

# ADDENDUM TO THE CITY OF GOLETA GENERAL PLAN / COASTAL LAND USE PLAN FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Prepared for:



City of Goleta Neighborhood Services  
and Public Safety Department  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, CA 93117



Prepared with the assistance of:



Amec Foster Wheeler Environment &  
Infrastructure, Inc.  
104 West Anapamu Street, Suite 204A  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

**SEPTEMBER 2018**

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

---

## Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND .....	1
1.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES .....	1
1.3 PROJECT LOCATION AND OVERVIEW .....	2
1.4 SURROUNDING LAND USES AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS .....	2
1.5 PURPOSE OF THE EIR ADDENDUM.....	3
1.6 STRUCTURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ADDENDUM ..	3
1.7 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES.....	3
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	17
2.1 INTRODUCTION .....	17
2.2 GENERAL PLAN BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW .....	17
2.2.1 GP/CLUP Objectives.....	21
2.3 CEQA AUTHORITY FOR PREPARING AN ADDENDUM TO AN EIR ANALYSIS AND CEQA APPENDIX F APPLICABILITY .....	21
2.3.1 Proposed Land Use Element, Land Use Plan Map Changes.....	22
3.0 RELATED PROJECTS .....	23
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS .....	29
EXISTING CONDITIONS.....	29
CHANGES IN REGULATORY FRAMEWORK .....	29
PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION.....	29
4.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES .....	34
4.1.1 Existing Conditions .....	34
4.1.2 Regulatory Framework.....	34
4.1.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation.....	34
4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FARMLAND .....	43
4.3 AIR QUALITY.....	45
4.3.1 Existing Conditions .....	45
4.3.2 Regulatory Framework.....	45
4.3.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation .....	45
4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	53
4.4.1 Existing Conditions .....	53
4.4.2 Regulatory Framework.....	53
4.4.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation .....	53
4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	61
4.5.1 Existing Conditions .....	61
4.5.2 Regulatory Framework.....	61
4.5.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation .....	61
4.6 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES .....	67
4.6.1 Existing Conditions .....	67
4.6.2 Regulatory Framework.....	67
4.6.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation .....	67

4.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS..... 73

    4.7.1 Existing Conditions ..... 73

    4.7.2 Regulatory Framework..... 73

    4.7.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation ..... 73

4.8 POPULATION AND HOUSING..... 81

4.9 WATER RESOURCES ..... 83

    4.9.1 Existing Setting ..... 83

    4.9.2 Regulatory Framework..... 83

    4.9.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation ..... 83

4.10 LAND USE AND RECREATION ..... 91

    4.10.1 Existing Conditions..... 91

    4.10.2 Regulatory Framework..... 91

    4.10.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation ..... 91

4.11 NOISE..... 99

    4.11.1 Existing Conditions..... 99

    4.11.2 Regulatory Framework..... 99

    4.11.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation ..... 99

4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES..... 105

    4.12.1 Existing Conditions..... 105

    4.12.2 Regulatory Framework..... 105

    4.12.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation ..... 105

4.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION ..... 115

    4.13.1 Existing Setting ..... 115

    4.13.2 Regulatory Framework..... 115

    4.13.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation ..... 115

5.0 GP/CLUP FEIR ADDENDUM PREPARERS ..... 123

6.0 REFERENCES ..... 125

**List of Tables**

Table 1-1 Project Site Characteristics ..... 2

Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum ..... 5

Table 2-1 2006 GP/CLUP Subsequent EIR Addenda  
and Supplemental EIRs ..... 16

Table 3-1 List of Projects Referenced for Cumulative Effects  
(November 2017) ..... 20

Table 4.14-1 Significant Changes in LOS for Evaluating Project Impacts..... 111

**List of Figures**

Figure 2-1 Project Vicinity ..... 14

Figure 2-1 Project Site ..... 15

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations §§ 15164, et seq.). The City of Goleta (City), with assistance from Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. (Amec), prepared this Addendum to the City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Report (GP/CLUP FEIR) (City of Goleta 2006) to evaluate potential environmental impacts resulting from a site-specific proposed General Plan Amendment (GPA) at 7952 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-075).

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

The City of Goleta proposes an amendment to the General Plan and Land Use Element at for the parcel known as 7952 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-075), located on the northeast corner of the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road Overpass intersection (see Figure 2-1). This proposed Project would amend the General Plan and Land Use Element Figure 2-1, the Land Use Plan Map, from Visitor-Serving Commercial (C-V) to Public/Quasi-Public (P-S).

A separate, related Project-specific EIR known as the Goleta Fire Station 10 EIR (State Clearinghouse No. [SCH] 2017081066) was prepared coincident with this GP/CLUP FEIR Addendum. Decision-makers must first render a decision regarding the proposed Project GPA. If approved, this GP/CLUP FEIR Addendum would be adopted and certified in association with the Goleta Fire Station 10 EIR.

### 1.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Project GPA objective is to amend the GP/CLUP designation of APN 079-210-075 from Visitor-Serving Commercial (C-V) to Public/Quasi-Public (P-S) to potentially allow for development of a government facility (the proposed Fire Station 10) in a location presently experiencing a deficiency of localized and community-wide emergency and fire protection service in the western City of Goleta area. The need for the Project GPA to accommodate this public facility was identified as early as 1967 during a regional assessment of long-term growth in the Goleta Valley by the National Board of Fire Underwriters for fire protection services. The County of Santa Barbara's Goleta Community Plan (adopted in August 1993) subsequently identified a conceptual public facility at or in proximity to the Project site. The City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Public Facilities Element approved in 2006 identified the proposed Project site as the appropriate location for the fire protection service expansion, though the General Plan and Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) for the parcel remained designated Visitor-Serving Commercial (C-V). The Project GPA objective is to align the GP/CLUP designation for APN 079-210-075 with the long-identified need for a public facility to address fire protection service in the western City of Goleta area.

### 1.3 PROJECT LOCATION AND OVERVIEW

The 1.21-acre proposed Project GPA site is located at 7952 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-075) and a 0.30-acre right-of way (ROW) easement along Hollister Avenue at the northeast corner of the Hollister/Cathedral Oaks intersection; it is considered the western entrance, or "gateway" to the City (see Figure 2-3). Project site details are provided in Table 2-1, below.

**Table 1-1. Project Site Characteristics**

<b>Existing General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Land Use Designation</b>	Visitor Serving Commercial (C-V)
<b>Zoning Ordinance, Zone District</b>	Coastal Zone District: Limited Commercial (C-1)
<b>Site Size</b>	1.21 acres, 0.30-acre Hollister Avenue easement
<b>Present Use and Development</b>	Undeveloped (former gas station)
<b>Surrounding Uses</b>	North: UPRR, U.S. 101 West: Cathedral Oaks Overpass East: The Hideaway residential development South: Hollister Avenue, Sandpiper Golf Course
<b>Access</b>	Hollister Avenue
<b>Utilities and Public Services</b>	Water: Goleta Water District Wastewater: Goleta West Sanitary District Solid Waste: Marborg Industries Electricity: Southern California Edison Gas: Southern California Gas Cable: Cox Communications Telecom: Verizon, Qwest, AT&T, Level 3

### 1.4 SURROUNDING LAND USES AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

The Project site is bordered to the north by the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks and right-of-way corridor that are at the base of an approximately 35-foot high cut slope along the northern proposed Project GPA site boundary. US 101, including the Cathedral Oaks / U.S. 101 south-bound onramp, is on the northern side of the UPRR corridor. The Hideaway residential development consisting of 101 townhouse units is to the east. The Hideaway neighborhood consists of "The Villas", single-family detached and duplex homes up to four bedrooms, and "The Bungalows", town homes and flats with up to three bedrooms.

## 1.5 PURPOSE OF THE EIR ADDENDUM

The CEQA lead agency for this Addendum to the GP/CLUP FEIR (EIR Addendum) is the City. An EIR Addendum was determined to satisfy compliance for the proposed Project GPA following the conditions and definitions in CEQA Guidelines §§ 15164.

This EIR Addendum provides analysis of the impacts related to implementation of the Project GPA, which proposes to change existing land use designation of APN 079-210-075 as follows:

- Amending the General Plan and Land Use Element Figure 2-1, the Land Use Plan Map, from Visitor-Serving Commercial (C-V) to Public/Quasi-Public (P-S).

A separate, related Project-specific EIR known as the Goleta Fire Station 10 EIR (State Clearinghouse No. [SCH] 2017081066) was prepared coincident with this EIR Addendum. That Project-specific EIR analyzes the impacts of the development and operation of that fire station along with the proposed rezone related to the proposed Project GPA. Decision-makers must first render a decision regarding the proposed Project GPA. If approved, this GP/CLUP FEIR Addendum would be adopted and certified in association with the Goleta Fire Station 10 EIR.

## 1.6 STRUCTURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ADDENDUM

This executive summary summarizes the project description and conclusions of the impact analyses provided in this EIR Addendum. Chapter 2, Project Description, provides a detailed description of the Project GPA. Chapter 3, Related Projects, includes a list of pending and approved projects in the Project vicinity, which is used, where applicable, in the environmental issue area evaluations of cumulative impacts. Chapter 4, Environmental Impact Analysis, addresses the GPA's effect on the impacts and mitigation measures identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. It provides an analysis of the proposed Project GPA buildout. Chapter 5 lists the EIR Addendum preparers and contacts.

## 1.7 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The impacts associated with the proposed Project GPA would not exceed those impacts identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. As supported by the analysis in Chapter 4, the proposed Project GPA would have no new significant environmental effects beyond those identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR.

Table 1-2 summarizes the potential environmental impacts identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR, including mitigation measures that were identified to reduce these impacts. The impact level of the proposed Project GPA is compared to the

GP/CLUP FEIR by impact classification (Class I, II, III, or IV) and then by environmental issue. The impact numbers in Table 1-2 correspond to the original impact numbers in the GP/CLUP FEIR.

For a more detailed discussion of proposed Project impacts and mitigation measures, please refer to the individual issue area sections of this GP/CLUP FEIR Addendum.



<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Impact 3.1-1.</b> Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) (Short-term); Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Long-Term) (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.1-2.</b> Impacts of GP/CLUP on Citywide Visual Character	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) (Short-term); Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Long-Term) (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.1-3.</b> Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Scenic Corridors and Key Public Viewpoints	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.1-4.</b> Impacts from Light and Glare	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.1-5.</b> Improvements to Visual Quality of City Gateways	Beneficial (Class IV)	Beneficial (Class IV)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.1-6.</b> Creating Well Defined Public Spaces	Beneficial (Class IV)	Beneficial (Class IV)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.1-1.</b> Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) (Short-term); Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Long-Term) (Class II)	(=)
<b>AGRICULTURE AND FARMLAND</b>			
<b>Impact 3.2-1.</b> Conversion of Agricultural Land and Loss or Impairment of Agricultural Productivity	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.2-2.</b> Incompatible Land Uses and Structures	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.2-3.</b> Preservation of Agricultural Land	Beneficial (Class IV)	Beneficial (Class IV)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.2-4.</b> Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Lands	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)

<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>			
<b>Impact 3.3-1.</b> Construction Emissions	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.3-2.</b> GP/CLUP Growth Projections Are Consistent with the Clean Air Plan	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.3-3.</b> The GP/CLUP Rate of Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled is Greater Than the Rate of Population Growth for the Same Area	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.3-4.</b> Long-term Operational Contributions to Air Pollutant Emissions as a Result of GP/CLUP Buildout	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.3-5.</b> Cumulative ROG and NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	Cumulatively Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.3-6.</b> Cumulative PM <sub>10</sub> Emissions	Cumulatively Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.3-7.</b> Long-term Cumulative Operational Contributions to Greenhouse Gas Emissions <sup>1</sup>	Cumulatively Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Impact 3.4-1.</b> Temporary Impacts to Special Status Habitats and Special Status Species	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.4-2.</b> Loss of Special Status Habitats	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.4-3.</b> Long-term Degradation of Special Status Habitats	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.4-4.</b> Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)

<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Impact 3.4-5.</b> Harm to Listed Species	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.4-6.</b> Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.4-7.</b> Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.4-8.</b> Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.4-9.</b> Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.4-10.</b> Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.4-11.</b> Impacts to Non-Special-Status Habitats and Species	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.4-12.</b> Resources Not Affected by Maintenance/Management	Beneficial (Class IV)	Beneficial (Class IV)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.4-13.</b> Protection of ESHAs and Maintenance/Management of Regional and Neighborhood Open Space Area	Beneficial (Class IV)	Beneficial (Class IV)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.4-14.</b> Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources – Except for Raptor Foraging	Cumulatively Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Cumulatively Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)

<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Impact 3.5-1.</b> Damage to Sites of Cultural, Historical, or Paleontological Significance	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.5-2.</b> Loss or Destruction of an Important Historical Building, Archaeological Site, or Paleontological Site	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.5-3.</b> Loss or Destruction of Significant Cultural Resource	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Impact 3.6-1.</b> Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.6-2.</b> Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from the Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault, Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismically Induced Landslide, or Liquefaction	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.6-3.</b> Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting from Development on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils or Steep Slopes	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.6-4.</b> Location of Development on Expansive Soil That Could Lead to Risks to People or Structures	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.6-5.</b> Exposure of People to Elevated Levels of Indoor Radon	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)

<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
<b>Impact 3.7-1.</b> Risk of Upset at Venoco Facilities	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.7-2.</b> Transport	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.7-3.</b> Risk of Upset at S.L. 421 Wells	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.7-4.</b> Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.7-5.</b> Airport	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.7-6.</b> Wildland Fires	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.7-7.</b> Surface Water	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.7-8.</b> Exposure of Population to Listed/Contaminated Sites	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.7-9.</b> Contaminated Soil	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.7-10.</b> Exposure of Populated Areas to Oil Gas Pipelines	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.7-11.</b> Ellwood Facility	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.7-12.</b> EMFs	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact HAZ-3.7-13.</b> Upset and Accident Conditions	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>Impact HAZ-3.7-14.</b> Contaminated Groundwater	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)

<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>			
<b>Impact 3.8-1.</b> The Result of the Increased Population Would Be the Need for Additional Housing and Jobs, Which Would Result in the Physical Alteration of Vacant and Previously Developed Land within the City	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.8-2.</b> Population Growth Associated with Implementation of the Proposed GP/CLUP Is Anticipated to Result in an Increase in the Population by 24 Percent at Full or Ultimate Buildout	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.8-3.</b> Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Could Result in the Addition of 3,730 Residential Units to the City's Housing Stock	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.8-4.</b> Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Would Result in the Addition of Approximately 3,400 to 3,900 Jobs	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.8-5.</b> The GP/CLUP Would Not Result in the Displacement of a Substantial Number of People or Existing Homes	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)

<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>WATER RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Impact 3.9-1.</b> Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.9-2.</b> Adequacy of Water supplies to Serve New Development	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.9-3.</b> Changes in Groundwater Supply from New Development	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.9-4.</b> Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.9-5.</b> Construction of Structures or Housing in a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.9-6.</b> Risk to New Development from Inundation by a Tsunami, Mudslide, or Seiche	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.9-7.</b> Increases in Point Source and Nonpoint Source Pollution from New Development	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.9-8.</b> Risk to New Development from Dam Failure and Resultant Flooding	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.9-9.</b> Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies Are 303(d) Listed	Cumulatively Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.9-10.</b> Cumulative Effects on Water Supply	Cumulatively Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Cumulatively Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)

<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>LAND USE AND RECREATION</b>			
<b>Impact 3.10-1.</b> Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.10-2.</b> Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.10-3.</b> Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.10-4.</b> Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.10-5.</b> Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.10-6.</b> Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.10-7.</b> Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.10-8.</b> Physical Division of an Established Community Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)



<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>NOISE</b>			
<b>Impact 3.11-1.</b> Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Sources	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.11-2.</b> Exposure of Existing or Planned Noise Sensitive Receptors Uses to Increased Noise	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less Than Significant (Class II)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.11-3.</b> Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less Than Significant (Class II)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.11-4.</b> Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Railway Noise	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less Than Significant (Class II)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.11-5.</b> Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Industrial and Other Point Sources	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.11-6.</b> Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Airport Noise	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.11-7.</b> Cumulative Traffic Noise	Cumulatively Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)

<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES</b>			
<b>Impact 3.12-1.</b> Increased Demand for Police Protection	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.12-2.</b> Increased Demand for Fire Protection	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Beneficial Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.12-3.</b> Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection, Treatment, and Disposal	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.12-4.</b> Increased Demand for Utility Services	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.12-5.</b> Increased Demand on Local School Districts	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	No Impact (Class IV)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.12-6.</b> Increased Demand on Library Facilities	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.12-7.</b> Exceedance of Capacity of Landfills to Accommodate Additional Solid Waste Stream	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b>			
<b>Impact 3.13-1.</b> Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways	Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(-)
<b>Impact 3.13-2.</b> Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways Intersections	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	Adverse, but Feasibly Mitigated to Less than Significant (Class II)	(=)

<b>Table 1-2 Summary of Impacts, 2006 GP/CLUP FEIR and EIR Addendum</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>GP/CLUP FEIR Impact</b>	<b>GPA Impact</b>	<b>Comparison to GP/CLUP FEIR</b>
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b>			
<b>Impact 3.13-3.</b> Increased Traffic Volumes, Either Individually or Cumulatively, without Violation of LOS Standards Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	Adverse, but Less Than Significant (Class III)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.13-4.</b> LOS under 2030 is expected to improve or remain unchanged at Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive and Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real	Beneficial (Class IV)	Beneficial (Class IV)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.13-5.</b> No Impacts to Air Traffic Patterns	Beneficial (Class IV)	Beneficial (Class IV)	(=)
<b>Impact 3.13-6.</b> Increased Transit Ridership and Encourage Alternative Modes of Transportation	Beneficial (Class IV)	Beneficial (Class IV)	(=)

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

The City of Goleta proposes to change existing land use designation of at 7952 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-075), as follows:

- Amending the General Plan and Land Use Element Figure 2-1, the Land Use Plan Map, from Visitor-Serving Commercial (C-V) to Public/Quasi-Public (P-S).

