

Table of Contents

4.17	Effects Found Not to be Significant	4.17-1
4.17.1	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	4.17-1
4.17.2	Mineral Resources	4.17-2
4.17.3	Population and Housing.....	4.17-2
4.17.4	Wildfire	4.17-3

Tables

[No table of contents entries found.](#)

Figures

[No table of contents entries found.](#)

4.17 Effects Found Not to be Significant

This section summarizes the analysis of issue areas for which no significant adverse impacts were identified during the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) scoping process and, therefore, are not discussed in detail in this EIR. Each of the potential environmental effects listed below are contained in the environmental checklist form included in Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*. Issue areas discussed in this section include Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, and Wildfire. All other potential environmental effects described in Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines* but not addressed in this section are addressed in Sections 4.1 through 4.16 of this EIR. Impacts are assessed relative to the environmental baseline, which consists of the current use of the site as the Sandpiper Golf Course.

4.17.1 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Potential Environmental Effects

1. Would the project 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?
2. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
3. Would the project 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))?
4. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land?
5. Would the project 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 land?

Reasons Why Effects Were Not Found Significant

The project site was previously occupied by the former Ellwood Oil Field, which ceased operation in the 1960s after over 30 years of operations. The Sandpiper Golf Club, which now occupies part of the former oil field, was developed in 1972. The project site is primarily surrounded by open space land uses, with the Pacific Ocean to the south, Haskell's Beach to the west, and Santa Barbara Shores Park to the east. Residential land uses are located across Hollister Avenue to the northeast and north. According to the California Department of Conservation's (DOC) *California Important Farmland Finder*, the project site does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Specifically, the project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land (DOC 2022), which is defined as land occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. This designation is used for golf courses, among other developed land uses (DOC 2025).

The project site is zoned for open space and active recreation uses, and is not zoned for agricultural use. No agricultural land uses occur in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural uses or have the potential to convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. No impacts to farmlands would occur.

The project site does not contain forest land or timberland and is not zoned for Timberland Production. Development of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning, or cause rezoning of, forest land or land zoned for timberland production; and would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land. No impacts to forestland would occur.

4.17.2 Mineral Resources

Potential Environmental Effects

1. Would the project 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?
2. Would the project 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?

Reasons Why Effects Were Not Found Significant

The California Geological Survey's *Updated Mineral Land Classification Map for Concrete Grade Aggregates in the San Luis Obispo-Santa Barbara Production-Consumption Region, California – South Half* indicates the project site is primarily within Mineral Resources Zone 3 (MRZ-3, California Geological Survey 2011). MRZ-3 indicates that mineral resources deposits could be present and further evaluation is required. However, no known mineral resources of value to the region and the residents of the state are present on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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. No impacts to known mineral resources would occur.

The project site does not include any existing mineral extraction activities, and no mineral extraction activities are planned in the City of Goleta. According to the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, the historic Ellwood Oil Field, located west of the project site, is the only extractive industry within the City (City of Goleta 2006). However, this facility ceased operation in 2017. The proposed project would not interfere with any oil extraction activities located in the Ellwood Mesa area. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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. No impacts to locally important mineral resource recovery sites would occur.

4.17.3 Population and Housing

Potential Environmental Effects

1. Would the project induce substantial unplanned 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)?
2. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Reasons Why Effects Were Not Found Significant

The proposed project would not construct new housing or extend roads. While the proposed project would extend utility infrastructure to the new clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop, these extensions would serve only the proposed project. Accordingly, the proposed project would not lead to direct growth due to residential development or indirect growth due to road or

infrastructure extensions into undeveloped portions of Goleta. The proposed project would result in approximately 21 additional employees, which could cause indirect growth; however, given the size of the city workforce and the relatively small number of jobs being created, these jobs would likely come from the local workforce. As such, it is not expected that people would relocate to Goleta because of the project. However, in a conservative scenario where all projected employees and their families were assumed to relocate to Goleta, there would be a population growth of 55 people,¹ which would raise Goleta's population to approximately 32,570² people (California Department of Finance 2024). This population growth would account for approximately 2.5 percent of the total anticipated growth in Goleta by 2050. This growth would not exceed the Santa Barbara County Association of Government's 2050 population forecast of 34,700 (Santa Barbara County Association of Government 2019). Therefore, the proposed project's potential to result in population growth is accounted for in regional growth forecasts, and the proposed project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth. Impacts related to population growth would be less than significant.

In addition, the project site is currently developed with the Sandpiper Golf Club, which does not include residential uses. Construction of the proposed project would not displace people or housing. Therefore, the proposed project would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing. No impacts related to displacement of people or housing would occur.

4.17.4 Wildfire

Potential Environmental Effects

If the project is located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

1. Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
2. Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, or thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?
3. Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuelbreak, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risks or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
4. Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding, landslides, mud flows, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Reasons Why Effects Were Not Found Significant

The project site is located within a Local Responsibility Area. The southeastern portion of the project site is within a Moderate fire hazard severity zone, and the western half of the project site is within a Moderate, High, and Very High fire hazard severity zone, ranging in severity from the center of the project site (Moderate) to the western boundary (Very High) (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2025). The northeastern and south central portions of the project site are not located within a fire hazard severity zone. Overall, approximately 40 percent of the project site is within a High or Very High fire hazard severity zone.

¹ 21 employees x 2.59 persons per household (California Department of Finance 2024) = approximately 55 persons.

