

4.15 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Section 15128 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires an EIR to briefly describe any possible significant effects that were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR. This section addresses the potential environmental effects of the project that have been found not to be significant. The items listed below that were found not to be significant are contained in the environmental checklist form included in Appendix G of the most recent update of the *CEQA Guidelines*. Any items not addressed in this section were addressed in Section 4.0, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, of this EIR. Section 4.0 also includes an expanded discussion of the settings under each environmental factor listed.

4.15.1 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

The proposed project site is not located within any designated farmlands or forest lands, and the site is not actively farmed. As such, the proposed project would not interfere with or convert existing farmlands or forest lands to urban uses. Therefore, no impacts related to agriculture and forestry would occur.

4.15.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (Habitat and Natural Community Conservation Plans)

There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the project site nor would the proposed project conflict with any such plans in place in the area. No impact would occur.

4.15.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES (Historic, Paleontological)

As the project site is undeveloped, there are no state or locally listed or eligible historic structures or resources onsite. Therefore, project implementation would not result in any impact on such resources in the city. There are no unique paleontological resources or sites, or unique geologic features on the project site. No such impacts to these types of resources would occur as a result of project implementation.

4.15.4 GEOLOGY AND SOILS (Surface Rupture, Landslides, Expansive Soils, Septic Systems)

Based on the geologic hazards assessment prepared by Hoover & Associates (1998), a subsequent Preliminary Foundation Investigation prepared by Pacific Materials Laboratory of Santa Barbara (2009), and a review of geologic hazards mapping in the Goleta General Plan, no active or potentially active faults, slopes exceeding 20%, landslide hazard areas, or expansive soils are located onsite. As such, impacts related to these geologic hazards are considered less than significant.

The proposed project would connect to the existing municipal waste disposal system and would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. Therefore, impacts related to having soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks would not occur.



4.15.5 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (Airports, Emergency Evacuation and Response)

The project site is not located near a private airstrip, but is located within two (2) miles of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. However, the property is not located within any of the airport's approach or clear zones and is not subject to review by the Airport Land Use Commission. Therefore, the project would not be exposed to any significant airport safety hazards. Given the project's location within the urban area and outside of the tsunami run-up area or any flood hazard area, the project site is not within any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

4.15.6 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (Flooding, Seiche, Mudflow, Tsunami)

No portion of the project site is within or adjacent to a local 100-year flood hazard area. The project site is not within a levee, dam inundation area and is not at risk of inundation by seiche, mudflow, or tsunami. Therefore, no impacts related to flooding would occur.

4.15.7 LAND USE (Divide an Established Community, Habitat & Conservation Plans)

There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans that apply to the project site or would be affected by the project. The proposed project is in an infill area and would not divide an established community. No impacts would occur.

4.15.8 MINERAL RESOURCES

No known mineral resources are located within the proposed project site. Therefore, no impacts related to mineral resources would occur.

4.15.9 NOISE (Airports)

Pursuant to the Goleta General Plan, the project site is located outside of either the current or the anticipated 2030 60 dBA noise contour of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. Therefore, airport noise impacts, either in the near or foreseeable future on the proposed project would be considered less than significant. There is no private airport anywhere within the vicinity of the City and as such, no private airport impacts on the proposed project would occur.

4.15.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

The project site is currently undeveloped. The proposed project would not displace any existing housing units or require the displacement of any people thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no such impacts would occur.



4.15.11 PUBLIC SERVICES (Police, Schools, Libraries)

Based on recommended service levels for the County Sheriff's Department, the proposed project would not trigger the need for additional police officers and/or equipment and facilities. The generation of students at the project site would not exceed the capacity of local public schools. Furthermore, the project-generated increase in demand for public library facilities would be considered less than significant. Therefore, impacts related to police protection, schools, and library facilities would be less than significant.

4.15.12 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC (CMP Intersections, Airports, Emergency Access, Alternative Transportation)

Based on the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments' criteria, the project would not result in significant degradation of the level of service of intersections in the CMP network. As the project site does not lie within the clear or approach zone of any public or private airports, it would have no impact on airport operations and/or flight patterns. The proposed project also would have no impact on the provision of emergency access to either the project or surrounding development. Finally, the project would have a less than significant impact on alternative transportation plans and facilities.



This page intentionally left blank.