The Project site is located on the northeast corner of the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road Overpass intersection (see Figures 2-1 and 2-2 later in this Section). The proposed project would enable implementation of City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy Public Facilities PF 3.2 that mandates the construction of a future fire station to serve the western portion of the City.

### 2.2 GENERAL PLAN BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

California law, at Government Code §§ 65300 *et seq.*, requires that cities and counties adopt a General Plan to guide their physical development. The General Plan acts as the City's "constitution" for the physical use of resources, to express the community's preservation and development goals, and to establish public policy relative to the distribution of future public and private land use. The City adopted its GP/CLUP in October 2006. Before adopting the GP/CLUP, the City, acting as the lead agency, determined that the proposed GP/CLUP could result in significant adverse environmental effects, as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Consequently, the City prepared a Program-Level EIR to evaluate the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of implementation of the GP/CLUP.

The City released a draft GP/CLUP on March 20, 2006 and released a EIR for the GP/CLUP on May 28, 2006 for public and agency comment. In response to public and agency comments, in September and October 2006, the City made revisions to both documents and adopted final versions of the GP/CLUP and Final EIR (2006 EIR). The GP/CLUP contains nine elements:



**Regional Location and Project Vicinity  
GP/CLUP FEIR Addendum**

**FIGURE  
2-1**



SCALE IN FEET

0 250

Source: ArcGIS Online Basemap (World Imagery).

N



**Project Site Location**  
**GP/CLUP FEIR Addendum**

**FIGURE**  
**2-2**

- Land Use;
- Open Space and Coastal Access;
- Conservation;
- Safety;
- Visual and Historical Resources;
- Transportation;
- Public Facilities;
  
- Noise; and
- Housing.

The GP/CLUP has been amended several times since 2006 in response to both City and applicant-initiated GPAs. Similar to this GPA, the City reviewed these previous GPAs to determine if any new environmental impacts would result that were not previously contemplated in the 2006 EIR (see Section 2.3). The various CEQA documents associated with previous GPAs are listed in Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1 2006 General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan –  
Subsequent EIR Addenda and Supplemental EIRs**

Case No.	Title	Type of Environmental Document	CC Resolution No.
07-200	Track 1 – Housing Element Update	Addendum	09-44
07-201	Track 2 – Minor Amendments	Addendum	08-30
09-033	Track 2.5 – Building Intensity Standards	Addendum	09-32/09-33
07-202	Track 3 – Substantive Amendments	Supplemental EIR & Addendum	09-59
03-050	Village at Los Carneros	EIR	EIR – 08-02 GPA – 08-06
07-102	Haskell's Landing	Addendum (EIR & Supplemental EIR by County)	Addendum – 09-26 GPA - 09-30 & -33
10-123	Housing Element Update	Addendum	Addendum – 10-56 GPA – 10-57
08-196	Montecito Bank and Trust Project	Addendum	Addendum – 11-09
08-128	Willow Springs Phase Two	Addendum & EIR	Addendum - 11-080 & -081



08-143	Westar Mixed Use Village	Addendum & EIR	Addendum – 12-68 GPA –12/62
10-043	Village at Los Carneros	Addendum	14-41
14-026	Old Town Village	Addendum	15-49
12-044	Hollister/Kellogg Park	Addendum	17-46
18-035	Cannabis Ordinance	Addendum	18-30

These analyses are incorporated by reference into this GP/CLUP FEIR Addendum. Therefore, the 2006 EIR, 2009 Supplemental EIR, and Addenda adopted to date and listed above are hereby collectively referred to as the GP/CLUP FEIR.

### 2.2.1 GP/CLUP Objectives

As summarized in the GP/CLUP FEIR, there are four fundamental objectives:

1. Ensure a high-quality environment by protecting and conserving the community's cultural, historical, natural, and environmental assets, values, and resources.
2. Provide a sustainable economy that is not solely dependent on growth, but provides for economic prosperity and well-being for current and future residents.
3. Maintain adequate service standards, including levels of service (LOS) on area highways.
4. Enable income group opportunities to meet current and future housing needs.

### 2.3 CEQA AUTHORITY FOR PREPARING AN ADDENDUM TO AN EIR ANALYSIS AND CEQA APPENDIX F APPLICABILITY

According to CEQA Guidelines § 15164, an addendum to a previously certified EIR is the appropriate environmental document in instances “if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.” These include:

- 1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- 2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant

environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

- 3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - A. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
  - B. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - C. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - D. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

This Addendum to an EIR describes the proposed Project GPA and compares its impacts to those identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR to demonstrate that no new environmental impacts or increase in their intensity would occur beyond what was previously contemplated.

Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines also requires a discussion of potential energy impacts of proposed projects with a particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. This Addendum to an EIR does not include a discussion of energy impacts based on the nature of the Project which is primarily a map change.

### **2.3.1 Proposed Land Use Element, Land Use Plan Map Changes**

The City of Goleta proposes to change the following land use designation

- Amending the General Plan and Land Use Element Figure 2-1, the Land Use Plan Map, from Visitor-Serving Commercial (C-V) to Public/Quasi-Public (P-S).

### 3.0 RELATED PROJECTS

CEQA Guidelines § 15130 requires EIRs to discuss cumulative impacts when the project's incremental effects are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, current projects, and probable future projects. It further states that this discussion shall reflect the severity of the impacts and likelihood of occurrence, but not in as great a level of detail as is necessary for the impacts of the project alone. CEQA Guidelines § 15355 defines cumulative impacts to be "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts."

CEQA Guidelines § 15130(b)(1) states that the information from one of the following two sources is necessary to an adequate discussion of significant cumulative impacts:

- a. A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or
- b. A summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional, or statewide plan or related planning document that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect. Such plans may include: a general plan, regional transportation plan, or plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. A summary of projections may also be contained in an adopted or certified prior environmental document for such a plan. Such projections may be supplemented with additional information such as a regional modeling program. Any such document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

The cumulative impact analysis contained in this EIR Addendum uses method a above. Table 3-1 provides a summary of the recently approved, currently planned, and pending future projects in the area that were used to determine the conditions contributing to cumulative effects. The baseline for the related projects is November 2017, when the Notice of Preparation of the specific-Project EIR for the Goleta Fire Station EIR was issued.

Table 3-1 List of Projects Referenced for Cumulative Effects (November 2017)

Project No.	Project Name	Description	Location	Project Status
<b>Projects Under Construction</b>				
1.	Village at Los Carneros	Residential, 465 units	Calle Koral and Los Carneros Road	Under construction
2.	Fairview Commercial Center	7,476 s.f. commercial / retail building	151 South Fairview Avenue	Under construction
3.	Harvest Hill Ranch	7-Lot Residential Subdivision with 6 new homes	880 Cambridge Drive	Under construction
4.	Islamic Society of SB	6,183 s.f. building with prayer room, meeting area and 1 caretaker unit	N/E Corner of Los Carneros and Calle Real	Under construction
5.	Citrus Village	Residential, 10 units	7388 Calle Real	Under construction
6.	Old Town Village	Residential and Commercial mixed use, 175 townhomes with shopkeeper and live-work unit	South Kellogg Avenue	Under construction
7.	Marriott Residence Inn	80,989 s.f. hotel, 118 rooms	6300 Hollister Avenue	Under construction
8.	Highway Recycling	Concrete and asphalt recycling facility with temporary and permanent equipment. Includes new creek restoration, fencing, landscaping, trash enclosure, retaining wall, and drainage improvements	909 South Kellogg Avenue	Under construction
<b>Approved Projects (Not Constructed)</b>				
9.	McDonalds Drive Thru Expansion	Second drive thru lane, revised parking and circulation, and new landscaping	1465 South Fairview Avenue	Approved
10.	Rancho Estates Mobile Home Park Fire Improvements (Rancho Goleta)	New fire access road, new/upgraded fire hydrants, new water lines, and bring existing car wash into conformance	7465 Hollister Avenue	Approved

Project No.	Project Name	Description	Location	Project Status
11.	Pacific Beverage at Cabrillo Business Park Reduced Project	Reduction in 24,398 s.f. from previously approved building	355 Coromar Drive	Approved
12.	Site Improvements	768-s.f. elevator addition, 1,100-s.f. new building, and 314-s.f. addition to rear of building	130 Robin Hill Road	Approved
13.	Schwann Self Storage	Addition of basements to 3 previously approved but unconstructed buildings for a 135,741 s.f. self-storage facility	10 South Kellogg Avenue	Approved
14.	Cortona Apartments	Residential, 176 units	6830 Cortona Drive	Approved
15.	Fuel Depot	Reconstruction of convenience store/auto-service building (2,396 s.f.); no changes to existing fueling stations or canopy	180 North Fairview Avenue	Approved
16.	Somera Medical Office Building	20,000 s.f. net new medical/dental office building	454 South Patterson Avenue	Approved
17.	Ward Renovations and Lot Split	New building façade, new site renovations, and lot split	749 and 759 Ward Drive	Approved
<b>Pending Projects (Complete Applications)</b>				
18.	Shelby	Residential, 60 units	7400 Cathedral Oaks Road	Pending, Complete Application
19.	Kenwood Village	Residential, 60 units	7300 Calle Real	Pending, Complete Application
20.	Fairview Gardens	Master Use Permit and Special Events	598 North Fairview Avenue	Pending, Complete Application
21.	Heritage Ridge	Residential, 228 apartments and 132 senior apartments	North of Calle Koral and East of Los Carneros	Pending, Complete Application
22.	Ellwood Mesa Coastal Trails and Habitat Restoration Project	Improve 7.1 miles of trails, improve 3 drainage crossings, improve 2 beach access points, and 13 acres of habitat restoration	Ellwood Mesa Preserve	Pending, Complete Application

Project No.	Project Name	Description	Location	Project Status
<b>Pending Projects (Incomplete Applications)</b>				
23.	Cabrillo Business Park, Lot 5	New 23,882-s.f. building within Cabrillo Business Park	6789 Navigator Way	Pending, Incomplete Application
24.	Cabrillo Business Park, Lot 6	New 16,750-sf building within Cabrillo Business Park	6765 Navigator Way	Pending, Incomplete Application
25.	Cabrillo Business Park, Lot 7	New 31,584-s.f. building within Cabrillo Business Park	6759 Navigator Way	Pending, Incomplete Application
26.	Cabrillo Business Park, Lot 9	New 44,924-s.f. building within Cabrillo Business Park	301 Coromar Drive	Pending, Incomplete Application
27.	Cabrillo Business Park, Lot 14	New 44,004-s.f. building within Cabrillo Business Park	289 Coromar Drive	Pending, Incomplete Application
28.	Calle Real Hotel	3-story hotel, 134 rooms	5955 Calle Real	Pending, Incomplete Application
29.	Fuel Depot with Car Washes	1,667 s.f. new drive-in carwash, self-serve car wash, gas fueling dispensers and manager's residence; Zizzo's Coffee building to remain	370 Storke Road	Pending, Incomplete Application
30.	Willow Industrial Park	146,000 s.f. new Light Industrial with outdoor storage and 2,587 s.f. office building	891 South Kellogg Avenue	Pending, Incomplete Application
31.	Providence Middle/High School	Façade improvement to existing 21,408 s.f. building and other associated site improvements	5385 Hollister Avenue	Pending, Incomplete Application
32.	Cortona Industrial Project	23,000-s.f. light industrial building use building and tentative parcel map	6864/6868 Cortona Drive	Pending, Incomplete Application
33.	Santa Barbara Honda	Includes façade improvements, a 1,628 s.f. enclosure of existing canopy for added showroom, a new 5,175 s.f. new enclosed canopy, and a new 300 s.f. new parts room	475 South Kellogg Avenue	Pending, Incomplete Application
34.	Verizon Wireless Antenna at U.S. Post Office	New 66 ft. tall monopine wireless tower	400 Storke Road	Pending, Incomplete Application

<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Project Status</b>
35.	Sywest	70,594 s.f. high cube industrial building	907 South Kellogg Avenue	Pending, Incomplete Application

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

This chapter examines the environmental setting, evaluates the potential significant environmental impacts, and identifies appropriate mitigation measures for each environmental element discussed in this GP/CLUP FEIR Addendum. The scope of this EIR Addendum is based on the project description outlined in Chapter 2.0. This chapter of the GP/CLUP FEIR Addendum (EIR Addendum) analyzes how impacts and mitigation measures identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR would change if the GPA were adopted. To determine this, the proposed Project GPA was evaluated in terms of two questions:

1. Does the Project GPA result in any increases to the severity of impacts previously identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR (e.g., from Class III to Class II or from Class II to Class I)?
2. Does the GPA have the potential to result in additional potentially significant impacts? If yes, is there feasible mitigation to reduce the potentially significant impact to an insignificant level?

In summary, the Project GPA would result in similar or decreased level of impacts identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR and would not result in any new significant impacts.

The following describes the type of information provided within each environmental resource area discussion.

### EXISTING CONDITIONS

The environmental setting subsection for each environmental resource area describes the physical environmental conditions in the Project area as they relate to the resource in question. CEQA Guidelines § 15125(a) states that “the environmental setting normally constitutes the baseline physical conditions by which the lead agency determines whether or not an impact is significant.” The environmental setting described in the proposed Project GPA for each resource area is the same as described in the GP/CLUP FEIR, unless otherwise noted.

### CHANGES IN REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

This subsection summarizes the applicable regulations, plans, and standards that apply to the GP/CLUP and relate to the specific resource in question. In most cases, the regulatory framework for each resource area is the same as described in the GP/CLUP FEIR. Changes in federal, state, or local regulations since adoption of the GP/CLUP FEIR are noted, where applicable.

### PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

This subsection discusses the thresholds of significance, the environmental impact analysis, mitigation measures that may be necessary to reduce environmental impacts, and the residual impacts following implementation of recommended mitigation measures to be incorporated. It also contains a

discussion of relevant GP/CLUP policies. The discussion presented in this EIR Addendum focuses on changes in impact determinations associated with the Project GPA.

Potential Project GPA Impacts are identified by comparing the allowable land uses defined in the City of Goleta Coastal Zoning Ordinance (CZO) for properties designated Resort Visitor Serving Commercial, and comparing them with allowable land uses for properties designated Professional and Institutional, listed below.

### **Existing GP/CLUP FEIR Designation and Potential Land Uses**

CZO Sec. 35-8 Sec. 35-81.5 C-V Resort Visitor Serving Commercial Permitted Uses:

1. Resort, guest ranch, hotel, motel, country club, convention and conference center.
2. Light commercial uses (i.e., barber and beauty shops, gift shops, restaurants, etc.) normally associated with the needs of visitors, provided such commercial activities are so designed and limited as to be incidental and directly oriented to the needs of visitors and do not substantially change the character of the visitor-serving facility.
3. Recreational facilities, including but not limited to piers, boat docks, golf courses, parks, playgrounds, riding and hiking trails, tennis courts, swimming pools, beach clubs.
4. Non-Residential Child Care Centers, that are accessory and subordinate to uses permitted by this Section 35-81.5-, for use by on-site employees of the development, when sited and designed to ensure compatibility with other permitted uses on the project site and on adjacent parcels. (Added by Ord 4067, 8/18/92).
5. Accessory uses, buildings, and structures which are customarily incidental to the above uses.

### **Proposed Project GPA Designation and Potential Land Uses**

CZO Sec. 35-83.4 PI Professional and Institutional Permitted Uses:

1. Professional offices, studios, and office buildings.
2. Hospitals, sanitariums, medical clinics, special care homes, and similar buildings, when used for the treatment of human ailments, subject to the approval as to need of the Santa Barbara Subarea Advisory Counsel of the Health Systems Agency, Ventura-Santa Barbara.
3. Eleemosynary [charity] and philanthropic institutions for human beings.
4. Churches, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, but not including dance halls nor trade schools using heavy equipment.
5. Community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures.

6. Clubs, golf courses, and country clubs.
7. Cemetery, crematory, or mausoleums.
8. Off-street parking facilities accessory and incidental to an adjacent commercial use.

The reasonably projected intensity of proposed buildout under the existing GP/CLUP FEIR and the proposed Project GPA is defined by the size of the proposed Project GPA site (1.21 acres), and associated development setbacks, parking area, landscaping and open space, and drainage infrastructure requirements.

The project site size of 1.21 acres reasonably defines buildout under the existing C-V Resort Visitor Serving Commercial Permitted Uses to:

- Light commercial uses (i.e., barber and beauty shops, gift shops, restaurants, etc.) normally associated with the needs of visitors.

Reasonably probable development of the 1.21-acre project site under the proposed PI Professional and Institutional Permitted Uses include:

- Professional offices, studios, and office buildings;
- Medical clinics;
- Eleemosynary and philanthropic institutions;
- Libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools;
- Community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures; and
- Crematory or mausoleum.

It is reasonable to assume that the development requirements defined above (i.e., setbacks, parking, landscaping and open space, and drainage areas) would be generally the same for buildout of the Project site under both existing and proposed GP/CLUP designations.

**Thresholds of Significance.** This discussion identifies the significance criteria, or where applicable, thresholds of significance, that are used to evaluate the GP/CLUP's impacts. The criterion or threshold for a given environmental effect is the level at which the City finds the effect to be significant.

**Environmental Impact Analysis.** The environmental analysis considers potential impacts resulting from the Project GPA. Specifically, the analysis examines whether the GPA:

- Would increase impacts identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR and whether the increase results in a change in classification of an impact (e.g., Class III to Class II or Class II to Class I) that would require mitigation beyond that identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR; or

- Would result in new impacts not identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR and whether the new impacts would require mitigation beyond that identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR.

The environmental impact analysis assesses each resource area to determine the significance level. These impacts are categorized using the City's guidance for classifying Project-related impacts:

- **Class I impacts are significant adverse impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated, reduced, or avoided.** If the Addendum to the GPA EIR is approved, decision makers are required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15093, explaining why project benefits outweigh the disturbance caused by the significant environmental impact or impacts.
- **Class II impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly reduced or avoided to less than significance** through the implementation of GP/CLUP policies or by other recommended mitigation. If the Addendum to the GPA EIR is approved, decision-makers are required to make findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091 that impacts have been mitigated to the maximum extent feasible by implementing the recommended mitigation measures.
- **Class III impacts are adverse impacts that are less than significant.** These impacts do not require that CEQA findings be made.
- **Class IV impacts are beneficial or have no impact.** These impacts do not require that CEQA findings be made, but beneficial impacts may be referenced in a statement of overriding considerations, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15093.

**Mitigation Measures.** Mitigation measures are identified for potential impacts related to buildout of the GP/CLUP and GPA that are considered significant based on the significance criteria or thresholds of significance. These measures would reduce or avoid each impact, as appropriate.

**Residual Impacts.** This section presents the final conclusion on the level of significance of the impact after all mitigation is considered and incorporated into the proposed Project GPA.

**Cumulative Impacts.** This section summarizes the cumulative impacts of the proposed Project GP/CLUP.

Please note that the impact numbering throughout Chapter 4 matches the original impact numbering in the GP/CLUP FEIR.

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## 4.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

### 4.1.1 Existing Conditions

Some important changes that have occurred within the Project site vicinity affecting the surrounding visual character, visual resources, and key public view points since certification of the GP/CLUP FEIR include the following:

- Completion of the Cathedral Oaks Overpass and realignment of the US-101 on- and off-ramps and Hollister Avenue south and west of the Project site.
- Completion of the Hideaway residential development, consisting of 101 townhouse units to the east of the Project site.
- Completion of The Bluffs residential development, consisting of 62 single-family units to the southeast of the Project site.
- Adoption of updates to the General Plan Visual and Historic Resources Element in 2009.

### 4.1.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project GPA is provided or is referenced to the regulatory framework described for the GP/CLUP FEIR, including the discussions of relevant federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.1.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.1.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized for the proposed Project GPA EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

A proposed project would result in a potentially significant visual impact if it would result in one or more of the following conditions:

- 1a. The project site has significant visual resources by virtue of surface waters, vegetation, elevation, slope, or other natural or man-made features which are publicly visible.
- 1b. The proposed project has the potential to degrade or significantly interfere with the public's enjoyment of the site's existing visual resources.
- 2a. The project has the potential to impact visual resources of the Coastal Zone or other visually important area (i.e., mountainous area, public park, urban fringe, or scenic travel corridor).
- 2b. The project has the potential to conflict with the policies set forth in the Local Coastal Plan, the General Plan or any applicable community plan to protect the identified views.

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

### **CEQA Thresholds**

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines identifies the following four circumstances that can lead to a determination that a project has a significant visual impact:

- a. The project has a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- b. The project substantially damages scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within view of a state scenic highway.
- c. The project substantially degrades the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- d. The project creates a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

#### **4.1.3.2 Project Impacts**

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

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the following Class I (significant and unavoidable) impacts related to aesthetics and visual resources.

##### **Impact 3.1-1. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City, Including Views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways**

The Project site is located along Hollister Avenue at a City gateway. As identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR, development of the Project site along Hollister Avenue would potentially affect views of the Project site as experienced along this corridor, as well affect views from the gateway to Goleta along Hollister Avenue at the western boundary of the City. Although Policy VH 2 and Policy VH 4 of the Visual and Historic Resources Element require that development not degrade or obstruct views of scenic areas and call for the enhancement of prominent gateways through landscaping and pedestrian amenities, there was the potential for impacts on aesthetic resources to be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum. Such a proposed Project under the GPA would be subject to review by the Design Review Board to ensure consistency with Policy HV 2 and VH 4. The proposed project would be required to be compatible with

surrounding architecture incorporate screening vegetation to minimize impacts on views experienced from Hollister Avenue to *adverse but feasibly mitigated* to less than significant (Class II). **Therefore, aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project GPA would be less than the certified GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact. 3.1-2. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Citywide Visual Character

##### Impact 3.1-2a. Impacts to the Visual Character of the City Subareas

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified Class I visual/aesthetic impacts related to new development within designated City subareas, including the Central Subarea, Old Town and Residential Subareas. However, the GP/CLUP FEIR identified that implementation of the GP/CLUP would not significantly impact the visual character of the Coastal or Central Resource Subareas. The Project site is located in the Coastal Resource Subarea identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. The proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum. Given that a proposed Project GPA would be in the Coastal Resource Subarea and the potential development would not be more intense than that allowed by Visitor-serving uses, it would have an *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impact in this regard. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have similar impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

##### Impact 3.1-2b. Impacts to the Visual Character of Natural Open Space and Agricultural Areas

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified Class I visual/aesthetic impacts related to the potential conversion of 55.7 acres of agricultural lands to urban uses. The proposed Project site is not located in a natural open space or agricultural area, but instead would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum adjacent along the Hollister Avenue corridor. The proposed Project would have *no impact* (Class IV) in this regard. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have less impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

##### Impact 3.1-2c. Impacts to the Visual Character of the Santa Ynez Mountains and Foothills

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) visual/aesthetics impacts related to potential conversion of vacant properties in the northern half of the City to urban uses. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the Hollister Avenue south of the proposed Project site as a scenic corridor and gateway to the City, where there is concern for impacts to views of the Santa Ynez Mountains and foothills. The proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and



structures, or a crematory or mausoleum along the Hollister Avenue corridor. It is reasonable to assume that buildout associated with the Project GPA could require some or all of the removal of existing eucalyptus woodland onsite. This would be a potential significant short-term impact on visual resources until screen trees and vegetation along the northern and eastern boundaries would establish and mitigate the loss of the existing on-site eucalyptus woodland. The loss of the vegetation would be a short-term significant and unavoidable impact (Class I), and in the long-term would be *adverse, but mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have similar impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.1-2d. Impacts to Views from Cathedral Oaks Road, Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road North of US-101, and Fairview Avenue

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) visual/aesthetics impacts related to development along Cathedral Oaks Road, Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road north of US-101, and along Fairview Avenue. The proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum along the Hollister Avenue corridor. It is reasonable to assume that buildout associated with the Project GPA could require removal of some or all of the existing eucalyptus woodland onsite. Removal of the eucalyptus woodland on the Project site would be experienced from view corridors along Cathedral Oaks Road until proposed landscaped would be established, as discussed under GP/CLUP AES-Impact 3.1-1, above (Class I short-term, Class II long-term). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have similar impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

***Class II Impacts***

Impact 3.1-3. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Scenic Corridors and Public Viewpoints

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified five Class II impacts related to scenic corridors and public viewpoints. The GP/CLUP FEIR identifies policies (Section 3.1.3.3) related to scenic views, local scenic corridors, and design review as methods to preserve and enhance the visual character and public views within and from Goleta's scenic corridors. Scenic corridors within the City include US-101, Hollister Avenue, SR-217, Cathedral Oaks Road, Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road north of US-101, and Fairview Avenue. The GP/CLUP FEIR found that implementation of the policies discussed above would reduce impacts on visual character resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP to *adverse, but less than significant with mitigation* (Class II). Given that the potential development under the proposed Project GPA would not be more intense than that allowed by Visitor-serving uses, impacts on visual resources would also be *adverse, but less than significant with mitigation* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have similar impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.1-3a. Impacts to Views from US-101

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified a Class II impact from development of the Project site for visitor serving commercial uses given its proximity to and visibility from US-101 and applicability of policies that would ensure compatible design of future development. The proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum along the Hollister Avenue corridor. Such proposed structures allowable under the Project GPA would be screened from the US 101 view corridor by proposed landscaping along the northern boundary and other eucalyptus trees north and outside of the Project area. The future structure under the Project GPA would have an *adverse, but less than significant* impact (Class III) on views from US 101 as vegetation between the Union Pacific Railroad and US 101 would screen the proposed Project site. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have less impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.1-3b. Impacts to Views from SR-217

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified an *adverse, but less than significant with mitigation* (Class II) impact to visual/aesthetic resources from development along the SR-217 corridor. The Project GPA site is not located on or near SR-217, and is not visible from SR-217. The proposed Project GPA would have *no impact* (Class IV) in this regard. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have less impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.1-3c. Impacts to Views from Public Viewing Areas within the City

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified an *adverse, but less than significant with mitigation* (Class II) impact from development of the Project site and adverse effects to views from public viewing areas. The GP/CLUP identified policies of the GP/CLUP which would ensure that future development be subject to height restrictions, landscaping requirements, and architectural treatments that reduce potential impacts to views from public viewing areas to a less than significant level. These policies would apply to the proposed Project GPA, that would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum. The policies would address potential impacts on public view corridors including from Sandpiper Golf Course and Hollister Avenue to the south. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have similar impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.1-3d. Impacts to Views from Areas within the Coastal Zone

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified an *adverse, but less than significant with mitigation* (Class II) impact related to changes in views from areas within Coastal Zone. The GP/CLUP identified policies of the GP/CLUP that would ensure that future development be subject to height restrictions, landscaping requirements, and

architectural treatments that reduce potential impacts to views from areas within the Coastal Zone to *adverse, but less than significant* level. These policies would apply to the proposed Project GPA, which would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum. The policies would address potential impacts to scenic resources of the Coastal Zone. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have similar impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.1-3e. Light and Glare

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant with mitigation* (Class II) impacts related to the increase of light and glare resulting from development of vacant land visible from scenic and public viewpoints mentioned above. The proposed Project site is located on Hollister Avenue, one of the City designated scenic corridors listed above. Since GP/CLUP FEIR certification, residential uses have been developed adjacent to the proposed Project site to the east (Hideaway Townhomes), which may also be adversely affected by light and glare generated by development of the site. The GP/CLUP FEIR (Section 3.1.3.3) identified policies that would minimize light and glare of new development on views from scenic corridors. These policies would apply to the Project GPA, which would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum. The policies would address impacts to scenic views, local scenic corridors, and design review that would reduce impacts to *adverse, but less than significant with mitigation* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have similar impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

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

#### Impact 3.1-4. Impacts from Light and Glare

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impacts related to the increase of light and glare visible from public view locations outside the City's boundaries because the most intense development would be adjacent to urbanized uses. The GP/CLUP FEIR (Section 3.1.3.3) identifies policies that address scenic views, local scenic corridors, and design review, including the requirement for dark sky compliant lighting fixtures for exterior lighting. Proposed Project GPA, which would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum, would be required to comply with these policies to ensure that potential light spillover impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have similar impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR**

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

#### Impact 3.1-5. Improvements to Visual Quality of City Gateways

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified Class IV (beneficial) impacts related to improvements to the visual quality at City Gateways with the implementation of Policy VH 2. The proposed Project GPA would potentially allow for a two-story structure accommodating libraries, museums, and schools, or a community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures that would provide for a public facility at the western gateway to the city. ***Therefore, the proposed Project would have similar impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

#### Impact 3.1-6. Creating Well Defined Public Spaces

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified Class IV (beneficial) impacts related to improvements to the visual quality by creation of well-defined public spaces with the implementation of Policy VH 2. The proposed Project GPA would potentially allow for a two-story structure accommodating libraries, museums, and schools, or a community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures that would provide for a public facility at the western gateway to the city. ***Therefore, the proposed Project would have similar impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

#### **4.1.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

The GP/CLUP FEIR found that implementation of the GP/CLUP would result in an *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) cumulative impact to the visual character or quality of the City for the following reasons. Future development would continue to be guided by the local General Plan and local design review procedures, which would continue to protect the visual character of the area represented by architectural features and elements, visual compatibility, view corridors, and scenic resources and vistas. Also, most development would occur on vacant or underutilized lands, which comprise approximately 6 percent of the land within City boundaries. Proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum. Similarly, with implementation of standard permitting requirements and design review, the proposed Project GPA would not represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to these cumulative impacts on visual character of the City because development on the Project site has occurred as an extension of urban neighborhoods to the south and east.

The GP/CLUP FEIR found that the implementation of the GP/CLUP would result in *adverse, but less than significant* cumulative impacts (Class III) related to increased light and glare associated with development of vacant and underutilized land because most of this development would occur in areas that

already have development and nighttime lighting. Also, new development would be subject to design review processes that would control the effects of new lighting. Similarly, with implementation of standard permitting requirements and mitigation for lighting standards, the proposed Project GPA allowing for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum would not represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to these cumulative impacts associated with light and glare because the changes would be subject to similar design review processes. **Therefore, the proposed Project would have similar cumulative impacts on aesthetic resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### 4.1.3.4 Mitigation

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

No modifications to General Plan policies are proposed.

#### 4.1.3.5 Residual Impacts

Implementation of the proposed Project would not increase significant visual character impacts over what was identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. No modifications to General Plan policies or mitigation measures are proposed. Impacts would be either *significant and unavoidable* (Class I), *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II), or *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## 4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FARMLAND

The GP/CLUP FEIR assessed impacts on agricultural and farmland resources on a City-wide basis, and programmatically identified impacts associated with buildout of the GP/CLUP and the loss or conversion of agricultural lands (GP/CLUP FEIR Impact 3.2-1), development of incompatible uses adjacent to agricultural land uses (GP/CLUP FEIR Impact 3.2-2), and the preservation of agricultural lands (GP/CLUP FEIR Impact 3.2-3). Given that the proposed Project GPA site is not located on or adjacent to lands containing valuable agricultural or farmland resources, the proposed Project GPA would have *no impact* (Class IV) on agriculture and farmland. ***Proposed Project GPA impacts would be less than those identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*



## 4.3 AIR QUALITY

### 4.3.1 Existing Conditions

Some important changes that have occurred with respect to regional and local air quality conditions since certification of the GP/CLUP FEIR include the following:

- Release and certification of SBCAPCD's 2016 Ozone Plan.
- South-Central Coast Air Basin's transition from a Nonattainment area designation for ozone to a Nonattainment-transitional area designation.<sup>1</sup>
- Completion of the Hideaway residential development, consisting of 101 townhouse units to the east of the Project site, establishing a new sensitive population directly adjacent to the Project site.
- Completion of The Bluffs residential development, consisting of 62 single-family units to the southeast of the Project site.

### 4.3.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project is provided in the GP/CLUP FEIR, including discussions of relevant federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.3.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.3.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized for this EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds Manual***

Per the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, a significant adverse air quality impact may occur when a project, individually or cumulatively, triggers either of the following:

- Interferes with progress toward the attainment of the ozone standard by releasing emissions which equal or exceed the established long-term quantitative thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG; or
- Equals or exceeds the State or Federal ambient air quality standards for any criteria pollutant (as determined by modeling).

#### ***CEQA Thresholds***

Per Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would pose a significant air quality impact if any of the following were to occur as a result of the project:

- a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> A region designation Nonattainment-transitional when the ozone standard has not been exceeded more than three times at any one location during the last year.

- b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in a state of non-attainment under applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).
- d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

### ***SBCAPCD Thresholds***

A proposed project will not have a significant air quality effect on the environment, if operation of the project will:

- Emit (from all project sources, both stationary and mobile) less than the daily trigger for offsets or Air Quality Impact Analysis set in the APCD New Source Review Rule, for any pollutant (i.e., 240 pounds/day for ROC or NO<sub>x</sub>; and 80 pounds/day for PM<sub>10</sub>. There is no daily operations thresholds for CO; it is an attainment pollutant); and
- Emit less than 25 pounds/day of NO<sub>x</sub> or ROC from motor vehicle trips only; and
- Not cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone); and
- Not exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board;
- Be consistent with the adopted federal and state air quality plans for Santa Barbara County.

### Construction Impacts Thresholds

The SBCAPCD does not currently have quantitative thresholds of significance in place for short-term or construction emissions; however, the SBCAPCD uses 25 tons per year for NO<sub>x</sub> and ROC as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts.