² 55 people + 32,515 (population of Goleta; California Department of Finance 2024) = 32,570 people.

Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project

The project site is surrounded by the Pacific Ocean to the south; the former Ellwood Onshore Oil processing facility (Venoco facility), hotel uses, and Haskell's Beach to the west; Hollister Avenue, United States Highway 101, Fire Station Number 10 (approved but not constructed), and residential uses to the north; and residential uses and Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve to the east. The project site would primarily consist of golf course turf, and the project would add native plants for landscaping purposes, both of which would have a low fire risk. The proposed project would not substantially change the slope, winds, or other factors such that wildfire risks would be exacerbated. The project would maintain the current land use of the site (golf course) and would not add new ignition sources such as campsites or overhead power lines. The project would underground the existing power lines, which would reduce fire risk when compared to existing conditions.

Project components located within High or Very High fire hazard severity zones include the renovated clubhouse, golf course improvements south and west of the clubhouse, and improvements to Hollister Avenue north of the clubhouse. When compared to existing conditions, the project would not add new components or intensified development within a fire hazard severity zone. No construction would occur in Bell Canyon, which is the largest area of the project site within a Very High fire hazard severity zone.

During construction, there would be a temporary increase in human activity and potential ignition sources, including equipment that could create sparks, be a source of heat, or leak flammable materials on the project site. In accordance with California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 4442, equipment including earth-moving and portable construction equipment with internal combustion engines would be equipped with spark arrestors to prevent the emission of flammable debris from exhaust, when operating on any forest-covered, brush-covered, or grass-covered land. In addition, PRC Sections 4427 and 4431 specify standards for conducting construction activities on days when a burning permit is required, and PRC Section 4428 requires construction contractors to maintain fire suppression equipment during the highest fire danger period (April 1 to December 1) when operating on or near any forest-covered, brush-covered, or grass-covered land. These measures are designed to prevent accidental ignition and facilitate rapid response in the event of a fire. Adherence to these regulatory requirements would minimize the risk of potential wildland fire during construction.

Project design would be subject to the California Fire Code, which includes safety measures to minimize the threat of fire, including ignition-resistant construction with exterior walls of noncombustible or ignition resistant material from the surface of the ground to the roof system and sealing any gaps around doors, windows, eaves and vents to prevent intrusion by flame or embers, automatic interior and exterior fire sprinklers, a water delivery system, fire apparatus access, and defensible space. Project design would also be required to comply with Chapter 9, *Fire Protection Systems*, of the California Building Code, which includes specific standards related to exterior wildfire exposure, and California Code of Regulations Title 14, which sets forth the minimum development standards for emergency access, fuel modification, setback, signage, and water supply, which help prevent loss of structures or life by reducing wildfire hazards. In addition, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department's development standards which includes requirements for egress on private driveways, fire hydrant spacing and flow rates, automatic fire sprinkler systems, and automatic alarm systems (Santa Barbara County Fire Department 2022). Adherence to State and local regulations would ensure the installation of infrastructure associated with the proposed project would not substantially exacerbate fire risk.

The proposed improvements on Hollister Avenue (identified as an evacuation route under the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan) would require encroachment into the right-of-way and temporary partial lane closures on Hollister Avenue, which could result in temporary disruptions to

emergency access through Hollister Avenue. However, in accordance with Chapter 12.02 of the City's Municipal Code, the project applicant would be required to maintain at least one safe crossing for vehicles and must implement measures to minimize disruption to existing traffic conditions. In addition, as described further in Section 4.14, *Transportation and Circulation*, the project applicant's construction contractor would be required to implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan during construction on Hollister Avenue. The Construction Traffic Management Plan would require implementation of traffic control measures and minimization of disruptions to critical access points at the project site for emergency service vehicles during construction on Hollister Avenue, which would be reviewed for potential safety concerns and approved by SBCFD and the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office. Furthermore, adherence to applicable guidance documents such as the City's Emergency Operations Plan (City of Goleta 2021) and the County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (County of Santa Barbara 2017) would minimize the potential for the proposed project to substantially impair emergency response and emergency evacuation. These documents provide direction for traffic control and management in emergency situations, and the proposed project would not preclude implementation of these plans (City of Goleta 2021; County of Santa Barbara 2017). During operation, the proposed project would add 21 employees to the project site, and a conservative estimate of 55 people to the city of Goleta (refer to Section 4.17.3, *Population and Housing*). This population growth is accounted for in regional growth forecasts, and thus the proposed project would not add substantial, unplanned congestion to local roadways in the event of an evacuation during a wildfire. As a result, the proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan within an SRA or VHFHSZ.

The project site and adjacent areas are relatively flat and do not contain the steep topography necessary to induce substantial landslides or mudflows that would have the potential to result in significant impacts on the project site. In addition, runoff and drainage changes would be minimized during construction and operation as the proposed project would be required to adhere to regulatory requirements which mandate implementation of erosion control measures. The proposed project must obtain coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit and implement the provisions of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, including BMPs related to erosion control and sediment release. The proposed project must comply with the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Post-Construction Requirements for Development Projects in the Central Coast Region, which entails submittal of a Stormwater Control Plan. The Stormwater Control Plan would be reviewed and approved by the City which would ensure erosion control measures are implemented during operation (City of Goleta n.d.). As a result, the proposed project would not result in substantial runoff, slope-instability, or drainage changes which could lead to post-wildfire flooding, landslides, or mud flows. Impacts related to wildfire would be less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank.