applicant/contractor must ensure that the plans include the appropriate specifications and that the appropriate additional measures are taken.</td>
<td>N-3. Noise requirements must be included on the plans submitted for LUP action and then implemented during grading and construction activities.</td>
<td>N-3. PER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party Obligation</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS- 1. One new fire hydrant must be installed. The fire hydrant must be located per fire department specification and must flow 1250 gallon per minute at a 20 psi residual pressure. The commercial fire hydrant must consist of one 4-inch outlet and two 2-1/2-inch outlets. Fire Department sign-off is required on fire hydrant plan prior to Land Use Permit and/or building permit issuance, as applicable. Further, the hydrant must be installed prior to vertical construction on-site.</td>
<td>PS- 1. The applicant to secure approval of fire hydrant plans from the Santa Barbara County Fire Department and must install a new fire hydrant with the required fire flow and pressure</td>
<td>PS- 1. Approval of the fire hydrant must be secured prior to the LUP approval and installed prior to commencement of construction.</td>
<td>PS-1. Fire Department/PER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C

PROJECT PLANS
Corner Calle Real and Los Carneros
Goleta, CA 93111

ISSB 2012

AREA CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE AREAS</th>
<th>PROJECT DIRECTORY</th>
<th>PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
<th>INDEX OF DRAWINGS</th>
<th>VICINITY MAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Lot Area: 22,854 sq ft</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>Lot Area (gross): 22,854 sq ft</td>
<td>0 - Cover Sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Easement/Sidewalk: 138 sq ft</td>
<td>Islamic Society of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>P.O. Box 714</td>
<td>1A - Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Lot Area: 22,716 sq ft</td>
<td>P.O. Box 714</td>
<td>Lot Area (net): 22,716 sq ft</td>
<td>1B - Grading Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint: 4,173 sq ft</td>
<td>911 S. Calle Real</td>
<td>Zoning: CH</td>
<td>2 - Site Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Walk &amp; Patio: 1,259 sq ft</td>
<td>Goleta, CA 93116</td>
<td>Occupancy: A</td>
<td>3 - Basement &amp; Lower Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Fire Lane: 5,059 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Zone: Zone X</td>
<td>4 - Upper &amp; Roof Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeable Parking Bay: 6,831 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Construction: V-1HR</td>
<td>5 - Exterior Elevations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Area: 4,974 sq ft</td>
<td>CONTACT</td>
<td>Maximum Height: 35'</td>
<td>6 - Exterior Elevations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING AREAS</td>
<td>MD Wahidianzadeh, P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Building Sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Level: 4,173 sq ft</td>
<td>(805) 485-6611</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 - Landscape Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Level: 3,399 sq ft</td>
<td>[Phone number]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area: 7,572 sq ft</td>
<td>[Location]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCE AREAS</td>
<td>Residential Area: 1,090 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch Area: 699 sq ft</td>
<td>Nonresidential Area: 2,230 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

ISSB Community Center
Corner Calle Real and Los Carneros
Goleta, CA 93111
LEFT & RIGHT TURN ALLOWED FROM LOS CARNEROS

20' between parking stalls

22' between parking stalls at turn

24' minimum radius

20' between parking stalls

ISSB SITE PLAN