#### **4.3.3.2 Project Impacts**

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

##### Short-Term Impacts

##### Impact AQ-3.3-1. Construction Emissions

The GP/CLUP FEIR found that significant short-term, construction-related impacts would occur due to the disturbance of friable asbestos during demolition of older structures during the buildout of the Plan. However, demolition activities involving asbestos are required to be conducted in accordance with SBCAPCD rules for

removal of asbestos prior to demolition, compliance with which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum. Construction of such a facility would not involve the demolition of any structures as the site is vacant and short-term construction-related impacts relating to disturbance of friable asbestos do not apply to the site. The proposed Project GPA is therefore considered to have *no impact* (Class IV) on air quality. ***The proposed Project impact would be reduced compared to the GP/CLUP EIR.***

The GP/CLUP also found that significant short-term, construction-related impacts could occur if such activities occurred near sensitive receptors such as residences, schools, and hospitals. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several Conservation, Land Use, Public Facilities, Safety, and Transportation policies designed to protect air quality resources and minimize the risk to humans and the environment from toxic air contaminants. Further, the SBCAPCD provides a number of recommended techniques to reduce construction-related emissions which the Project may apply to further reduce pollutant concentrations. The GP/CLUP polices and SBACAPCD recommended techniques would apply to the two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum allowed under the proposed Project GPA. Impacts of the Project GPA would therefore be considered *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have similar impacts on air quality compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

The Project GPA could also result in similar short-term, construction-related impacts if such construction activities resulted in diesel emissions and fugitive dust near sensitive receptors such as residences, schools, and hospitals. Use of SBCAPCD's recommended techniques compliance with applicable GP/CLUP policies protecting air quality would reduce construction-related air quality impacts to less than significant. These techniques and policies would also apply under the proposed Project GPA that would allow for development of a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum to further reduce estimate air pollutant concentrations. ***Therefore, the proposed Project would have similar impacts to air quality compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

### Long-Term Impacts

#### Impact 3.3-2. GP/CLUP Growth Projections are Consistent with the Clean Air Plan

The GP/CLUP FEIR found that buildout of the GP/CLUP and associated population growth would be within SBCAG's Regional Growth Forecasts, and associated increases in air pollutant emissions would not result in a significant increase in emissions forecasted within the Clean Air Plan. Impacts were identified as being *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). The proposed Project GPA allowing for the construction of a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum would have a minor incremental effect on regional growth resulting from hiring new full-time employees serving the structure; the additional employees would generate a minimal increase in air pollutant emissions that would be consistent with emissions forecasted within the Clean Air Plan. This impact would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project would have similar impacts to air quality compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.3-3. The GP/CLUP Rate of Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled is Greater than the Rate of Population Growth for the Same Area

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified an *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impact resulting from implementation of development under the GP/CLUP that would cause an annual average VMT growth rate of 1.15 percent, which was greater than the rate of population growth for the Goleta region as projected by the 2004 SBAPCD CAP referenced in the GP/CLUP FEIR. However, the GP/CLUP FEIR concluded that buildout would be consistent with the SBCAPCD's 2004 CAP and other regional plan strategies, such as SBCAG's Regional Transportation Plan, to reduce the number of trips and the length of trips in the region and to improve the balance between jobs and housing at the sub-regional level.

The proposed Project GPA would allow for the construction of a two-story structure accommodating professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum. Compared to a typically high-traffic and trip-based visitor-serving commercial development such as restaurants or retail stores that would be potentially permitted under the existing GP/CLUP designation, the proposed Project GPA land uses would result in relatively fewer daily vehicle trips and associated VMT. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have less impacts to air quality compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.3-4. Long-term Operational Contributions to Air Pollutant Emissions as a Result of GP/CLUP Buildout

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) associated with operational emissions created by stationary sources including the

use of natural gas, landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products such as aerosol sprays, and various industrial and commercial processes (e.g., dry cleaning) allowed under the GP/CLUP. These non-vehicular operational emissions would represent an *adverse but less than significant* (Class III) impact to air quality, and that such emissions would be regulated and permitted on a project-by-project basis. Similarly, emissions generated by non-vehicular stationary sources such as the proposed Project GPA buildout including professional offices, studios, and office buildings, medical clinics, charitable institutions, libraries, museums, and schools, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental buildings and structures, or a crematory or mausoleum would not generate significant air pollutant concentrations, would be regulated and permitted by SBCAPCD, and would not generate concentrations harmful to nearby sensitive receptors. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have similar impacts to air quality compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **4.3.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

##### Impact 3.3-5. Cumulative ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> Emissions

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified a significant contribution to cumulative increases in air emissions within the South-Central Coast Air Basin that would adversely affect the ability of local agencies to achieve the goals and objectives of the SBCAPCD's 2013 CAP adopted in 2015. Because Santa Barbara County is in nonattainment of state standards for ozone emissions, and any project-generated new ozone precursor (ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions could exacerbate such nonattainment, the GP/CLUP buildout's contribution to cumulative levels of ozone emissions was considered *significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

The emissions associated with proposed Project GPA buildout including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum are estimated to be below the SBCAPCD's established thresholds for ozone precursors (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG). Further, proposed Project GPA buildout would result in less growth than anticipated under the GP/CLUP FEIR (see discussion of Impact 3.3-2 above), and growth of the GP/CLUP that has been accounted for in regional growth projections used to inform the SBCAPCD's 2016 Ozone Plan.<sup>2</sup> Given that the proposed Project GPA buildout anticipated emissions would be below the thresholds of significance and would result in a level of growth that have been anticipated in the 2016 Ozone Plan, it would not result in a significant cumulative

---

<sup>2</sup> The 2016 Ozone Plan states: "Any general plan amendment that would provide for increased population growth above that forecasted in the most recently adopted Ozone Plan is inconsistent with the Ozone Plan and may have a significant impact on air quality."

contribution to regional ozone emissions. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to air quality compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.3-6. Cumulative PM<sub>10</sub> Emissions

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified an *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III), contribution to cumulative air quality impacts related to PM<sub>10</sub> emissions, as implementation of GMC Chapter 15.09 (Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control) and SBCAPCD dust-control measures would ensure any project's contribution to cumulative levels of PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). (See Impact 3.3-1 above for a discussion of PM10 emissions resulting from GP/CLUP buildout). The proposed Project GPA buildout of a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum would incrementally increase potential PM<sub>10</sub> emissions. However, the proposed Project GPA buildout would also be subject to standard City grading regulations and SBCAPCD dust-control measures. Therefore, the proposed Project GPA's contributions to cumulative levels of PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would also be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts on air quality compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.3-7. Long-term Cumulative Operational Contributions to Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

The GP/CLUP FEIR did not evaluate the potential contribution to GHG emissions from GP/CLUP implementation. The GP/CLUP FEIR did however address impacts to air quality, which generally includes discussion of impacts from typical GHGs and ozone precursors (reactive organic compounds, volatile organic compounds, and nitrogen oxides) and their effects on compliance with the adopted Clean Air Plan and state and federal ambient air standards. As identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR, impacts to air quality from station and mobile short- and long-term emissions were conservatively concluded to be *significant and unavoidable* (Class I). The 2009 Supplemental EIR for the Track 3 GP/CLUP amendments (City of Goleta 2009) did evaluate GHG emissions resulting from original 2006 GP/CLUP.

The proposed Project GPA buildout of a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum would incrementally increase GHGs and ozone precursors (reactive organic compounds, volatile organic compounds, and nitrogen oxides). Compared to a typically high-traffic and trip-based visitor-serving commercial development such as restaurants or retail stores that would be potentially permitted under the existing GP/CLUP designation, the proposed Project GPA land uses would result in relatively fewer daily vehicle trips and associated VMT. Therefore, the proposed Project GPA buildout impact on GHG emissions would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **The proposed**

***Project GPA would result in less impacts from new sources of GHG emissions and on global climate change compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

#### **4.3.3.4 Mitigation Measures**

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

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are proposed.

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

No mitigation, above that required by regulatory agencies and in compliance with GP/CLUP policies, is identified.

#### **4.3.3.5 Residual Impacts**

Implementation of the proposed Project would reduce significant air quality impacts over what was identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. No modification to General Plan policies or mitigation measures are proposed. Impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*



## 4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

### 4.4.1 Existing Conditions

Some important changes that have occurred with respect to biological resources since certification of the GP/CLUP FEIR include the following:

- Completion of The Hideaway residential development, consisting of 101 townhouse units to the east of the Project site, resulting in development on all sides of the Project site.
- Adoption of updates to the General Plan Conservation Element in 2009.

### 4.4.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project is provided in the GP/CLUP FEIR, including discussions of relevant federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.4.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.4.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized for this EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

The City's adopted Thresholds Manual (City of Goleta 2008) provides environmental thresholds specific to biological resources. This manual primarily uses Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines for its criteria, which states that a project would have a significant impact on the environment if it exceeds any of the following thresholds:

- Conflicts with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located.
- Substantially affects a rare or endangered species of animal, plant, or the habitat of the species.
- Interferes substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.
- Substantially diminishes habitat for fish, wildlife, or plants.

Determination of impacts is done on a project-by-project basis. Disturbance to habitat and/or species is considered significant if it affects significant biological resources in any of the following ways:

- Substantially reduces or eliminates diversity or abundance.
- Substantially reduces or eliminates quantity or quality of nesting areas.
- Substantially limits reproductive capacity through loss of individuals or habitat.

- Substantially fragments, eliminates, or otherwise disrupts foraging areas and/or access to food sources.
- Substantially limits or fragments the geographic range or dispersal routes of species.
- Substantially interferes with natural processes, such as fire or flooding, upon which the habitat depends.

Policy-related impacts on biological resources may be considered less than significant where there is little or no biological importance of a given habitat and where disturbance would not cause a substantial effect. For example, disturbance to cultivated agricultural fields or small acreages of nonnative, ruderal habitat would be considered less than significant.

### **CEQA Thresholds**

Per Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would pose a significant impact to biological resources if any of the following were to occur as a result of the project:

- 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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service;
- b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service;
- 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;
- 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;
- e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or
- 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.

### 4.4.3.2 Project Impacts

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

##### Short-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.4-1. Temporary Impacts to Special-status Habitats and Special-status Species

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with construction of planned land uses, which would have the potential to temporarily remove or degrade special-status habitats and temporarily affect special-status species. The Project site was not identified by the GP/CLUP as supporting special-status habitats, and no instances of special-status species occurring at the site were documented. Regardless, the GP/CLUP FEIR identified several wildlife and habitat protection policies that are applicable to the proposed Project and are incorporated here by reference. Enforcement of these policies would reduce Impact 3.4-1 to a less than significant level.

The proposed Project GPA would allow for buildout of a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of such a structure and related development footprint including parking, new landscaping, and drainage infrastructure would be similar in extent to a visitor-serving commercial structure that would be allowable under the existing GP/CLUP designation. GP/CLUP FEIR wildlife and habitat protection policies would also apply to the proposed Project GPA buildout. ***Therefore, the proposed Project would have an equal level of impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

##### Long-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.4-2. Loss of Special-status Habitats

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with permanent loss of special-status habitats, including 40 acres of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) on identified vacant sites throughout the City. Development allowed under the existing GP/CLUP designation as well as the proposed Project GPA would not have potential to result in this impact because none of the vegetation present at the site is considered rare or a special community within the state and does not meet the City's criteria for designation as ESHA. As such, impacts of the proposed Project GPA are considered to be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). However, GP/CLUP policies would continue to apply to ensure development does not adversely affect special-status habitat. ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

##### Impact 3.4-3. Long-term Degradation of Special-status Habitat

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with long-term degradation of special-status habitats, including increased occurrence of

invasive non-native species, change in hydrology and water flow, or disturbances from unauthorized recreation activities. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several wildlife and habitat protection policies that are applicable to the proposed Project and are incorporated by reference. The existing GP/CLUP FEIR wildlife and habitat protection policies would reduce Impact 3.4-3 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

Proposed Project GPA buildout would not have potential to result in this impact, because the Project site does not contain and is not located adjacent to special-status habitat. Impacts of the proposed Project GPA are considered to be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). However, GP/CLUP policies would continue to apply to ensure development would not adversely affect special-status habitat. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.4-4. Fragmentation of Special-status Habitat

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with fragmentation of existing areas of special-status habitats. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several wildlife and habitat protection policies that are applicable to the proposed Project and are incorporated here by reference. Enforcement of these policies would reduce Impact 3.4-4 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

Proposed Project GPA buildout would not have potential to result in this impact because the site does not contain and is not located adjacent to special-status habitat, and is now surrounding by development. Impacts of the proposed Project GPA are considered to be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). However, GP/CLUP policies would continue to apply to ensure development would not adversely affect special-status habitat. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.4-5. Harm to Listed Species

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with harm to listed species. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several wildlife and habitat protection policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-5 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). As the Proposed Project GPA buildout would be similar to a facility constructed under the Visitor Serving General Plan designation, the Project GPA would not have potential to result in this impact, as no sensitive wildlife, listed species, or breeding habitat would be impacted by implementation of the Project and impacts are considered *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.4-6. Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with loss, reduction, or isolation of local populations of native species, primarily from habitat loss and degradation. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several wildlife and habitat

protection policies that are applicable to the proposed Project and are incorporated here by reference. Enforcement of these policies would reduce Impact 3.4-6 to an *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

Development of the proposed Project would not have potential to result in this impact because the site does not contain and is not located adjacent to habitat supporting local populations of native species. For instance, the GP/CLUP FEIR identified the site as supporting only non-native grassland habitat. Impacts of the proposed Project GPA are considered to be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). However, GP/CLUP policies would continue to apply to ensure development would not adversely affect native species. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.4-7. Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special-status Species

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with reduction of the amount and/or quality of habitat available for special-status species. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several wildlife and habitat protection policies that are applicable to the proposed Project and are incorporated here by reference. Enforcement of these policies would reduce Impact 3.4-7 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

Development of the proposed Project GPA would not have potential to result in this impact because the site does not contain and is not located adjacent to valuable habitat that may support special-status species and is surrounding by development. Impacts of the proposed Project are considered to be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). However, GP/CLUP policies would continue to apply to ensure development would not adversely affect special-status species. **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.4-8. Break or Impairment of Functions of Existing Wildlife Linkages

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with breaking or impairing the functions of existing wildlife linkages, specifically along riparian corridors. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several wildlife and habitat protection policies that are applicable to the proposed Project and are incorporated here by reference. Enforcement of these policies would reduce Impact 3.4-8 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

No significant wildlife linkages exist through or directly adjacent to the site which would be broken or impaired by development of the proposed Project GPA, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. Impacts of the proposed Project GPA would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III); however, GP/CLUP policies would continue to apply to ensure development would not adversely affect wildlife linkages. **Therefore, the**

***proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

Impact 3.4-9. Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with biological resources in areas of conserved habitat. Proposed Project GPA buildout would not have the potential to result in this impact, because the site does not support nor is located adjacent to sensitive, valuable, or species-status habitat. Impacts of the proposed Project GPA are considered to be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

Impact 3.4-10. Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with proposed activities that are inconsistent with approved conservation plans and local conservation policies for special-status species. Proposed Project GPA buildout would not have the potential to result in this impact, as the Project site does not support nor is located adjacent to habitat supporting a special-status species. Impacts of the proposed Project GPA are considered to be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

***Class III Impacts***

Impact 3.4-11. Impacts to Non-Special-status Habitats and Species

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impacts associated with activities that would remove or degrade non-special-status habitats or adversely affect non-special-status species. The GP/CLUP FEIR determined that these activities would not substantially alter the non-special-status resources. The proposed Project GPA would allow for buildout of a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum that would also potentially cause similar impacts on non-special-status species, such as removal of nonnative vegetation. Impacts of the proposed Project GPA are considered to be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). ***Therefore, the proposed Project would result in similar impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

***Class IV Impacts***

Impact 3.4-12. Resources Not Affected by Maintenance/Management

The GP/CLUP FEIR found that the maintenance/management of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities within the City's open space preserves would entail activities that would not fragment special-status habitats or break existing wildlife linkages. The proposed Project GPA would not affect the management and protection of these resources, as the site is not located near these open space

preserves and would have *no impact on biological resources* (Class IV). **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in similar impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.4-13. Protection of ESHAs and Maintenance/Management of Regional and Neighborhood Open Spaces

The GP/CLUP FEIR found that the protection of ESHAs and maintenance/management of regional and neighborhood open space areas have the potential to benefit (Class IV) special-status habitats and species by preserving lands with these resources, providing for ongoing management, and maintaining linkages to other habitats. The proposed Project GPA would not affect the management and protection of these resources because the Project site is not located within a designated ESHA or open space preserve, and would have *no impact on biological resources* (Class IV). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **4.4.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

##### Impact 3.4-14. Cumulative Impacts on Biological Resources

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant cumulative impacts on biological resources in the region but found that contribution to these cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the GP/CLUP would be reduced to *less than significant levels with mitigation* (Class II) by compliance with applicable federal and state regulations and the enforcement of GP/CLUP policies protecting biological resources. The proposed Project GPA would allow for buildout of a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum that would also potentially contribute incrementally to significant biological impacts, including disturbing potential raptor nests during construction. These impacts would be feasibly reduced to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II), including standard pre-construction surveys and construction scheduling to avoid any active nesting. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to biological resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **4.4.3.4 Mitigation**

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

No modifications to General Plan policies are proposed.

#### **4.4.3.5 Residual Impacts**

Implementation of the proposed Project would not increase significant biological resources impacts over what was identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. No modification to General Plan policies or mitigation measures are proposed. Residual impacts would be either *significant and unavoidable* (Class I), *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II), or *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*



## 4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

### 4.5.1 Existing Conditions

Since certification of the GP/CLUP FEIR, the Project site existing conditions have been modified including soil vapor extraction used to remediate contaminated soils from August 2010 to June 2011, and construction of the adjacent Cathedral Oaks/US 101 Overpass.

### 4.5.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project is provided in the GP/CLUP FEIR, including the discussions of relevant federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.5.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.5.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized for this EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

The City's adopted Thresholds Manual (City of Goleta 2008) provides specific thresholds for conducting CEQA analysis. Section 8 of the Thresholds Manual, "Cultural Resources Guidelines: Archaeological, Historical, and Ethnic Elements Thresholds," provides guidance for assessing the significance of cultural, archaeological, and historic resources impacts associated with a proposed project. 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.

#### ***CEQA Thresholds***

As suggested by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may have a significant impact related to Cultural Resources if any of the following are true:

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resources as defined in Section 15064.5;
- b. Cause a substantially adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature;
- d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR, Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines has been amended to also include significance criteria unique to Tribal Cultural Resources. While not analyzed in the GP/CLUP FEIR, impacts of the proposed

Project on tribal cultural resources are analyzed in Section 4.3, *Cultural Resources*. Pursuant to Appendix G of the 2018 CEQA Guidelines, a project may have a significant impact related to Tribal Cultural Resources if the project were to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that is:

- a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or
- b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

#### 4.5.3.2 **Project Impacts**

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

##### **Short-term Impacts**

##### **Impact 3.5-1. Damage to Sites of Cultural, Historical, or Paleontological Significance**

The GP/CLUP FEIR noted that damage to an archaeological site, Native American site, paleontological site, or historic building is, by definition, long-term, as described below in Impact 3.5-2. Exceptions to this might include a temporary impact to the setting, aesthetics, and integrity of a building or structure as the result of adjacent construction. In this instance, projects contiguous to historic buildings or structures could cause short-term, *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant impacts* (Class II). The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several policies that would reduce Impact 3.5-1 to a less than significant level. Surface Phase 1 and subsurface Extended Phase excavations have been completed within the proposed Project GPA site. No prehistoric or historic cultural resources nor paleontological resources have been identified.

The proposed Project GPA would allow for buildout of a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The result disturbance area associated with the development envelope would be similar in size and depth to a structure that would be allowable under the existing GP/CLUP visitor-serving designations. Identified GP/CLUP FEIR policies including construction monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and local Native American observer consultant would apply equally to the proposed Project GPA development and would result in *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant impacts* (Class II).

***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to cultural and tribal resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

### **Long-term Impacts**

#### **Impact 3.5-2. Loss or Destruction of an Important Historical Building, Archaeological Site, or Paleontological Site**

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with the potential for loss or destruction of an important historic building, archaeological site, or historic site. It also identified potential significant impacts to paleontological resources in areas of western Goleta and a few other areas in the City. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several policies that would reduce Impact 3.5-1 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). These relate to protection of Native American and paleontological and historic resources, as well as historic and cultural landscapes. Surface Phase 1 and subsurface Extended Phase 1 investigations of the Project site did not identify the site as being part of an archaeological site, Native American site, paleontological site, or being located near a historic structure.

The proposed Project GPA would allow for buildout of a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. It is conservatively concluded that potential for undiscovered resources continues to exist at the site, and if unknown resources were encountered, impacts would be potentially significant. GP/CLUP FEIR policies including construction monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and local Native American observer consultant would address the potential for unknown cultural resource to be impacted during construction to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

#### **Impact 3.5-3. Loss or Destruction of Significant Cultural Site**

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with potential for loss or destruction of significant cultural, historic, or paleontological resources within the City as a whole. It also identified potential significant impacts to paleontological resources in areas of western Goleta and a few other areas in the City. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several policies that would reduce Impact 3.5-2 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). These relate to protection of Native American and paleontological and historic resources, as well as historic and cultural landscapes. As stated in the GP/CLUP FEIR, mitigation measures within the policies noted above would serve to reduce the potential impacts of implementing the GP/CLUP to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

The proposed Project GPA would allow for buildout of a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and

governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The GP/CLUP FEIR policies identified above would apply to the proposed Project GPA buildout, would serve to reduce the potential impacts of implementing the GP/CLUP to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to cultural and tribal resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

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

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the potential for no impacts/beneficial impacts (Class IV) related to cultural resources if future projects and land uses are designed to preserve important cultural resources, to develop cultural landscapes, or to use the discovery and recordation resources in an educational manner that serves the community as a whole. The proposed Project GPA would allow for buildout of a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. Implementation of the proposed Project GPA would have similar potential for no impacts/beneficial impacts (Class IV). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to cultural and tribal resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **4.5.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

The GP/CLUP FEIR found that policies in the GP/CLUP to protect cultural resources would ensure that contributions to cumulative impacts on cultural, historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources resulting from GP/CLUP buildout would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). These policies would minimize the degradation of cultural resources on a project-by-project basis, thereby maintaining cumulative impacts within the City as a whole below significant levels.

The same policies in the GP/CLUP would also be applicable to proposed Project GPA buildout, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. Therefore, the proposed Project GPA's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on cultural, historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources would also be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **The proposed Project GPA would result in similar cumulative impacts to cultural resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **4.5.3.4 Mitigation**

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

No modifications to General Plan policies are proposed.

#### **4.5.3.5 Residual Impacts**

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in similar significant impacts to cultural resources compared what was identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. No

modification of General Plan policies or mitigation is proposed. Residual impacts would be either *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II), or *no or beneficial impact* (Class IV).

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## 4.6 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES

### 4.6.1 Existing Conditions

No important changes have occurred relative to the Project site since release of the GP/CLUP and the physical existing conditions described therein for geologic, soil, and mineral resources within the City. No significant mineral resources were identified on the proposed Project GPA site. The below discussion of impacts resulting from the proposed GPA and Project focuses solely on impacts to geology and soil resources.

### 4.6.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project is provided in the GP/CLUP FEIR, including discussions of relevant federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.6.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.6.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized for this EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

Per the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (published 2008), impacts are classified as potentially significant with regard to geology if:

- The project site or any part of the project is located on land having substantial geologic constraints, as determined by Planning and Development or Public Works Department. Areas constrained by geology include parcels located near active or potentially active faults and property underlain by rock types associated with compressible/collapsible soils or susceptible to landslides or severe erosion. "Special Problems" areas designated by the Board of Supervisors have been established based on geologic constraints, flood hazards and other physical limitations to development;
- The project results in potentially hazardous geologic conditions such as the construction of cut slopes exceeding a grade of 1.5 horizontal to 1.0 vertical;
- The project proposes construction of a cut slope over 15 feet in height as measured from the lowest finished grade; or
- The project is located on slopes exceeding 20% grade.

#### ***CEQA Thresholds***

As suggested by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may have a significant impact related to geologic and soil resources if any of the following are true:

- a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides;
- b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;
- 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;
- d. Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property;
- e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater;

#### **4.6.3.2 Project Impacts**

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

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the following *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) impacts related to geology and soils.

##### **Short-term Impacts**

##### **Impact 3.6-1. Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil**

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with groundbreaking and vegetation removal during construction, resulting in soil exposure to rain and wind, and potentially causing accelerated erosion and deposition of sediment into nearby drainages and/or waterways. Such erosion and sedimentation could result in a short-term increase in turbidity in these waterways, potentially causing water quality degradation. Accelerated erosion and loss of a substantial amount of topsoil resulting from buildout under the GP/CLUP would be *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). These impacts would also apply under the proposed Project, resulting in similar potential for adverse effects from soil erosion. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified policies addressing construction-related soils impacts that are relevant to the project site. As provided in Section 3.6.3.3 of the GP/CLUP FEIR, GP/CLUP policies related to soil and slope stability would reduce construction-related impacts to *adverse, but mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

The proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of the development envelope under the proposed Project GPA would be similar to that of a visitor-serving commercial structure reasonably projected under the existing GP/CLUP designation. In addition to the GP/CLUP policies identified above, proposed



Project GPA buildout would be subject to an approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required by state, and local regulations. The SWPPP would identify various best management practices (BMPs) to prevent substantial soil erosion or loss of substantial topsoil associated with development. Given that the intensity of development would be similar under the proposed GPA and existing visitor-serving commercial designation and the same regulations would apply, construction-related impacts would be *adverse, but mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to geologic and soil resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Long-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.6-2. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from the Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault, Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismically Induced Land-sliding, or Liquefaction

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with exposure to surface fault rupture, strong ground shaking, seismically induced landslides, and/or liquefaction. Section 3.6.3.3 of the GP/CLUP FEIR identified policies related to public safety, seismic hazards, and emergency preparedness that would reduce impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) with implementation of the GP/CLUP.

The proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of the development envelope and soil preparation including landscaping and drainage infrastructure would be similar to that of a visitor-serving commercial structure reasonably projected under the existing GP/CLUP designation. The GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.6.3.3 policies related to public safety, seismic hazards, and emergency preparedness would apply to the proposed Project GPA buildout. Given that the intensity of development would be similar under the proposed GPA and existing visitor-serving commercial designation and the same regulations would apply, seismic-related impacts would be *adverse, but mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in similar impacts to geologic and soil resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

##### Impact 3.6-3. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting from Buildout on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils or Steep Slopes

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with exposure to landslides in areas of steep slopes or unstable geologic units or soils, particularly in the northern and southern areas of the City. Section 3.6.3.3 of the GP/CLUP FEIR identified policies related to public safety, soil and slope stability, and seismic hazards that would reduce impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) with implementation of the GP/CLUP.

The proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of the development envelope and soil preparation including landscaping and drainage infrastructure would be similar to that of a visitor-serving commercial structure reasonably projected under the existing GP/CLUP designation. The GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.6.3.3 policies related to public safety, seismic hazards, and emergency preparedness would apply to the proposed Project GPA buildout. Given that the intensity of development would be similar under the proposed GPA and existing visitor-serving commercial designation and the same regulations would apply, potential landslide-related impacts would be *adverse, but mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in similar impacts to geologic and soil resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.6-4. Location of Development on Expansive and/or Compressed Soil That Could Lead to Risks to People and Structures

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with development in areas with expansive and/or compressible soils. Section 3.6.3.3 of the GP/CLUP FEIR identified policies related to public safety and soil and slope stability that would reduce impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

The proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of the development envelope and soil preparation including landscaping and drainage infrastructure would be similar to that of a visitor-serving commercial structure reasonably projected under the existing GP/CLUP designation. The GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.6.3.3 policies related to public safety, seismic hazards, and emergency preparedness would apply to the proposed Project GPA buildout. **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in similar impacts to geologic and soil resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

### **Class III Impacts**

#### Long-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.6-5. Exposure of People to Elevated Levels of Indoor Radon

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impacts associated with exposure to Rincon Formation areas capable of emanating radon gas, especially along the City's northern border. The proposed Project GPA site is not located in an area associated with exposure to Rincon Formation or radon gas, and *no impact* (Class IV) is anticipated. **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less impacts from exposure to radon gas compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **4.6.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

As discussed in the GP/CLUP FEIR, impacts related to geologic processes and/or exposure of people and structures to geologic hazards are generally site-specific and do not interact to constitute a cumulative impact. Therefore, no such cumulative impacts are anticipated as a result of GP/CLUP implementation. Similarly, any such impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed Project GPA buildout, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum would also not interact to constitute a cumulative impact. However, proposed Project GPA buildout would potentially contribute towards a potential cumulative impact with respect to erosion induced sedimentation in local streams and water bodies. Erosion prevention and erosion control features would be implemented during grading and construction of the proposed Project GPA buildout and related projects located within the Devereux Slough watershed. The City would require that a Construction General Permit Qualified Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Practitioner and/or Qualified SWPPP Developer be responsible for implementation of SWMPs during grading and construction of the proposed Project GPA and all related projects. As a result, the proposed Project GPA's contribution to this potentially cumulative impact would be less than considerable. ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative effects to geology and soils, and impacts would be similar compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

#### **4.6.3.4 Mitigation**

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

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are proposed.

#### **4.6.3.5 Residual Impacts**

As described above, following implementation of the GP/CLUP policies and mitigation measures identified for Impacts 3.6-1 through 3.6-4, geology, soils, and mineral resources impacts of the proposed Project would be equal to or less than those identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. Residual impacts would be either *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II), or *no or beneficial impact* (Class IV).

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## 4.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

### 4.7.1 Existing Conditions

No important changes have occurred relative to the Project site since release of the GP/CLUP and the physical existing conditions described therein for hazards and hazardous materials within the City.

### 4.7.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project is provided in the GP/CLUP FEIR, including the discussions of relevant federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.7.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.7.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized for this EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

The City of Goleta's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual contains thresholds for assessing the significance of impacts to public safety resulting from the involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. The manual establishes categories for identifying potential significant impacts to public safety including transportation of hazardous materials, as well as potentially significant impacts to non-hazardous land uses proposed in proximity to existing hazardous facilities. The manual specifically identifies a potentially significant impact to all development proposed in proximity to one or more existing hazardous facilities.

#### ***CEQA Thresholds***

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines contains a checklist of environmental factors to be assessed to determine the potential for significant impacts, including the following for hazards and hazardous materials:

- a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- 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;
- c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
- 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;
- 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, the project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;

- 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;
- g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or
- 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.

#### **4.7.3.2 Project Impacts**

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the following Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to hazards and hazardous materials.

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

###### Long-term Impacts

###### Impact 3.7-1. Risk of Upset at Venoco Facilities

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) impacts from risk of upset at the Venoco Elwood Oil Facility (EOF). The proposed Project GPA site is also located in the same EOF risk of upset footprint. The potential risk of upset impact on buildout of a proposed Project GPA land use would also be *significant and unavoidable* (Class I). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts from risk of upset from the Venoco EOF as documented in the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

###### Impact 3.7-2. Transport

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) impacts associated with exposure of populations following buildout of the GP/CLUP to the risks of transportation of hazardous materials on US-101, State Route 217, Hollister Avenue, and the UPRR tracks. The proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum that could involve transport of limited quantities of hazardous materials and would be exposed to the same risks that would potentially impact a structure built under the existing visitor-serving commercial designation. These impacts would also be potentially *significant and unavoidable* (Class I). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts from transportation of hazards and hazardous materials compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

## **Class II Impacts**

### Long-term Impacts

#### Impact 3.7-3. Risk of Upset at S.L. 421 Wells

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with recommissioning of oil production at idled oil wells and the potential creation of risks to marine and land resources and neighboring populations associated with spills, leaks, or pipeline ruptures. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified a number of policies relating to oil and gas production, storage, transport, and safety that would reduce impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). The proposed Project GPA site is not adjacent to State Lands 421 wells, but this facility is in the process of being decommissioned and abandoned by the state. Therefore, there would be *no impact on risk of upset* (Class IV). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts associated with risk of upset from oil processing facilities compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.7-4. Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with potential spills, leaks, or pipeline ruptures affecting marine and land resources and planned neighborhoods. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified a number of policies relating to oil and gas production, storage, transport, and safety that would reduce impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). The proposed Project GPA site is not subject to potential risk of upset from operations associated with the Ellwood Marine Terminal and would have *no impact on risk of upset* (Class IV). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts associated with risk of upset from oil processing facilities compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.7-5. Airport

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with development within the influence area of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. A number of policies of the GP/CLUP were identified and capable of reducing impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). As discussed above, the proposed Project GPA site is not within the influence area of an airport and would have *no impact on risk of upset* (Class IV). **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less impacts with airport hazards compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.7-6. Wildland Fires

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with wildland fires in areas classified by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection as wildland fire hazard areas. A number of policies of the GP/CLUP were identified and capable of reducing impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). The proposed Project GPA site is not within a wildland fire hazard area such that impacts on buildout associated with wildland fire hazards would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less impacts associated with wildland fires compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with ordinary use or spills of hazardous materials on surface waters used during site grading and construction activities, such as fuels, solvents, paint, and other similar substances, that could adversely affect local surface water quality. A number of policies of the GP/CLUP and required compliance with existing local and state policies and regulations, including implementation of SWPPPs and Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures, were identified and capable of reducing impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). These policies and regulations are now considered standard conditions of approval that would be applied to the development the proposed Project GPA buildout, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. Potential impacts from hazardous spills into surface waters would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to surface water from hazardous materials compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR).**

#### Impact 3.7-8. Exposure of Population to Listed/Contaminated Sites

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated release of and/or exposure to hazardous materials from listed contaminated sites. A number of policies of the GP/CLUP, including site-specific evaluation and remediation prior to or as part of a proposed development process, were identified and capable of reducing impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

The proposed Project GPA site was previously occupied by a Chevron service station. In 2007, a Phase I environmental site assessment was completed for the Project site and contaminated soils associated with previous gas station underground storage tanks was identified. Soil vapor extraction was used to remediate the contaminated soils from August 2010 to June 2011. The Project site contamination levels were adequately assessed such that residual hydrocarbons in site soils do not pose a significant threat to human health, to beneficial or potentially beneficial groundwater, or to the environment. The County Fire Protection District granted remediation site closure in 2012 (City of Goleta 2018).

The proposed Project GPA site is not located on the Cortese Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List, which has been compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (California DTSC 2017). No risk of upset impacts (Class IV) related to the proposed Project GPA would occur. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts from exposure to listed/contaminated sites compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.7-9. Contaminated Soils

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with exposure to contaminated soils during development of a site. A number of policies of the GP/CLUP, including site-specific evaluation and remediation prior to or as



part of a proposed development process, were identified and capable of reducing impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

While the proposed Project GPA site was previously occupied by a Chevron service station, which resulted in petroleum hydrocarbon soil contamination beneath one of the fuel dispenser islands as a result of fuel leaks, multiple phases of environmental site assessments and soil remediation have occurred and have resulted in the successful remediation of the site. A sensitive receptor survey, based upon readily available public records, site and vicinity inspections, and site assessment results, concluded that the proposed Project GPA site was adequately assessed and that the residual hydrocarbons in soil do not pose a significant threat to human health, to beneficial or potentially beneficial groundwater, or to the environment (City of Goleta 2018). As a result, the proposed Project GPA is determined to have an *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impact on hazardous material exposure. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts from exposure to contaminated soils compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

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

#### Long-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.7-10. Exposure of Populated Areas to Oil and Gas Pipelines

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant impacts* (Class III) associated with potential damage to oil and gas pipelines and potential for gas leaks or explosions during third-party construction of a site where oil and gas pipelines are present. These pipelines are typically within a right-of-way and are regulated by the DOT and California Public Utilities Commission and subject to stringent state and federal regulations which minimize damage to or leaks from these pipelines. These same regulations and conditions would apply to the proposed Project GPA buildout, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum.

Oil Pipeline 96 has been abandoned in place along the Hollister Avenue frontage south of the proposed Project site. The line is at least 5 feet below the street surface and below all other existing utilities. Therefore, proposed Project GPA buildout would have *no impact* (Class IV) associated with exposure to the abandoned pipeline. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts from exposure to underground oil and gas pipelines compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

##### Impact 3.7-11. Ellwood Facility

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impacts associated with accidental release of hydrogen sulfide stored at the Ellwood Onshore Oil and Gas Processing Facility (EOF) and the associated chance of

fatality. The proposed Project GPA site is also located in the same EOF risk of upset footprint. The potential risk of upset impact on buildout of a proposed Project GPA land use would also be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts associated with release of hydrogen sulfide from the EOF compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.7-12. EMFs

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impacts associated with electromagnetic fields (EMFs) and proximity of development to transmission corridors and substations. The proposed Project GPA site is not located within the vicinity of a transmission corridor or substation, such that *no impact* (Class IV) would occur. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less potential for impacts from EMFs compared to the GP/CLUP.**

#### Impact 3.7-13. Upset and Accidental Conditions

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) associated with potential release of hazardous materials into the environment during the course of operation of uses such as landscaping or building maintenance activities. Implementation of the proposed Project GPA buildout, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum, would also have a similar potential for release of such hazardous materials and *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impacts. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts from accidental release of hazardous materials from landscaping or building maintenance compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.7-14. Contaminated Groundwater

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impacts associated with exposure of the community to contaminated groundwater associated with a federal National Priorities List (NPL) hazardous waste site or leaking underground storage tank (LUST) site. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified a policy related to hazardous materials and facilities that would ensure that the community is protected from exposure to groundwater contamination but would not be required to reduce impacts.

As discussed above, the proposed Project GPA site has undergone successful remediation and contaminated soils are not anticipated to be encountered onsite. Risk of upset impacts of the proposed Project GPA buildout, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum, are considered *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts from contaminated soils compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

### 4.7.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The GP/CLUP FEIR found that, while the implementation of the GP/CLUP would increase the number of persons potentially exposed to hazards and hazardous materials, development of Emergency Preparedness Programs and implementation of GP/CLUP policies would provide adequate safety protection for the public and the environment. The GP/CLUP FEIR also noted that risks resulting from exposure of people and the environment to hazards and hazardous materials are usually site-specific and generally do not combine with similar effects that could occur with other projects throughout the cumulative study area. Therefore, any cumulative impacts resulting from such exposures are *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

The proposed Project GPA buildout, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum, would generate an equivalent number of persons potentially exposed to hazards and hazardous materials compared to buildout of a potentially high-visitor-serving use allowed for the site under the GP/CLUP. The same programs and policies identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR would apply to proposed Project GPA buildout, and adequately protect the public and environment, such that the proposed Project GPA's contribution to cumulatively considered impacts would be incremental and *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative effects to hazards and hazardous materials and impacts would be similar to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

### 4.7.3.4 Mitigation

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

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are proposed.

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

No mitigation, above that required by regulatory agencies and in compliance with GP/CLUP policies, is identified.

### 4.7.3.5 Residual Impacts

Implementation of the proposed Project would reduce significant hazard and hazardous material impacts over what was identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. No modification of General Plan policies or mitigation is proposed. Residual impacts would be either *significant and unavoidable* (Class I), *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II), or *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## 4.8 POPULATION AND HOUSING

The GP/CLUP FEIR assessed impacts to population and housing on a City-wide basis, and programmatically identified impacts associated with buildout of the GP/CLUP and increases in population and associated need for additional housing and jobs (GP/CLUP FEIR Impact 3.8-1), substantial growth in population (GP/CLUP FEIR Impact 3.8-2), increase in the City's residential housing stock (GP/CLUP FEIR Impact 3.8-3), generation of additional employment opportunities (GP/CLUP FEIR Impact 3.8-4), and potential displacement of people and/or homes (GP/CLUP FEIR Impact 3.8-5).

The proposed Project GPA buildout, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum, would generate an equivalent number of potential new employees to the area compared to buildout of a potentially high-visitor-serving use allowed for the site under the GP/CLUP. Given the relatively small size of the structure feasibly developed on the 1.21-acre site, new full-time employees would foster a very minor contribution to economic or population growth within the City or County. The proposed Project GPA site is currently undeveloped and potential buildout at this location would not result in the loss of any existing housing or displacement of current City residents nor substantial residential growth. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project GPA would not significantly adversely affect population or housing within the City. As no potentially significant population impacts on population and housing would occur, contributions to cumulative population and housing impacts would not be considered significantly adverse. ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to population and housing compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## 4.9 WATER RESOURCES

### 4.9.1 Existing Setting

Some important changes that have occurred with respect to hydrology and water quality since certification of the GP/CLUP FEIR include the following:

- Alteration of off-site drainage patterns resulting from buildout of the Cathedral Oaks Overpass, realignment of the US-101 on- and off-ramps and Hollister Avenue, and the Hideaway residential development.

### 4.9.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project is provided in the GP/CLUP FEIR, including the discussions of relevant federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.9.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.9.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized for this EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

The City's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* specifies the following significance thresholds relating to hydrology and water resources:

Hydrology and Drainage. The Project would result in a significant impact to surface hydrology and drainage if it would:

- 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 of amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding, increased erosion, or increased sedimentation on- or off-site.
- Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or increase runoff into naturally drained areas without storm drains.

Surface Water and Groundwater Quality. The Project would result in a significant surface water or groundwater impact if its construction or operation results in:

- Be located within an urbanized area of the County and the project construction or redevelopment individually or as a part of a larger common plan of development or scale would disturb more than one (1) or more acres of land.
- Increase the amount of impervious surfaces on a site by 25 percent or more.
- Result in channelization or relocation of a natural drainage channel.

- Discharge pollutants that exceed the water quality standards set forth in the applicable NPDES permit, the RWQCB's Basin Plan or otherwise impair the beneficial uses of a receiving waterbody.
- Result in a discharge of pollutants into a "impaired" waterbody that has been designated as such by the SWRCB or the RWQCB under Section 303(d) of the Federal Water Pollution and Control Act (i.e., the CWA).
- Result in a discharge of pollutants of concern to a receiving water body, as identified by the RWQCB.
- Substantially degrade groundwater quality.
- Result in failure to comply with the City's Stormwater Program.

### **CEQA Guidelines**

In accordance with Appendix G of the 2017 CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the proposed Project may have a significant adverse impact on hydrology and water quality if it would:

- a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).
- c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the site or area, including through the alteration of a course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.
- d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.
- e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantially additional sources of polluted runoff.
- f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.
- g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.
- h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.



- i. Exposure people or structures to significant loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.
- j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

#### 4.9.3.2 Project Impacts

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

##### Short-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.9-1. Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-related Contaminants

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with construction-related earth disturbing activities for future development and infrastructure projects associated with buildout of the GP/CLUP. Impacts were identified associated with potential soil erosion, sedimentation of local waterways, and hazardous materials leaks. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified policies related to the protection of creeks, riparian areas, and wetlands and to watershed management and water quality that would reduce Impact 3.9-1 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

The proposed Project GPA buildout, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum, would also potentially result in discharge of sediment and pollutants, including soils and grease from mechanical spills into receiving waters, potentially degrading water quality. These impacts would be minimized during all phases of proposed Project GPA buildout through compliance with standard state and local regulations, including the Construction General Permit. Implementation of and compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit would ensure the construction site and activities are managed to effectively control site runoff through BMPs, Best Available Technology Economically Achievable, Best Conventionally Pollutant Control Technology, and a SWPPP. Given that the proposed Project GPA buildout would be subject to full compliance with standard regulations adopted for the purpose of protecting water quality from construction activities, impacts from this buildout on hydrology and water quality are considered *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to water quality compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

##### Long-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.9-2. Adequacy of Water Supplies to Serve New Development

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with inadequate water supplies during a critical dry year. Section 3.9 of the GP/CLUP FEIR identified policies that would reduce Impact 3.9-2 to an *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) level. These include a number of

measures intended to ensure that water supplies are adequate to serve proposed development, including phasing development until resources can be identified that provide adequate supplies and improvements. Additionally, development will be allowed only when and where all essential utility services are adequate based on the service standards of their providers and without reducing levels of service below the level of service guidelines. Domestic water service is considered essential for supporting new development.

The proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including water demand are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Buildout would be subject to implementation of GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.9 policies that would result in an *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) impact on water resources. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts from increased demand for water supplies compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.9-3. Changes in Groundwater Supply Resulting from New Development

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with the increased amounts of impervious surfaces and the decreased amount of rainfall reaching the groundwater basin. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified policies related to the protection of creeks and riparian areas, water management and water quality, water conservation and materials recycling, and water and sewer facilities that would reduce Impact 3.9-3 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including water demand are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Buildout would be subject to implementation of GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.9 policies that would result in an *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) impact on water resources. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to groundwater supplies compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.9-4. Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with the increased amounts of impervious surfaces causing increased drainage flows and earlier peak flows, with the potential to cause flooding or erosion impacts downstream. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified policies related to land use planning,

protection of creeks and riparian areas, watershed management and water quality, public facilities standards, safety, flood hazards, and street design and streetscape that would reduce Impact 3.9-4 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The extent of required drainage infrastructure for this development is considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Buildout would be subject to implementation of GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.9 policies that would result in an *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) impact on water resources. Impacts of the proposed Project would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to drainage patterns and runoff compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.9-5. Construction of Structure or Housing in a 100-year Flood Hazard Area

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with development of new structures or housing in designated 100-year flood plains or other identified flood hazard areas. The proposed Project GPA site is not located within a designated flood hazard area, and related buildout would have no impact (Class IV) on flooding. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts from flooding and flood hazards compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.9-6. Risk to New Development from Inundation by a Tsunami, Mudslide or Seiche

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with development of new structures or housing in areas subject to inundation by seismically induced hydrologic hazards. The proposed Project GPA site is not located within an area subject to inundation by such hazards. Although the proposed Project GPA site is located within the Coastal Zone of the City, the site is not located within a tsunami inundation area, as mapped by the University of Southern California for the California Emergency Management Agency (California Department of Conservation 2009). As such, the proposed Project GPA would have *no impact* (Class IV) on inundation from tsunami, mudslide or seiche. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to hydrologic hazards compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.9-7. Increases in Point Source and Nonpoint Source Pollution from New Development

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with nonpoint source pollution. It found that new development would increase the amount of nonpoint sources of wastewater generated, with corresponding

increases in the volume of wastewater being discharged. It also identified potential point-source discharges associated with commercial or industrial uses that could adversely affect water quality. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified policies related to the protection of creeks and riparian areas, watershed management and water quality, oil and gas industry hazards, hazardous materials and facilities, energy, water and sewer facilities, and street design and streetscape that would reduce Impact 3.9-7 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The extent of additional point source and nonpoint source pollutants generated by GPA buildout is considered to be similar to that resulting from a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Buildout under the existing and proposed GP/CLUP designations would involve the use of fuel and oil/grease that would result from on-site vehicle and equipment maintenance and washing of emergency vehicles, and “household” cleaners and chemicals associated with building maintenance. These chemicals could be absorbed by runoff and discharged into downstream waters, potentially adversely affecting the quality of receiving waters. However, the proposed Project GPA buildout would be subject to federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to the storage and use of any hazardous materials/waste, including obtaining appropriate permits, training, and agency inspections. Impacts of the proposed Project GPA would be *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to water quality compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

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

#### Long-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the following long-term *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impact related to water resources.

#### Impact 3.9-8. Risk to New Development from Dam Failure and Resultant Flooding

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified a less than significant impact associated with risk to new development from the unlikely failure of Bradbury Dam, located on Lake Cachuma. The dam and lake are separated from Goleta by the Santa Ynez Mountains. The dam is situated facing west, and the drainage travels west down through the Santa Ynez Valley. In the unlikely scenario that Bradbury Dam failed, resulting floodwaters would travel through the Santa Ynez Valley but not south through the Goleta planning area because the Santa Ynez Mountains serve as a natural barrier. The impact resulting from exposure to such a risk would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

The proposed Project GPA site is located in the Goleta planning area and would similarly not be subject to inundation by waters due to the unlikely failure of Bradbury Dam. As such, the proposed Project GPA is considered to have an

*adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impact. **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in similar impacts to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **4.9.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

##### Impact 3.9-10. Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies Are 303(d) Listed

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified a *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) contribution to the cumulatively significant impact to the water quality of Goleta Slough, which is listed as impaired under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. The proposed Project GPA site is not located on tributary to the Goleta Slough such as Devereux Creek and would have *no contribution* (Class IV) to this cumulative impact. **Therefore, the proposed Project would have less impacts on water quality compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

##### Impact 3.9-10. Cumulative Effects on Water Supply

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified an *adverse but less than significant* (Class III) contribution to cumulative demand on the Goleta area's water supply. The North-Central portion of the Goleta Groundwater Basin was adjudicated in the Wright Judgment, which determines the safe yield of the Basin and distributes appropriate groundwater pumping allocations to various users (including GWD) based on this safe yield. GWD would only pump its annual allocated quantity plus any banked groundwater supplies that are available and needed. Thus, cumulative groundwater pumping would not exceed the safe yield and groundwater supplies would not be substantially depleted by development anticipated in the buildout of the GP/CLUP.

The proposed Project GPA buildout on the 1.21-acre site would have a small, incremental increase in annual water demands and a highly negligible increase in demand for groundwater supplies. Proposed Project GPA buildout would be subject to review and approval for development and determination of adequate water supply by the GWD prior to approval of the Project. The proposed Project GPA's contribution to a cumulative impact on water quality is therefore considered *adverse, but less than cumulatively considerable* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to cumulative increases in water supply compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **4.9.3.4 Mitigation**

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

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

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

No mitigation is identified.

**4.9.3.5 Residual Impacts**

Overall, the proposed Project would have less impact on water resources when compared to those identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. No modification of General Plan policies or mitigation is proposed. Residual impacts would be either *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II), or *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

## 4.10 LAND USE AND RECREATION

### 4.10.1 Existing Conditions

Important changes that have occurred within the Project site vicinity affecting the surrounding land uses and planning conditions since certification of the GP/CLUP FEIR include the following:

- Completion of the Hideaway residential development, consisting of 101 townhouse units to the east of the Project site.
- Completion of The Bluffs residential development, consisting of 62 single-family units to the southeast of the Project site.
- Adoption of updates to elements of the General Plan in 2009, 2016, and 2017.

### 4.10.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project is provided in the GP/CLUP FEIR, including the discussions of relevant federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.10.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.10.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized for this EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

The City's adopted Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual does not provide environmental thresholds specific to land use and recreation; however, the Thresholds Manual does observe that quality of life should be considered when evaluating land uses proposed by a given project. Quality of life can be broadly defined as the aggregate effect of all impacts on individuals, families, communities, and other social groupings and on the way in which those groups function. Where a substantial physical impact to the quality of the human environment is demonstrated, the project's effect on quality of life shall be considered significant. Quality of life issues, while difficult to quantify, are often primary concerns to the community affected by a project. Examples of such issues that directly involve land use and planning include the loss of privacy and/or neighborhood incompatibility.

#### ***CEQA Thresholds***

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines contains a checklist of environmental factors to be assessed to determine the potential for significant impacts, including the following for land use and planning:

- a. Physically divide an established community;

- b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulations 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 the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines also contains a checklist of environmental factors to be assessed to determine the potential for significant impacts related to recreational resources. As suggested by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project may have a significant impact on recreational resources if it would:

- a. 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; or
- b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

#### **4.10.3.2 Project Impacts**

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

##### Short-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with construction-related activities that have the potential to result in temporary impacts due to conflicts with applicable land use policies and/or regulations. Conflicts related to air quality, noise, water quality, and other environmental impacts related to construction are specifically addressed in those relevant sections of the GP/CLUP FEIR. As discussed in those relevant sections and in Section 3.10.3.3 of the GP/CLUP FEIR, GP/CLUP policies such as those related to protection of natural resources, safety, and hazards would reduce impacts to *adverse, but less than significant levels* (Class III).

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Conflicts identified therein related to aesthetics/visual resources,



biological resources, potential (unknown) archaeological resources, geologic resources, hazards, noise, and transportation would be reduced through implementation of applicable GP/CLUP policies and identified mitigation to an *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts associated with conflicts with plans and policies compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Long-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts from construction and expansion of planned recreational facilities, parks, and open spaces by up to 68.6 acres and potential for significant physical effects due to construction activities. A number of GP/CLUP policies relating to the protection of natural resources were identified which would reduce impacts to an adverse, but less than significant level.

The proposed Project GPA site does not have any established recreational uses, such that no impact (Class IV) to recreational resources would occur from Project buildout. Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would not involve the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities with potential to adversely physically affect the environment through construction activities. *No impact* (Class IV) on recreation would result. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to the environment from construction of recreational facilities compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

##### Impact 3.10-3. Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities

Buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses have potential to conflict with the applicable environmental impact mitigation policies and/or regulations of the other agencies (i.e., Santa Barbara Municipal Airport; University of California Santa Barbara, the California Coastal Commission, and special districts including Goleta Water District, Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Embarcadero Community Services District, Isla Vista Recreation and Park District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, Santa Barbara County Flood Control District, Metropolitan Transit District) that maintain full or partial jurisdictions within the City planning area. These impacts would be considered potentially significant. The proposed elements of the GP/CLUP include goals, policies, implementation actions, and implementation programs that are designed to consider the requirements of the various jurisdictional agencies.

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several land use and recreation policies that would successfully reduce impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

The proposed Project GPA site and related buildout is located entirely within the California Coastal Zone and is subject to coastal land use policies of the California Coastal Act. Implementation of the proposed Project GPA would result in potential conflicts with California Coastal Act policies relating to potential (unknown) archaeological or paleontological resources. However, implementation of mitigation would require that resources are properly identified, assessed, and managed consistent state regulations in the event of inadvertent discovery of unknown resources and ensure consistency with these policies. Impacts would be reduced to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts from consistency with other applicable plans and policies compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with proposed activities that are inconsistent with approved conservation plans and local conservation policies. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified land use and recreation policies in Section 3.10.3.3 of the GP/CLUP FEIR that would reduce Impact 3.10-4 to an *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) with implementation of the GP/CLUP.

The proposed Project GPA site is not located within an area subject to a pending or approved habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Further, the Project GPA site does not support any Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas. As such, the proposed Project GPA and associated buildout would have no potential to result in a conflict with such plans or policies and *no impact* (Class IV) on land use would result. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to land use and planning compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.10-5. Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with the loss of privacy or the creation of other conditions potentially incompatible with existing neighborhoods. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified policies in 3.10.3.3 of the GP CLUP EIR that would reduce Impact 3.10-5 to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) with implementation of the GP/CLUP.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of the proposed GPA development buildout and related impacts on privacy and neighborhood compatibility are considered to be similar to that resulting from a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Proposed GPA buildout would potentially result in loss of privacy or

cause neighborhood incompatibility as a result of construction and operation adjacent to The Hideaway residential development if not sited and designed appropriately. Proposed GPA buildout, similar to existing GP/CLUP visitor serving commercial buildout, would be subject to consistency with GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.10.3.3 policies. The proposed Project GPA buildout would therefore result in *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) on land use. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to land uses compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effects on the Environment Due to Building of Planned Recreational Facilities

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with adverse physical effect on the environment due to buildout of planned recreational facilities and identified several policies which would reduce impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

As discussed above, the proposed Project GPA buildout would not involve the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities with potential to adversely physically affect the environment through construction activities nor create demand for recreational services. No impacts (Class IV) on land use would result. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to the environment from construction of recreational facilities compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

Impact 3.10-7. Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due to Buildout of the GP/CLUP Land Uses

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with greater wear and tear of existing recreational facilities due to additional development/population. Several GP/CLUP policies pertaining to the maintenance or existing and provision of new facilities were identified that would result in *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* impacts (Class II).

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of the proposed GPA development buildout and related impacts on existing recreational facilities are considered to be similar to that resulting from a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Proposed Project GPA buildout would potentially generate a similar number of persons and demand on existing neighborhood and regional parks or recreational facilities as a visiting serving use that could lead to substantial physical deterioration of such facilities compared to existing site GP/CLUP designation buildout. Recreational impacts of the proposed Project GPA would be *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* impacts (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project would have similar impacts to recreational resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

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

#### Long-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.10-8. Physical Division of an Established Community Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

Buildout of the GP/CLUP would generally result in more efficient growth and development, with vacant sites having land use designations similar to existing land uses surrounding those sites. Transportation improvements identified in the GP/CLUP would not result in the physical division of an established community. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified impacts associated with division of established communities by projects and transportation improvements as *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

The proposed Project GPA site is an infill property abutting on The Hideaway residential development to the east. No new roads or rights-of-way that would physically divide an established community would be required to support proposed Project GPA buildout. *No impacts* (Class IV) on land use would result. ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to land use compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

#### **4.10.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

The GP/CLUP FEIR anticipated that development of the identified related projects and general regional growth would be reviewed for consistency with adopted and applicable land use plans and policies, in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the Planning and Zoning Law (Government Code § 65000, et seq.), and the Subdivision Map Act (Government Code § 66410, et seq.), all of which require findings of general plan and policy consistency prior to approval of entitlements for development. For this reason, the GP/CLUP FEIR deemed cumulative impacts associated with inconsistency of future development with adopted plans and policies to have a *less than considerable* (Class III) contribution to cumulative land use impacts. Proposed Project GPA buildout, including a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum, would be subject to these consistency reviews. ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in a similar incremental contribution to cumulative impacts compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

The GP/CLUP FEIR also identified an or *less than considerable* (Class III), contribution to cumulative impacts related to recreational facilities due to future planned recreation, policies supporting maintenance of existing facilities in the GP/CLUP, and the requirement for in-lieu fees for parks or donation of parkland (pursuant to the Quimby Act [Government Code § 66477]) required for individual projects. The incremental increase in population due to development associated with the proposed Project GPA would be equivalent to that reasonably projected under the existing GP/CLUP visitor serving commercial designation, and would not

result in significant cumulative impacts on recreational facilities for the same reasons. ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less of a contribution to cumulative impacts to recreational resources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

#### **4.10.3.4      Mitigation**

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

No modifications to General Plan policies are proposed.

#### **4.10.3.5      Residual Impacts**

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in similar land use or recreational impacts compared to those identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. Residual impacts would be either *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II), or *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## 4.11 NOISE

### 4.11.1 Existing Conditions

Some important changes that have occurred within the Project site vicinity affecting the surrounding land uses and planning conditions since certification of the GP/CLUP FEIR include the following:

- Completion of the Hideaway residential development, consisting of 101 townhouse units to the east of the Project site.
- Completion of The Bluffs residential development, consisting of 62 single-family units to the southeast of the Project site.

### 4.11.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project is provided in the GP/CLUP FEIR, including the discussions of relevant federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.11.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.11.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized for this EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides guidance that lead agencies can use to develop specific CEQA significance thresholds. The City's adopted Thresholds Manual (City of Goleta 2008) provides specific thresholds for conducting CEQA analysis. Section 12 of the Thresholds Manual, Noise Thresholds, provides guidance for assessing the significance of noise impacts associated with a proposed project.

The following are thresholds of significance for assisting in determination of significant noise impacts. The thresholds are intended to be used with flexibility, as each project must be viewed in its specific circumstances:

- a. A proposed development that would generate noise levels in excess of 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and could affect sensitive receptors would generally be presumed to have a significant impact.
- b. Outdoor living areas of noise sensitive uses that are subject to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL would generally be presumed to be significantly impacted by ambient noise. A significant impact would also generally occur where interior noise levels cannot be reduced to 45 dBA CNEL or less.
- c. A project would generally have a significant effect on the environment if it would increase substantially the ambient noise levels for noise sensitive receptors in adjoining areas. Per item a., this may generally be presumed

when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors are increased to 65 dBA CNEL or more. However, a significant effect may also occur when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors increase substantially but remain less than 65 dBA CNEL, as determined on a case-by-case basis.

- d. Noise from grading and construction activity proposed within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors, including schools, residential development, commercial lodging facilities, hospitals or care facilities, would generally result in a potentially significant impact. According to the EPA guidelines, the average construction noise is 95 dBA at a 50-foot distance from the source. A 6 dB drop occurs with a doubling of the distance from the source. Therefore, locations within 1,600 feet of the construction site would be affected by noise levels over 65 dBA. Construction within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors on weekdays outside of the hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. and on weekends would generally be presumed to have a significant effect. Noise attenuation barriers and muffling of grading equipment may also be required. Construction equipment generating noise levels above 95 dBA may require additional mitigation.

### **CEQA Thresholds**

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides guidelines for assessing the significance of noise impacts under CEQA. The CEQA Guidelines indicates that a significant noise impact can occur if a project would result in any of the following:

- 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, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.



### 4.11.3.2 Project Impacts

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

##### Short-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.11-1. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Sources

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) impacts associated with exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to single-event and nuisance noise levels from construction. Section 3.12.3.3 of the GP/CLUP FEIR identified several noise policies incorporated here by reference. Policies include those related to noise and land use compatibility standards. Implementation of these policies would place specific limits on noise from construction activities. Although these policies would reduce construction-related noise impacts resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP, they would not reduce short-term impacts to less than significant in all cases, such as during certain building activities that are critical to construction that may temporarily exceed acceptable short-term noise levels set by City policies or regulations.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of the proposed GPA development buildout and related impacts on noise are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would result under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Site construction would potentially generate significant noise levels at adjacent sensitive receptors which would be in excess of City Noise Element standards. GP/CLUP noise policies, along with project-specific mitigation addressing timing of construction and use of noise attenuation measures, would apply to the proposed Project GPA buildout. However, short-term noise impacts during proposed Project GPA buildout construction would be *significant and unavoidable* (Class I). ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts from single-event and nuisance noise sources compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

##### Long-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.11-2. Exposure of Existing or Planned Noise Sensitive Receptors Uses to Increased Noise

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) impacts associated with noise levels to sensitive receptors from increased vehicular traffic levels, in some cases enough for noise levels to exceed 65 dBA. Several policies helping to limit increases in traffic noise and providing design criteria for noise attenuation would help to reduce noise levels to acceptable levels in some areas, but potential would still exist for buildout of the GP/CLUP land uses

to result in increases in roadway noise such that sensitive receptors would become exposed to long-term or ambient noise levels in excess of acceptable standards.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including water demand are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Vehicular traffic would be expected to be relatively small given the constraints of the 1.21-acre project site. Therefore, long-term impacts of the proposed Project GPA buildout, like those resulting from a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation, would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less impacts from increases in roadway noise volumes compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.11-3. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) impacts associated with the development of noise sensitive land uses in areas where traffic noise would expose those future noise sensitive uses to unacceptable interior and exterior noise levels. While a number of policies and standards were identified that would potentially reduce the potential for impacts, the GP/CLUP FEIR concluded that on occasion, practical limitations would feasibly preclude noise level reduction to *adverse, but mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. Some of the uses, such as a medical clinic, school, or library, would be a noise-sensitive use. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the Project site as being located entirely within the 65 dBA CNEL U.S. 101 noise contour. Exterior spaces associated with these sensitive land uses would need to be designed to avoid significant exposures, to reduce impacts to *adverse, but mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less impacts from exposure of existing or planned sensitive receptors to noise levels compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.11-4. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Railway Noise

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potential *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) impacts associated with the development of noise sensitive land uses in areas where railway noise would expose those future noise sensitive uses to unacceptable interior and exterior noise levels. While a number of policies and standards were identified that could reduce the potential for impacts, the GP/CLUP FEIR concluded that on occasion, practical limitations would feasibly preclude noise level reduction to an adverse, but less than significant level.

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the Project site as being located entirely within the 65 dBA CNEL UPRR noise contour. Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. Some of the uses, such as a medical clinic, school, or library, would be a noise-sensitive use. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the Project site as being located entirely within the 65 dBA CNEL U.S. 101 noise contour. Exterior spaces associated with these sensitive land uses would need to be designed to avoid significant exposures, to reduce impacts to *adverse, but mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less impacts from exposure of existing or planned sensitive receptors to noise levels compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.11-5. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Industrial and Other Point Sources

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potential *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) impacts associated with the development of noise sensitive land uses in areas where industrial and other point source noise would expose noise sensitive uses to substantial interior and exterior noise levels. While a number of policies and standards were identified that could reduce the potential for impacts, the GP/CLUP FEIR concluded that on occasion, practical limitations would feasibly preclude noise level reduction to an *adverse, but less than significant* level.

The GP/CLUP FEIR did not identify the proposed Project GPA site as being located within an area subject to industrial or other point source noises. Given that the proposed Project GPA site is removed from areas industrial and other sites that could generate substantial amounts of noise, no impacts are anticipated under implementation of the proposed Project (Class IV). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts from exposure of existing or planned sensitive receptors to noise levels compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

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

#### Long-term Impacts

#### Impact 3.11-6. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Airport Noise

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impacts associated with airport noise levels and the future development of noise sensitive receptors within suitable sites within the vicinity of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. The proposed Project GPA site is located over 3 miles west of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport and outside the 60 dBA airport noise contour. Airport noise impacts on the proposed Project GPA buildout are considered incrementally *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts from airport noise compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

### 4.11.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

#### Impact 3.11-7. Cumulative Traffic Noise

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified a *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) contribution to cumulative traffic noise impacts to noise sensitive land use along several roadways within the City, including portions of Hollister Avenue in the vicinity of the Project site. Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. While the proposed Project GPA buildout would contribute additional new traffic to City roadways, the buildout's contribution to area noise levels would be incremental, and subsequently, the associated increase in noise levels is also incremental (see discussion of Impact 3.11-2 above). ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less cumulative impacts from increases in traffic noise compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

### 4.11.3.4 Mitigation

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

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are proposed.

### 4.11.3.5 Residual Impacts

The proposed Project would result in short-term *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) noise impacts during construction; long-term noise impacts would be *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant (Class II)*. These would be equal to those noise impacts identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. Residual impacts would be either *significant and unavoidable* (Class I), *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II), or *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

This section of the EIR Addendum addresses impacts to public services and utilities, including impacts to schools, libraries, police and fire protection services, solid waste, wastewater, and energy supplies. Impacts to water supplies and public parks and recreation are addressed in Section 4.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, and 4.10, *Land Use and Recreation*, respectively.

### 4.12.1 Existing Conditions

No important changes have occurred relative to the Project site since release of the GP/CLUP and the physical existing conditions described therein for public services and utilities within the City.

### 4.12.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project GPA is described for the GP/CLUP FEIR, including discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.12.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.12.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized this EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

The City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (City of Goleta 2008) provides specific thresholds for conducting CEQA analysis. Section 15, "School Thresholds," and Section 17, "Solid Waste Thresholds," provide guidance for assessing the significance of project impacts to area schools and the City's solid waste generation based on landfill capacity. The City does not have thresholds of significance relating to energy supplies or energy conservation.

#### Schools

A project would have a significant impact on schools and school facilities if it would:

- Generate sufficient students to require an additional classroom. This assumes 29 students per classroom for elementary/junior high and 28 students per classroom for high school, based on the lowest student per classroom loading standards for the State school building program. This threshold is to be applied in those school districts which are currently approaching, at, or exceeding their current capacity.

### Solid Waste

A project would have a significant impact on solid waste facilities if it would:

- Generate 5 percent or more of the expected average annual increase in waste generation thereby using a significant portion of the remaining landfill capacity (the numerical value associated with this 5 percent is approximately 196 tons per year increase). If a proposed project generates 196 or more tons per year, after receiving a reduction and recycling credit of 50 percent, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable.

### **CEQA Guidelines**

In accordance with Appendix G of the 2017 CEQA Guidelines, impacts to public services would be potentially significant if the proposed project would result in:

- a. 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 the following public services:
  - Fire protection
  - Police protection
  - Schools
  - Libraries
  - Other public facilities

In accordance with Appendix F of the 2017 CEQA Guidelines, impacts to energy supplies would be potentially significant if the proposed project would:

- a. Use large amounts of fuel or energy in an unnecessary, wasteful, or inefficient manner;
- b. Constrain local or regional energy supplies, affect peak and base periods of electrical or natural gas demand, require or result in the construction of new electrical generation and/or transmission facilities, or necessitate the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.
- c. Conflict with existing energy standards, including standards for energy conservation.

As previously discussed, thresholds and impact analysis related to water resources are provided in Section 4.9, *Water Resources* of this EIR Addendum. Thresholds and impact analysis related to public parks and recreation are provided in Section 4.10, *Land Use and Recreation*.

### 4.12.3.2 Project Impacts

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

##### Long-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the following long-term *adverse but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) impacts related to public services and utilities.

##### Impact 3.12-1. Increased Demand for Police Protection

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with increased demand for law enforcement and police service in the City due to population growth, creating the need for an additional 7 to 10 police officers, additional equipment, and capital projects such as additions to existing facilities or new facilities. In order to accommodate projected population growth, the City of Goleta identified multiple policies and objectives in the GP/CLUP that address police protection: the potential of the addition of a new police station; the incorporation of service standards such as 5-minute response times for emergencies; and a community planning process to evaluate the need for a police station, identify appropriate sites, and plan for its development.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including police protection are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Application of proposed GP/CLUP policies to proposed Project GPA buildout would reduce potential impacts on police protection to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to police services compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

##### Impact 3.12-2. Increased Demand for Fire Protection

The GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.12.3.3 identified potential significant impacts associated with increased demand for fire protection services in the City due to population growth, creating the need for additional personnel, equipment, and facilities or new facilities. The increased population would exacerbate existing deficiencies in fire protection in the City. The GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.12.3.3 identified multiple policies and objectives in the GP/CLUP intended to address fire protection service and to accommodate projected growth. These included the addition of a new fire station.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related

development requirements including fire protection are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. The proposed Project would allow the construction of a governmental building such as a fire station that would address the GP/CLUP policy identified to reduce impacts of buildout of GP/CLUP land uses. Such a fire station would improve existing fire protection services and would result in a *beneficial* (Class IV) impact. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in reduced impacts to fire protection services compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.12-3. Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection, Treatment, and Disposal

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with increased demand on the City's wastewater collection and service providers due to population growth. The GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.12.3.3 identified policies that would reduce impacts to the City's wastewater treatment facilities and service providers associated with GP/CLUP buildout to a less-than-significant level. These policies relate to coordination with other agencies and future development as it relates to water and sewer facilities.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including wastewater treatment are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Given the GWSD has infrastructure and unused treatment capacity available to accommodate anticipated Project wastewater demands, impacts to wastewater services, storm drainage facilities, and associated infrastructure would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to wastewater services compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.12-4. Increased Demand for Utility Services

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with increased demand for utilities such as electricity and natural gas due to population growth. The GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.12.3.3 identified several policies that would reduce impacts related to demand for utilities associated with GP/CLUP buildout to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). These policies include those related to utilities including energy conservation, standards for public facilities and coordination of facilities with future development and other agencies.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including utility services are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under



the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Given the relatively small site size of 1.21 acres and resulting project structure, construction and operation of the proposed Project GPA buildout would result a negligible increase in energy demand compared to existing regional demands and supplies. Impacts of the Project are considered *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to utility services compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.12-5. Increased Demand on Local School Districts

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with increased demand on local school districts due to population growth. The GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.12.3.3 identified one policy related to school facilities that would reduce impacts related to demand on school districts associated with GP/CLUP buildout to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). The proposed Project GPA would not create residential buildout and additional school-age children such that *no impact* (Class IV) on public services would result. **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less impacts to school facilities compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### Impact 3.12-6. Increased Demand for Library Facilities

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified potentially significant impacts associated with increased demand on library facilities due to population growth. The GP/CLUP FEIR Section 3.12.3.3 identified several policies that would reduce impacts related to demand on library facilities associated with GP/CLUP buildout to a less-than-significant level. These policies include those related to standards for public and other facilities and coordination of facilities with other agencies.

The proposed Project GPA would potentially result in hiring a relatively small number of employees from outside the area. Associated increase in demand for library facilities is considered *de minimis* and impacts would be *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in less impacts to library facilities compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

### **Class III Impacts**

#### Long-term Impacts

#### Impact 3.12-7. Exceedance of Capacity of Landfills to Accommodate Additional Solid Waste Stream

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impacts associated with increases in solid waste generation due to population growth. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified Policy PF 9, Coordination of Facilities with Future Development, which would limit development in the event that landfill capacity is achieved and ensure these impacts would remain less than significant.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum,

and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements of proposed GPA Project buildout including utility services are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Project specific impacts from new solid waste generation would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in a similar impact associated with solid waste generation compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### 4.12.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

##### **Police and Fire Protection**

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) contributions to cumulative impacts for police and fire services due to the requirements for Goleta Development Impact Fees for new development. The Police Facility Development Impact Fee is required pursuant to Chapter 16.21 of the Goleta Municipal Code (GMC). The Fire Facility Development Impact Fee is required for properties within the City pursuant to County Ordinance No. 4353 (adopted March 23, 1999) as adopted by the City Council by Ordinance Nos. 02-17 (adopted April 22, 2002) and 02-22 (adopted June 17, 2002).

The proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. If other than a governmental project, Goleta Development Impact Fees would apply. Impacts on police and fire protection would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). If proposed Project GPA buildout were a governmental project providing increased public services such as a fire station, the proposed Project would result in beneficial (Class IV) impacts on City fire protection services, and no impact on police protection. **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in similar (Class III) or beneficial (Class IV) cumulative impacts to police and fire protection services compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

##### **Solid Waste**

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) contributions to cumulative impacts on solid waste disposal because there is adequate landfill capacity in the regional landfill to accommodate GP/CLUP buildout. Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including utility services are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but*

*less than significant* (Class III) contributions to cumulative impacts on solid waste disposal because adequate landfill capacity in the regional landfill was projected to accommodate GP/CLUP buildout.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including utility services are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. The incremental increase in landfill demand that would result from proposed Project GPA buildout on the 1.21-acre site would be consistent with that projected in the GP/CLUP FEIR and would not cause demand to exceed the landfill capacity. Proposed Project GPA buildout would result in an *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) contribution to cumulative impacts on solid waste disposal. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar contributions to cumulative impacts to solid waste facilities compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **Wastewater**

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) contributions to cumulative impacts on wastewater treatment because adequate capacity within the existing wastewater treatment infrastructure was projected to accommodate GP/CLUP buildout.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including utility services are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. The incremental increase in wastewater treatment resulting from proposed Project GPA buildout on the 1.21-acre site would not exceed available wastewater treatment system capacity. The proposed Project GPA would result in an *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) contribution to cumulative impacts on wastewater treatment and disposal. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar contributions to cumulative impacts to wastewater facilities compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **Schools**

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) contributions to cumulative impacts on schools because new private development would be required to pay impact fees to the corresponding school district to help fund construction of additional facilities. Under current law, payment of these fees is deemed to constitute full mitigation per CEQA (Government Code § 65996(b)). The proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story professional office, studio,

and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. If other than a governmental project, school district impact fees would apply. Impacts on schools would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). If proposed Project GPA buildout were a governmental project providing increased public services such as a fire station, it would not be subject to development impact fees and would have *no contribution* (Class IV) to cumulative impacts on schools. **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in a similar or less of a contribution to cumulative impacts to school facilities compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **Private Utility Services (Energy Supplies)**

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) contributions to cumulative impacts on private utility services because the utility companies were projected to have adequate future capacity to address buildout demand.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including utility services are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. Therefore, adequate capacity would be available for the incremental increase in utility demand resulting from proposed Project GPA buildout. **Therefore, the proposed Project would result in similar contributions to cumulative impacts on private utility services and energy supplies compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### **Libraries**

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) contributions to cumulative impacts on libraries because implementation of GP/CLUP policies along with payment of applicable development impact fees would reduce impacts on libraries resulting from current and future demand to less than significant levels.

The proposed Project GPA would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. If other than a governmental project, library impact fees would apply. Impacts on schools would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). If proposed Project GPA buildout were a governmental project providing increased public services such as a fire station, it would not be subject to development impact fees and would have *no contribution* (Class IV) to cumulative impacts on libraries. **Therefore, the proposed Project would result**

*in a similar or less of a contribution to cumulative impacts to libraries compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.*

#### **4.12.3.4      Mitigation**

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

No modifications to General Plan policies are proposed.

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

No mitigation is identified.

#### **4.12.3.5      Residual Impacts**

Implementation of the proposed Project would reduce impacts to public services and utilities over what was identified in the GP/CLUP FEIR. No modification of General Plan policies or mitigation is proposed. Residual impacts would be either *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II), or *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## 4.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

### 4.13.1 Existing Setting

Important changes have occurred within the Project site vicinity affecting the surrounding land uses and planning conditions since certification of the GP/CLUP FEIR:

- Completion of The Hideaway residential development, consisting of 101 townhouse units to the east of the Project site;
- Completion of The Bluffs residential development, consisting of 62 single-family units to the southeast of the Project site; and
- Completion of the Cathedral Oaks Overpass and realignment of the US-101 on- and off-ramps and Hollister Avenue south and west of the Project site.

### 4.13.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework applicable to the proposed Project is provided in the GP/CLUP FEIR, including the discussions of relevant federal, state, and local regulations.

### 4.13.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.13.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds have been updated since release of the GP/CLUP FEIR and are utilized for this EIR Addendum.

#### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

Pursuant to the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, impacts to transportation and the circulation environment would be significant if the proposed project would result in:

- 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 a LOS F, E, or D.

**Table 4.14-1. Significant Changes in LOS for Evaluating Project Impacts**

<b>Intersection LOS (Including Project)</b>	<b>Increase in V/C or Trips Greater Than</b>
LOS A	0.20
LOS B	0.15
LOS C	0.10
OR THE ADDITION OF:	
LOS D	15 TRIPS
LOS E	10 TRIPS
LOS F	5 TRIPS

Source: City of Goleta 2002.

- 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.
- 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 substantial increases in traffic (e.g., rural road 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. Exceedance of the roadways designated Circulation Element Capacity may indicate the potential for the occurrence of the above impacts.
- Project traffic would utilize a substantial portion of an intersection(s) capacity where the intersection is currently operating at acceptable levels of service (A-C) but with cumulative traffic would degrade to or approach LOS D (V/C 0.80) or lower. Substantial is defined as a minimum change for 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 at anything lower.

In addition to the CEQA impact thresholds, the City has developed the administrative policy of defining a significant roadway impact if a project would increase traffic volumes by more than 1.0 percent (either project-specific or project contribution to cumulative impacts) on roadways that currently exceed Acceptable Capacity or are forecast to exceed the Acceptable Capacity under cumulative conditions.

### **CEQA Thresholds**

In accordance with Appendix G of the 2017 CEQA Guidelines, impacts to transportation and the circulation environment would be potentially significant if the proposed project would result in:

- a. 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.
- b. Conflict with 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.
- c. 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.



- d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
- e. Result in inadequate emergency access.
- f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycled, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

#### 4.13.3.2 Project Impacts

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

###### Long-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified the following long-term Class I impacts related to transportation and circulation.

###### Impact 3.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standards Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified one intersection where a long-term significant and unavoidable transportation/circulation impact would occur: at Hollister Avenue and Storke Road. The City considers LOS C as the minimum acceptable operating standard for all intersections, with the exception of the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection, which has a standard of LOS D because the intersection is built to its planned capacity (under GP/CLUP policy subsection TE 4.2).

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. The average daily trips (ADT) and peak hour trips (PHT) resulting from buildout of the 1.21-acre site would represent a minimal contribution to operations of the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection, and would be similar to that resulting from buildout of the visitor serving commercial in this location. ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar contributions to impacts on intersection operations compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

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

###### Long-term Impacts

###### Impact 3.13-2. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways Intersections

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified intersections and roadway segments where potentially significant transportation/circulation impacts would occur as a result of additional traffic from buildout of the GP/CLUP. Section 3.13.3.5 of the GP/CLUP

FEIR identifies those intersections and roadways in which Class II impacts would occur under buildout of the GP/CLUP FEIR. A number of policies of the GP/CLUP, including modifications to LOS standards and transportation improvements, continuous monitoring of future traffic conditions and standards, would reduce impacts to *adverse, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant* (Class II) level.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation. The average daily trips (ADT) resulting from buildout of the 1.21-acre site would represent a minimal contribution to operations of the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection, and would be similar to that resulting from buildout of the visitor serving commercial in this location. ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar contributions to impacts on roadway operations compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

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

#### Long-term Impacts

##### Impact 3.13-3. Increased Traffic Volumes, Either Individually or Cumulatively, without Violation of LOS Standards Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified intersections where *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) transportation/circulation impacts would occur as a result of additional traffic from buildout of the GP/CLUP. Section 3.13.3.5 of the GP/CLUP FEIR identifies those intersections and roadways in which Class III impacts would occur under buildout of the GP/CLUP FEIR.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size and related development requirements including utility services are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation at the 1.21-acre site. The associated increase in ADT would result in incremental increases in traffic along fewer local roadways and highways and at local intersections and would not result in exceedance of any adopted LOS standards either individually or cumulatively. Impacts of the proposed Project are considered *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). ***Therefore, the proposed Project would result in similar impacts to traffic and intersection operations compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

## ***Class IV Impacts***

### Long-term Impacts

Impact 3.13-4. LOS under 2030 Buildout is Expected to Improve or Remain Unchanged at Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive and Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real  
The GP/CLUP FEIR identified that the LOS at the intersections of Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive and Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real would remain unchanged or would improve (Class IV) under conditions at buildout of the GP/CLUP in 2030. Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of proposed GPA Project buildout and resulting vehicular impacts are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation at the 1.21-acre site. Proposed Project GPA buildout would have *no impact* (Class IV) on LOS under 2030 GP/CLUP buildout. ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA impacts on transportation would be similar to those of the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

### Impact 3.13-5. No Impacts to Air Traffic Patterns

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified that *no impacts* (Class IV) to air traffic patterns would result from implementation of the GP/CLUP. Development that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP would not result in a change to local land use patterns that would require changes to air traffic patterns. Similarly, the proposed Project GPA buildout would not result in changes to air traffic patterns and would have *no impact* (Class IV) on air traffic patterns. ***Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to air traffic patterns compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.***

### Impact 3.13-6. Increase Transit Ridership and Support Alternative Modes of Transportation

The GP/CLUP FEIR identified *beneficial impacts* (Class IV) associated with proposed bicycle and pedestrian plans and increased ridership as a result of GP/CLUP implementation. The GP/CLUP FEIR identified several policies that would support and encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, such as carpool, transit, rail, bicycle, and pedestrian travel.

Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of proposed GPA Project buildout and resulting vehicular impacts are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation at the 1.21-acre site. Proposed Project GPA buildout would not alter the development or implementation of these proposed bicycle and pedestrian plans. The existing Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) bus

stop on Hollister Avenue on the proposed Project GPA frontage would potentially increase ridership on local public transit systems. Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would have a beneficial impact (Class IV). **Therefore, the proposed Project GPA would result in similar impacts to alternative modes of transportation compared to the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### 4.13.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

Transportation and Circulation impact analysis in the GP/CLUP FEIR assessed buildout through year 2030, representing cumulative conditions of Plan buildout. As stated in the GP/CLUP FEIR (page 3.13-37),

“The GP-7 alternative presented in this section reflects cumulative conditions. This means that future conditions projected with the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan and recommended transportation network take into account traffic expected to occur from other regional growth, regardless of the development that occurs within the City of Goleta. This provides for a more realistic projection of traffic under future conditions. If land use under the GP/CLUP were analyzed without taking into account the cumulative effect of other regional traffic growth, the overall traffic projected under future conditions could be underestimated.”

Therefore, the transportation and circulation impacts analysis is inherently a cumulative analysis. Proposed Project GPA buildout would allow for a two-story professional office, studio, and office building, medical clinic, charitable institution, library, museum, and school, including business schools, community, civic center, and governmental building, or a crematory or mausoleum. The size of proposed GPA Project buildout and resulting vehicular impacts are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation are considered to be similar to that required of a visitor-serving commercial facility that would be allowed under the existing site GP/CLUP designation at the 1.21-acre site. The proposed Project would have an *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III), less than cumulatively considerable (Class III) contribution to cumulative transportation and circulation impacts. **Therefore, the proposed Project impacts on transportation would be similar to those of the GP/CLUP FEIR.**

#### 4.13.3.4 Mitigation

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

No modifications to General Plan policies are proposed.

#### 4.13.3.5 Residual Impacts

Implementation of the proposed Project would have generally less impacts on traffic and circulation relative to the GP/CLUP FEIR. Contributions to residual impacts would be either *significant and unavoidable* (Class I), *adverse, but feasibly*

*mitigated to less than significant (Class II), adverse, but less than significant (Class III), or no impact (Class IV).*

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*

## 5.0 GP/CLUP FEIR ADDENDUM PREPARERS

This document was prepared under the direction and approval of the City of Goleta. A team of private consultants, led by Amec Foster Wheeler, Environmental and Infrastructure, prepared the document for the City, and the City by its approval accepts the document as its own.

### LEAD AGENCY

#### ***City of Goleta***

130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, California 93117

#### **Neighborhood Services and Public Safety Department**

Vytautas “Vyto” Adomaitis, Director and Project Manager  
Laura Bridley, Project Planning Consultant

#### **Planning and Environmental Review Department**

Lisa Prasse, Planning Manager, Current Planning Division  
Kathy Allen, Supervising Senior Planner  
Mary Chang, Supervising Senior Planner

### EIR ADDENDUM PREPARATION

Amec Foster Wheeler Environmental and Infrastructure, Inc.  
104 West Anapamu Street, Suite 204A  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

David Stone, M.A., Project Manager

Taylor Lane, B.A., Deputy Project Manager

Marie Laule, B.A., Deputy Project Manager

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*



## 6.0 REFERENCES

City of Goleta. 2006. *Final Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, Environmental Impact Report*. Prepared by Jones & Stokes, September.

<http://www.cityofgoleta.org/city-hall/planning-and-environmental-review/general-plan/view-general-plan/general-plan-coastal-land-use-plan-final-eir>

City of Goleta. 2018. *City of Goleta Fire Station No. 10 Final Environmental Impact Report*. Neighborhood Services and Public Safety Department. Prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank*