Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?					
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		✓			
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 stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial 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. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			✓		
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			✓		

Existing Setting

Surface Drainage

The project site is currently undeveloped and contains mostly ruderal grasslands with some other vegetation as described above in *Biological Resources*. A preliminary drainage report was prepared for a previously proposed project (Penfield & Smith, March 2005) on the property. No subsequent hydrology or water quality studies were prepared specifically for use in this MND. Existing conditions for this project are similar since the site has not since been modified. Therefore, the Penfield & Smith analysis is considered representative of conditions for the proposed site within the current hydrologic setting.

The site generally slopes toward the southeast with spot elevations in the northeast corner of 76.97 feet and 66.93 feet in the southeast corner. For approximately 0.40 acre of the site, storm water runoff sheet flows from northwest toward the southeast across the site and outlets to the gutter on Calle Real with a discharge of approximately 0.97 cubic feet per second (cfs). For approximately 0.60 acres of the site, stormwater sheet flows toward the east and north onto the adjacent properties to the east and north, respectively, with a discharge of approximately 1.34 cfs. Surface water from the area enters the stormwater conveyance system on Calle Real, which then channels the flows to the El Encanto Creek, which ultimately discharges to the Devereux Slough.

Groundwater

The Goleta Water District would provide water to the proposed project. The District obtains most (approximately 9,300 acre feet annually) of its water supply from Lake Cachuma. The State Water Project Supplies approximately 4,500 acre feet and District wells supply an additional 2,300 to 2,500 acre feet. The Goleta Groundwater Basin is approximately 9,210 acres, and 8 miles long by 3 miles wide, bound by the Santa Ynez Mountains to the north and the More Ranch Fault to the south.[5] The Basin is subdivided into the North Subbasin, Central Subbasin and the West Subbasin. The West Subbasin underlies the project site. Groundwater flow is generally to the south following the natural topographic gradient. Recharge in the Basin is from infiltration of precipitation, seepage from streams, and subsurface flows as well as imported from Lake Cachuma and injected. Active recharge for the Basin occurs in the lower reaches of creeks in the North Subbasin and is more minor in the West Subbasin, which is characterized by fine-grained shallow sediments. Water table levels fluctuate year-to-year depending on recharge and pumping extraction. In recent past years, private wells in the area have extracted approximately 232 acre-feet per year from the West Basin, while the safe yield (gross pumpage) is estimated to be 500 acre-feet per year.

[5] GP/CLUP Final EIR, September 2006.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Hydrology & Water Quality would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines* Manual assume that a significant impact on hydrology and water resources would occur if a project would result in a substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns, alter the course of a stream or river, increase the rate of surface runoff to the extent that flooding, including increased erosion or sedimentation, occurs, create or contribute to runoff volumes exceed existing or planned stormwater runoff facilities, or substantially degrade water quality.

Project Specific Impacts

Water Quality Standards and Waste Discharge

During construction the site would be cleared of vegetation and graded. As such, the proposed project could temporarily increase erosion causing increased silt in the surface water runoff and siltation of the storm drain system. As described above under Geology and Soils, in order to minimize erosion of the site, the project includes a Preliminary Erosion Control Plan (see Figure G-1, above), which contains proposed erosion control and desilting measures to be in place during construction. Measures include rock bag catch basin sediment barriers, a silt fence and a stabilized construction entrance.

Since the proposed project would result in the disturbance of more than one acre of land, structural BMPs would be required to ensure that pollutants from the developed project do not exceed the water quality standards set forth in the applicable National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit, do not violate the CCRWQCB Basin Plan, or otherwise impair the beneficial uses of any receiving waterbodies (e.g. El Encanto Creek, Devereux Slough). Initial plans show the use of both natural and mechanical treatment systems onsite. Pervious pavement is proposed in segments of the drive aisle, bioswales are proposed along the western property boundary and along the northeastern portion of the property, and storm drain cleaning inserts are proposed for all catch basins. Additional BMP measures may be added to the current project drainage and erosion control design, such as, biofiltration swales and strips distributed in landscape areas, features that would capture roof and hardscape runoff and distribute it to the landscaping before this runoff enters the local drainage collection system. Without final plans illustrating the mechanisms to filter out or remove pollutants before runoff is released from the property, waste discharge impacts are considered potentially significant (**Impact HYDRO/WQ 1**).

Groundwater Supply

The project development would result in an increase of impervious surfaces, which would reduce infiltration on-site of rainwater. However, the project includes some permeable pavement, permeable landscape features and bioswales on the western boundary of the project and along the northeastern portion of the property in effort to reduce the amount of increased surface flows to run off site as result of the increased impervious surface. Given the low-permeability of the underlying soils and relatively small site, the amount of groundwater infiltration to be impeded would be minimal. Therefore, impacts related to groundwater supply as a result of the project are considered less than significant.

Surface Drainage Post Construction

The project would increase the amount of impermeable surfaces, which would result in increased stormwater runoff. On-site stormwater conveyance facilities would be constructed to carry surface water to existing stormwater improvements along Calle Real. The project would include a 10-foot wide landscaped open space within the westerly property line setback, which would contain a 2-foot wide bio-swale and a bioswale along the northeastern portion of the property. However, hydrologic outflow calculations of the on-site surface water runoff quantity and the capacity of the proposed storm drain facilities have not been generated for the post construction design. Although any expected increase in surface runoff is expected to be minimal, without hydrologic calculations, potential impacts related to alteration of on-site drainage patterns to cause to flooding on- or off-site (i.e. neighboring properties) are considered potentially significant. (**Impact HYDRO/WQ 2**).

100-Year Flood Hazards

Development at the project would increase impervious surfaces from building roofs, residential hardscape, and access roadways and parking areas. However, the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in potential flooding risks because the 100-year post-development peak flow from the project is expected to represents a minimal increase in surface slows through existing channels. Per Figure 3.9-2 of the General Plan Final EIR, there are no designated 100-year floodplains within the development footprint, and development would not occur within existing channels. The project would not be at risk of flooding due to the failure of a levee or dam. Impacts of the project related to 100-year flood hazards and exposure of people or structures to flooding risks is considered less than significant.

Inundation

The project is not located near a water body that would be susceptible to a seiche (an oscillating wave that forms in an enclosed body of water). Per Figure 3.9-1 of the General Plan Final EIR, the project site is not located within a potential tsunami run-up

area. The site and vicinity is relatively flat and is surrounded by urban development. Per Figure 3.6-4 of the General Plan Final EIR, the project site is within an area identified as having "Low Landslide Potential." Therefore, impacts related to inundation as a result of seiche, tsunami or mudflow are considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* assumes that projects resulting in significant, project specific, hydrologic and water quality impacts are also considered to result in a significant contribution to cumulative hydrologic and water quality impacts. Development in the area would cumulatively increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the area; thereby, potentially reducing the capacity of drainage systems and increasing surface water runoff pollutants. As such, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative hydrologic and water quality impacts would be considered potentially significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

Water Quality Standards and Waste Discharge (Impact HYDRO/WQ 1)

HYDRO/WQ 1-1: The applicant shall submit a copy of the Notice of Intent to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Plan Requirements and Timing: Prior to map recordation for the project, the applicant shall submit a copy of the Notice of Intent and shall provide a copy of the required Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City. A copy of the SWPPP must be maintained on the project site during grading and construction activities.

Monitoring: City staff shall review the documentation prior to map recordation for the project. City staff shall site inspect during construction for compliance with the SWPPP.

HYDRO/WQ 1-2: Applicant shall submit drainage and grading plans with a final hydrology report for review and approval by Community Services and Building staff. The plan shall incorporate appropriate Best Management Practices to minimize storm water impacts to the maximum extent feasible in accordance with the City's Storm Water Management Plan.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The plans shall include but not be limited to bio-swales, permeable paving, on site detention, fossil filters and other operational features. The plans shall also include an erosion control plan for review and approval by Community Services staff prior to the issuance of any

LUP for the project. After installation of any drainage improvements or erosion control measures, the applicant shall be responsible for on-going maintenance of all improvements in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications or the approved plans.

HYDRO/WQ 1-3: To prevent illegal discharges to the storm drains, all onsite storm drain inlets, whether new or existing, shall be labeled to advise the public that the storm drain discharges to the ocean (or other waterbody, as appropriate) and that dumping waste is prohibited (e.g., "Don't Dump – Drains to Ocean"). The information shall be provided in English and Spanish. The CC&Rs shall include a notification regarding this requirement.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The location of all storm drain inlets shall be shown on site, building and grading plans prior to approval of any grading and/or land use permits. Labels shall be installed prior to the first occupancy clearance for the project. Standard labels, as available from the Santa Barbara County Public Works or Project Clean Water, shall be shown on the plans and submitted to City prior to approval of any grading and/or land use permits.

Monitoring: The City shall site inspect prior to the first occupancy clearance for the project to verify installation of all stormdrain labels.

Surface Drainage Post Construction (Impact HYDRO/WQ 2)

HYDRO/WQ 2-1 Drainage facilities shall be constructed to adequately collect stormwater runoff generated on-site.

Plan Requirements: The applicant/owner shall submit a Drainage and Stormwater Management Plan that has been prepared by a licensed civil engineer. The Plans shall include hydrologic calculations of site runoff flows and plans for drainage facilities designed to accommodate these flows. It shall demonstrate that the quantity of stormwater runoff generated at the site can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Features of the Plan shall also be shown on grading plans submitted for a grading permit for the project.

Timing: Prior to map recordation, the Plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval.

Monitoring: City staff shall site inspect to ensure drainage is handled according to the approved plans.

Residual Impact

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, the project's residual hydrology and water quality impacts would be less than significant.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

Existing Setting

The Land Use Element of the City's General Plan provides a land use designation of Planned Residential (R-P) for the project site. According to Land Use Policy LU 2.5, the intent of the Planned Residential designation is to allow flexibility and encourage innovation and diversity in design of residential developments. This is accomplished by allowing a range of densities and housing types, while requiring a provision of a substantial amount of open space and other common amenities within new developments

The zoning designation of the site is DR-12 (Design Residential, Maximum of 12 units per acre). Consistent with the Planned Residential land use designation, DR zoning is intended to provide standards for traditional multiple residences as well as allow flexibility and innovation in design by allowing a wide range of densities and housing types while requiring a substantial amount of open space.

The project site is within an urbanized area of the City with a mix of commercial, residential and transportation corridor uses within the site's surroundings. A summary

of adjacent existing land uses and associated land use designations is provided in **Table LP-1**.

Table LP-1
Surrounding Land Uses

Direction from the Project Site	Existing Land Use	GP/CLUP land use designation
Project Site	Vacant	Planned Residential
North	Attached and detached single-family residences	Planned Residential
South	Calle Real / US U.S. Highway 101 / Union Pacific RR ROW	Public / Quasi-Public
East	Attached Condominiums	Planned Residential
West	Small Commercial Center / Convenience Goods	Community Commercial

Thresholds of Significance

A significant Land Use & Planning impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project Specific Impacts

Established Community

The project site represents an infill project. It is bound to the west by the Padre Shopping Center, which contains both one-story and two-story commercial buildings. These adjacent uses include a Citgo gas station, 7-Eleven convenience store that is backed by a two-story commercial office building, and one-story commercial structure at the rear of the property. The proposed two-story residential structures would not create a physical division within the existing community. The project would also be compatible with the adjacent commercially developed site to the west and the properties that abut both the eastern and northern sides of the project site, which contain eight multi-family residential buildings and associated covered parking structures and a swimming pool complex in a planned residential development. In addition, the project does not involve

modifications to the existing circulation network within the community. Therefore, there would be no impact related to dividing an established community.

Land Use Plan

The project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Planned Residential in terms of the types of residences proposed, densities, design and function as a transition between businesses and single-family residential areas. Under the City's Inland Zoning Ordinance (Article III), the DR zoning designation is intended to carry out the intent of the Planned Residential designation. The DR-12 zoning designation allows up to 12 units per acre.

Although the project is consistent with the City General Plan and is an allowed use within the DR-12 zoning designation, the proposed specifications of the project are currently not consistent with all provisions of the Zoning Code. Modifications to specific zoning ordinance requirements are being requested as detailed in the project description.

Additionally, the project would include an application under the State Density Bonus Law to obtain incentives for providing two affordable units. Locally, the requested incentives would include modifications to the development standards as required under Article III for those specifications the project would not meet as provided in the project description. Such modifications to Article III are permitted pursuant to Section 35,317.8 *Conditions, Restrictions, and Modifications* of the Article upon approval of the applicable approving authority.

Conservation Element

Per Figure 4-1 of the Conservation Element, no Environmentally Sensitive Habitats Areas (ESHAs) or special status species occur on the project site. No other conservation plans are noted within the City. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to conservation plans.

Cumulative Impacts

The project is consistent with existing and planned land uses in the vicinity of the project as the area grows in accordance with the General Plan. There are no related projects in the immediate vicinity that, in combination with the proposed project, would change the surrounding land use patterns. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

There are no land use and planning–related mitigation measures required or recommended for the project.

Residual Impact

The project's residual land use and planning impacts would be less than significant.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				✓	
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				✓	

Existing Setting

There are currently no existing or planned surface mining operations located within the City of Goleta. There are also no state designated mineral resource areas within the City. An oil extraction operation, known as the Ellwood Oil Field, is located within the City in the Ellwood Mesa area. The Ellwood Mesa also contains the Venoco oil and gas processing facility.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

The proposed project would not result in the loss of mineral resources that are of value to the region or the state and would not otherwise interfere with or preclude access to mineral resources. Therefore, the project would result in no impacts to mineral resources.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would have no impact on any cumulative loss of mineral resources or resource recovery sites.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Since no impacts would occur, no mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

The project's residual mineral resource impacts would be less than significant.

NOISE

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

Existing Setting

Noise is defined as unwanted or objectionable sound. The measurement of sound takes into account three variables; 1) magnitude, 2) frequency, and 3) duration.

Magnitude is the measure of a sound's "loudness" and is expressed in decibels (dB) on a logarithmic scale. Decibel levels diminish (attenuate) as the distance from the noise source increases. For instance, the attenuation rate for a point noise source is 6dB every time the distance from the source is doubled. For linear sources such as Highway 101 or the railroad tracks, the attenuation is 3 dB for each doubling of distance to the source.

The frequency of a sound relates to the number of times per second the sound vibrates. One vibration/second equals one hertz (Hz). Normal human hearing can detect sounds ranging from 20 HZ to 20,000 Hz.

Duration is a measure of the time to which the noise receptor is exposed to the noise. Because noise levels in any given location fluctuate during the day, it is necessary to quantify the level of variation to accurately describe the noise environment. One of the best measures to describe the noise environment is the Community Noise Equivalent Level or CNEL. CNEL is a noise index that attempts to take into account differences in the intrusiveness of noise between daytime hours and nighttime hours. Specifically, CNEL weights average noise levels at different times of the day as follows:

Daytime—7 am to 7 pm	Weighting Factor = 1 dB
Evening—7 pm to 10 pm	Weighting Factor = 5 dB
Nighttime—10 pm to 7 am	Weighting Factor = 10 dB

Noise exposure contours map points of equal average noise levels in the same way that topographic contours map points of equal elevation. The project site lies within the 60-70 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise exposure contours within the City. The primary sources of noise in the area are vehicular traffic on Calle Real, Highway 101, and the Union Pacific Railroad Right of Way, aircraft operations at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, neighboring commercial operations such as the adjacent gas station.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Noise would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual*. The City's adopted thresholds assume that outdoor CNEL noise levels in excess of 64 dB are considered to pose significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors and the maximum acceptable noise level for interior living areas due to exterior noise sources is 45 dB CNEL (with doors and windows closed).

Project Specific Impacts

a) As noted above, the project site is located within the existing 60-70 dB CNEL noise contours of the City. Prior to incorporation of the City of Goleta, the County of Santa Barbara approved a residential development on the site known as the El Encanto Apartments. This proposal was the subject of noise study prepared by Artntek (2001). To facilitate assessment of potential noise impacts resulting from the Citrus Village proposal, the applicant's consulting noise engineer (URS) submitted a review of the previous noise assessment prepared for the property, updated for the current project design and more recent estimates of future traffic volumes (March 7, 2005)[6].

   The study used the SOUND32 model to estimate exterior noise levels on the property at representative locations under current conditions with no barriers, future conditions with no barriers, future conditions with houses only; and future conditions with 6-foot walls near Buildings B and D, and 7-foot walls near Buildings A and C.

   Results showed that future exterior noise levels at building sites within the project boundary will range from approximately 69 dBA (affecting Unit 3 in Building B and Unit 7 in Building D) to 74.4 dBA (affecting Unit 1 in Building A, and Unit 5 in Building C). The study states that interior noise level is a function of the sound transmission loss qualities of the construction material and surface area of each element, with doors and windows generally being the acoustical weak link in a building. Further, the study states that by limiting the number and size of these openings on the sides of the building exposed to noise, interior noise levels will be minimized. Unit 1 in Building A and Unit 5 in building C would be exposed to the greatest amount of noise. Units 1 and 5 have windows facing south. Both units have entrance patios on the south side near the front doors.

   Results for future exterior noise levels with inclusion of the 6 and 7-foot walls show that the noise levels within the yards would be at or below 65 dBA Ldn.

   Since the project site lies within an area of the City where the CNEL is greater than 65 dB, the exposure of the proposed residential uses to such noise levels would be considered a potentially significant impact **(Impact NSE 1)**.

b,f) The proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. There are no private airports or airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. Such impacts are not anticipated as a result of this project.

[6] The traffic volumes used were reviewed and approved by the City's traffic engineer.

c) As a residential project, this proposal would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. No such impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of project implementation.

d) The project site is located within close proximity to sensitive noise receptors, specifically the residential development to the north and east of the project site. Noise associated with heavy equipment operation and construction activities can average as high as 95 dB or more measured 50 feet from the source. At a point-source attenuation rate of 6 dB for each doubling of distance from the source, construction equipment noise levels at 95 dB would not decrease to below the 65 dB threshold for sensitive receptors until the distance between the source and receptor reach 1,600 feet. Since the residential units to the north and east of the property lie within a 1,600 foot radius of the project site, construction noise would be considered to pose a potentially significant impact on sensitive receptors in the area **(Impact NSE 2)**.

e) Although the project site does lie within the area of influence of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport as defined by the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan, it is outside of any airport noise contour of 65 dB or greater. As such, noise impacts from airport operations on the proposed project would be considered less than significant

Cumulative Impacts

Short term project construction noise would result in a potentially significant cumulative noise impact on sensitive receptors, including the residential development to the north and east of the project site.

Required Mitigation Measures

Noise Exposure (Impact NSE 1)

NSE 1-1 The project shall incorporate measures listed in the current version of the Acoustic Design Manual and all construction techniques and recommendations of the URS Noise Study (March 7, 2005) to reduce exterior and interior sound levels to below 65 and 45 dBA CNEL, respectively.

Plan Requirements and Timing: All construction techniques and recommendations of the noise study shall be incorporated into design of the project and detailed on building plans. These measures include:

- Provide forced air ventilation systems for all units in order to allow windows to be kept closed.

- Use windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 30 throughout the project.
- Other than on the northernmost units (Units 9-11 in Building E), restrict doorways to avoid facing south. All exterior doors shall be solid core with tight fitting seals. Sliding or French doors that provide patio access shall have a STC rating of not less than 30.
- Design all attic vents to be baffled and acoustically treated.
- Provide all fireplaces with closable dampers.
- If these specifications are altered, prepare an acoustical engineering report in conjunction with submittal of the building permit applications. If alternative noise reduction techniques are designed in the project, the report shall demonstrate that they achieve an equivalent mitigation of noise impacts and provide Ldn values of 45 dBA or less.

A acoustic survey shall be submitted to Planning & Environmental Services prior to occupancy showing that the required levels have been attained.

Monitoring: Building inspectors shall ensure that all noise control measures have been constructed pursuant to the approved plans. Planning & Environmental Services will ensure recommended levels have been reached prior to occupancy clearance.

Temporary Increase in Noise Levels (Impact NSE 2)

NSE 2-1 Construction activity for site preparation and for future development shall be limited to the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. No construction shall occur on State holidays (e.g. Christmas, Thanksgiving, Memorial Day, 4th of July, Labor Day). Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions.

Plan Requirements and Timing: Two signs stating these restrictions shall be provided by the applicant and posted on site prior to commencement of construction. The signs shall be in place prior to beginning of and throughout all grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits.

Monitoring: City staff shall spot to verify compliance and/or respond to complaints.

NSE 2-2 The applicant shall notify sensitive receptors and contiguous property owners with a preliminary construction activity schedule in advance of any and all construction activities. The construction manager's (or representative's)

telephone number shall also be provided with the notification so that community concerns can be communicated.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The applicant shall submit a copy of the construction activity schedule, mailing list, and proof of mailing to the City of Goleta prior to initiation of any earth movement.

Monitoring: The City of Goleta shall site inspect to ensure compliance in the field during construction and respond to complaints.

Residual Impact

With implementation of the required mitigation measures, the residual project specific and project contribution to cumulative Noise impacts would be less than significant.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			✓		
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓	
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓	

Existing Setting

The City's population in 2005 was 30,679, which was approximately 7.3 percent of the County's population.[7] Upon build-out of the General Plan to the year 2030, the City's population is expected to reach 38,100. In 2000 the estimated average household size was 2.99 persons.

[7] City of Goleta GP/CLUP Final EIR, Section 3.8 *Population and Housing.*

In January 2005 there were an estimated 11,486 housing units within the City. Upon full build-out, in accordance with its General Plan, the City will have zoned areas for an additional 3,880 residential units (a 33 percent increase over the 2005 conditions), which will include 480 single-family units and 3,400 multi-family units, a greater proportion of multi-family units to single family units than exists currently. Pursuant to requirements for the City to contribute to regional housing needs, the City must zone for an additional 2,388 dwelling units by June 30, 2009. The General Plan identifies vacant sites available for development of approximately 3,681 dwelling units, while sites that may be subject to redevelopment and include a residential component may make up the remaining balance. It is estimated that the additional residential development provided for in the General Plan would result in an increase in population of approximately 7,420 persons.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

The proposed project would result in the addition of 11 multi-family residential units of two and three bedroom variations. Based on an average of 2.65 people per attached unit, persons per household for these housing types, the project would allow the City to accommodate housing needs for an additional 30 people. Therefore, the project would induce population growth. However, since this project site is identified as a vacant site with a General Plan designation of multi-family residential, this increase in population is accounted for within the estimates anticipated under build-out of the City's General Plan and environmental impacts were considered within the General Plan Final EIR. With the addition of housing supply, the project would result in a beneficial impact with respect to a reduction in the City's overall jobs:housing ratio. Impacts related to population growth inducement are less than significant.

Since the project involves an increase to the City's housing supply and would be constructed on existing vacant land, there would be no impacts relative to the displacement of existing housing or people.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would contribute to the population growth of the City and the region. However, the population growth has been forecasted in planning documents (e.g. the City General Plan), and is consistent with the land use designation for housing types and numbers. Therefore, the project's cumulative population and housing impacts would be less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Since there are no potentially significant population and housing impacts expected as a result of the project, no mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

The project's residual population and housing impacts would be less than significant.

PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Existing Setting

Fire Protection

Fire protection services for the City of Goleta are provided by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD). SBCFD serves a population of approximately 165,000 individuals within 1,441 square miles of unincorporated and incorporated territory. Services are provided by six fire stations in the Goleta Valley area, three of which are located within City of Goleta limits: Stations 11, 12, and 14. In combination, these three stations serve approximately 44,177 individuals.[8]

[8] City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, adopted October 2, 2006.

The GP/CLUP employs three standards with respect to the provision of fire protection services, which include:

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

The General Plan requires that new development provide two routes of ingress and egress but allows for a waiver of this requirement when secondary access cannot be provided and maintenance of fire safety standards are ensured by other means (PF 3.4.a.). The policy also states that all private roads that provide access to structures served by the SBCFD shall be constructed at a minimum to the Department's standards (PF 3.4.b.).

Police Protection

The Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department (SBCSD) provides police protection services within the City limits under contract to the City of Goleta. The SBCSD protects an area of 2,744 square miles with over 189,000 citizens. The City of Goleta is divided into three patrol units (beats), and one police car is assigned to each area, and is supplemented by County Deputies during an emergency.[9] City of Goleta police operate from three locations: the City of Goleta offices, an office located in Old Town on Hollister Avenue and the other located at the Camino Real Marketplace. The City of Goleta police also use facilities at the SBCSD headquarters located in the unincorporated area between Turnpike Road and El Sueno Road. The SBCSD headquarters houses the Goleta Valley Bureau at 4434 Calle Real. The SBCSD has 300 employees, with 34 sworn deputies employed at the Calle Real Station.[10] This station services a population of approximately 30,000.

Schools

The elementary school that serves the project site is the Brandon Elementary School. The SBHSD secondary schools that serve the site are Goleta Valley Junior High School and Dos Pueblos High School. **Table PS-1** provides current enrollment and capacity levels for each of the schools. As shown, all of the schools that serve the project site are currently operating below capacity.

[9] City of Goleta, General Plan, Section 3.12-1, adopted October 2, 2006.
[10] Written correspondence from Lieutenant Chris Pappas of the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department dated May 26, 2006.

Table PS-1
Existing Enrollment and Capacity

School	Enrollment	Capacity	Capacity Utilization
Brandon Elementary School	421	575	73.2%
Goleta Valley Junior High School	907	1,269	71.5%
Dos Pueblos High School	2,257	2,565	88.0%

Sources: Personal communication with Ralph Patrick, Goleta Union School District, July 25, 2008. Written Communication from David Hetyonk, Director of Facilities & Operation, Santa Barbara School District, March 14, 2006. www.goleta.k12.ca.us, www.schooldigger.com/go/CA/schools/1551006622/school.aspx

Parks

A more detailed discussion of parks is provided below under *Recreation*. The City currently contains approximately 16 acres of public parks. City parks are considered in combination with open space to provide recreational opportunities and encompass approximately 526 acres, and an existing ratio of 17 acres per 1,000 residents.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Public Services would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* includes thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools. Specifically, under these thresholds any project that would generate enough students to generate the need for an additional classroom using current State standards, would be considered to result in a significant impact on area schools.[11]

Project Specific Impacts

Fire Protection

The proposed project would develop 11 condominium units. Based on a County average of 2.65 people per attached unit,[12] the project would generate an increased City population of approximately 30 people. Fire Station No. 11, located near Storke Road, south of Hollister Avenue at 6901 Frey Way, is the primary station serving the project site and is within the five minute response time. The ratio of service (population/firefighter) for Station No. 11 is 7,198, which exceeds the maximum acceptable level of 4,000. With the addition of the proposed project, this ratio would

[11] Current State standards for classroom size are as follows:
Grade K-2—20 students/classroom; Grade 3-8—29 students/classroom; Grades 9-12—28 students/classroom
[12] City of Goleta *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, October 2002, Page 162.

increase to 7,208. To account for increases in population with under build-out of the General Plan, the Plan includes provisions for an additional fire station (Station No. 10) and fire personnel, which would reduce the Fire Protection service ratio to within acceptable levels. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to the need to construct new facilities. The General Plan has identified a two-acre site in western Goleta. Per Policy PF 3.3 of the Plan, the project would be required to contribute its fair share of impact fees toward the station development.

The proposed project plans incorporate design features to allow for adequate fire protection in accordance with the County Fire Department's requirements. The project includes features that prohibit parking within the fire lane access-way, maintaining a width of 24 feet, and a "hammerhead" type turnaround at the rear of the access-way. The Fire Department has reviewed the proposed project. With respect to the width of access to the project off Calle Real, in a letter dated April 5, 2005 the Fire Department explains that design of the proposed project with all of the garages oriented towards the accessway assures that parking cannot occur in the fire lane access-way. Due to the units being two-story (and not three-story) ground ladders can reach the roof at the proper angle of inclination. Based on these two conditions the Fire Department will accept the 24-foot proposed access-way. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to fire protection services.

Police Protection

The City's General Plan provides an estimate that a population of increase of 7,500 individuals from build-out of the General Plan would result in the need to hire 7 to 10 police additional officers over time. As a part of this anticipated growth, the proposed project would contribute approximately 30 people. The standard police officer to population ratio ranges from one officer for every 750 individuals to one officer for every 1,071 individuals. Since the proposed project is expected to generate approximately 30 individuals, it would not by itself generate the need to add an additional officer to the SBCSD, but would contribute to the anticipated future need for additional police officers associated with City-wide growth.

It is estimated that a minimum of 400 square feet of police administrative center space is required per 1,000 in population. The proposed project's demand for police protection services would not by itself result in the need a new physical facility and therefore would not result in a significant impact at a project level. Although the project would contribute to the potential future need for new police administrative space, there are currently no plans for construction of a new facility. Therefore, the potential for associated physical impacts is speculative at this point in time. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact associated with an additional police facility.

Schools

To estimate the number of students added to the District from new residential units, the District utilizes the student generation factors shown in **Table PS-2**.

Table PS-2
GUSD and SBHSD Student Generation

School	Generation Factor (Students/ Unit[1])	Number of Units	Number of Students Generated by Project	Fall 2007-2008 Enrollment Plus Project	Percent Capacity Utilization with Project
Brandon Elementary School	0.2	11	3	427	74.3
Goleta Valley Junior High School	0.04	11	1	815	64.2
Dos Pueblos High School	0.05	11	1	2366	92.2

As noted above in Table PS-2, the project would generate five students for the Elementary, Junior High and Senior High Schools. This number of school aged children to potentially live in the proposed units would have no adverse impact on enrollment. This projected increase is considered a less than significant impact on schools.

Parks

The project specific and cumulative impacts related to parks are discussed below under *Recreation*.

Other Public Facilities
The project is not expected to result in impacts to other public facilities not listed above.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would make no measurable contribution to cumulative impacts on fire or police protective services or the demand for parks and other public facilities and services.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

The project would not result in significant project level or cumulative impacts to public services. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

The project's residual public services impacts would be less than significant.

RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			✓		
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			✓		

Existing Setting

According to the General Plan inventory of existing parks and open space, as of 2005, the City contains approximately 526 acres of parkland and open space areas available for recreational purposes. The 526 acres equates to approximately 17 acres of recreational area per 1,000 residents.

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific Impacts

The proposed project would include a "tot lot" at the western portion of the property, north of Building B as shown in Figure 1. At the eastern portion of the site, the project would include a BBQ and picnic area with landscaping (also shown in Figures 1 and 6). As provided in Figure 3.10-3 of the City of Goleta GP/CLUP Final EIR, there are several existing neighborhood open space areas, neighborhood parks, and community parks within the vicinity (i.e. one mile) of the project that could accommodate local recreational demands of the project residents. Given the available supply of recreational facilities, the small number of residents added to the area as a result of the proposed project (30

people), and the project's provision for on-site recreational facilities, the project's recreation impacts are considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project in combination with other proposed residential uses within the City would increase the City's population resulting in a cumulative increase in impacts to the City's recreational capacity. Given the small number of residents added to the area as a result of the proposed project (30 people) and the project's provision for on-site recreational facilities, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts are considered less than significant**.**

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Since there are no significant project specific or cumulative impacts, no mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impact

The proposed project's residual recreation impacts would be less than significant.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			✓		
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard 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. Result in inadequate parking capacity?		✓			
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?		✓			

Existing Setting

The property is located near the northeast corner of the intersection of Calle Real and Ellwood Station Road in northwest Goleta. The site is within a developed residential and commercial area and is bound on three sides by urban development, including condominiums to the north and east, Calle Real, U.S. Highway 101 and the Union Pacific railroad right of way to the south, and Padre Shopping Center, including a Citgo gas station, 7-Eleven convenience store, and one and two-story commercial buildings to the west. The street network generally affected by the project is bound by Ellwood

Station Road to the west, Calle Real to the south, and Glen Annie/Storke Roads to the east.

At the project location, Calle Real has one eastbound through lane, one westbound through lane, and one westbound right lane. The existing north curb face of Calle Real is aligned with the adjacent properties to the east and west of the project site. No curb cuts or westbound bike lane exist along the project frontage on Calle Real. The nearest MTD bus stops are located on Ellwood Station Road.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Transportation/Traffic would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds of significance are set forth in the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* and include the following:

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

LEVEL OF SERVICE (including the project)	INCREASE IN V/C (greater than)
A	.20
B	.15
C	.10
OR THE ADDITION OF	
D	15 trips
E	10 trips
F	5 trips

2) Project access to a major road or arterial road would require a driveway that would create an unsafe situation or a new traffic signal or major revisions to an existing traffic signal.

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

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

Project Specific Impacts

a). The applicant's consulting traffic engineer (Orosz Engineering Group, Inc.) submitted a traffic analysis dated March 8, 2005 comparing the potential impacts identified for the previously approved El Encanto Apartment project and the proposed project. This analysis concluded that there would be a net decrease in trip generation for the proposed project when compared to the previously approved project. However, since traffic analyses must be conducted relative to the existing undeveloped baseline conditions at the site, the site specific traffic analyses for this project were quantitatively and qualitatively developed by City staff.

The site specific trip generation estimates for the new traffic which would be generated by the proposed project when compared to the baseline or undeveloped site were calculated based on average trip generation rates provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Report (Seventh Edition). Using the ITE average trip generation rates for residential condominium/townhouse, the project is estimated to generate a net total of 65 new average daily trips (ADT; 5.86 trips per DU) and 6 P.M. peak hour trips (0.52 trips per DU).

Table TR-1 shows the existing P.M. peak hour study area intersections. Potential project impacts to these study area intersections were evaluated by considering the existing LOS, the potential new project trips that could be oriented through these intersections, and the amount of project trips that could result in an impact based on City thresholds. As shown in the table below, the study area intersections are currently operating in the LOS B-C range during the P.M. peak hour. Even if all of the P.M. peak hour project trips were oriented through each of these intersections, the project traffic would not be great enough to cause any significant impacts based on City impact thresholds. And since the project traffic will become more disbursed at the intersections farther from the project site, it can be surmised that the project will not cause any significant impacts to any intersections within the study area. Project specific impacts on all intersection operations within the project travelshed would therefore be considered to be adverse but less than significant.

Table TR-1
Existing P.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service

Intersection	Existing LOS	V/C
Glen Annie Road/US-101 NB Ramps	B	0.651
Storke Road/US-101 SB Ramps	C	0.727
Storke Road/Hollister Avenue	C	0.774

b). Per the Santa Barbara County Association of Government's (SBCAG) Guidelines, a Congestion Management Analysis should be conducted to identify potential impacts to the Congestion Management Program (CMP) system if total trip generation exceeds 50 peak hour trips or 500 daily trips. A significant impact to the City's CMP system may occur if:

i. any roadway or intersection currently operating at LOS A or B decreases operational levels by two levels of service as a result of project added traffic;
ii. any roadway or intersection operating at LOS C for which project added traffic results in LOS D or worse;
iii. intersections on the CMP system with existing congestion experience the following as a result of project implementation:

LOS	Added Peak Hour Trips
D	20 trips
E	10 trips
F	10 trips

In this particular instance, additional traffic volumes resulting from the proposed project would be below both of the City's initial screening levels. Therefore, the project's addition of approximately 6 P.M. peak hour trips would not be considered to pose either a project specific, significant impact or significant contribution to cumulative impacts on the City's CMP system.

c) The proposed project lies outside of any airport approach or clear zone and would have no impact on air traffic patterns.

d). At the project location, Calle Real has one eastbound through lane, one westbound through lane, and one westbound right lane. The existing north curb face of Calle Real is aligned with the adjacent properties to the east and west of the project site. One curb cut would be created to access the site but would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. Impacts would be considered to be less than significant.

e) Access to the site is proposed via one two-way driveway, proposed to be 24 feet wide, taken directly from Calle Real. The Fire Department has determined that the proposed 24-foot wide driveway with hammerhead turnaround would allow proper emergency access to the parcel as long as there is no parking along the main drive aisle and "no parking" signage and red curbs are installed. Unless these standards are maintained, emergency vehicle access would be considered deficient and as such pose a potentially significant emergency vehicle access impact (**Impact TR 1**).

f) *Long Term Parking*
The Article III, Division 6 Parking Regulations require two spaces per dwelling unit for two-bedroom dwellings, 2.5 spaces per dwelling unit for three or more bedroom dwellings, and one visitor parking space per five dwelling units. The proposed project includes ten 3-bedroom dwellings and one 2-bedroom dwelling. Therefore, 30 spaces for the eleven residential units would be required per the zoning ordinance. The proposal would be one space short of meeting the zoning ordinance requirement by providing 29 parking spaces. However, the proposed project includes a request for application of State Density Bonus Law (Government Code §65915 *et. seq)* relative to the granting of incentives for the provision of two affordable units. Specifically, the proposal includes a request for a modification to the number of parking spaces required pursuant to Government Code §65915(p)(1)(b) which requires two parking spaces for each 2 and 3-bedroom units (inclusive of handicap accessible and visitor spaces). This standard would result in the requirement for 22 spaces, and the 29 spaces proposed would exceed the requirement by seven spaces.

Short Term Construction Parking
Vehicular access to the project site for construction activities and workers is only available from Calle Real. There is no available vehicular parking along the section of Calle Real fronting the project site. Because construction activities often conflict with onsite construction vehicle parking, such vehicles may have to be parked offsite for significant amounts of time. While offsite parking in the near vicinity is available, it is not on land owned by the applicant. As such, demand for construction related vehicle parking either on or offsite is considered to pose a potentially significant, short term parking impact (**Impact TR 2**).

g) The project would not adversely affect any existing or planned bus stops in the area. The site is within close proximity to bus service (MTD Line 23) along at Ellwood Station making public transportation access to the project feasible for residents. The enclosed garages could provide bike parking space for residents. Additionally, the project proposes a bike parking area north of the tot lot. However, no bike lane exists along the project frontage on Calle Real. As such, two mitigation measures are recommended to encourage use of alternative transportation and reduce project trip generation.

Cumulative Impacts

No intersections within the project's travelshed would experience a significant change from cumulative to cumulative + project conditions as a result of project implementation. The project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts in the City would be addressed by payment of the required traffic development impact mitigation fees. As such, under the City's thresholds, project contributions to cumulative traffic conditions at area intersections would be considered to be less than significant.

Required Mitigation Measures

Emergency Access (Impact TR 1)

TR 1-1 To prevent parking along the main drive aisle and maintain emergency vehicle access, the applicant shall paint the rolled curbs red and install "no parking" signage.

Plan Requirements & Timing: The design of this signage shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department and City staff prior to approval of a Land Use Permit. These signs shall be installed at locations approved by the Fire Department prior to occupancy clearance.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance prior to approval of a Land Use Permit and prior to occupancy clearance.

Short Term Construction Parking (Impact TR-2)

TR 2-1 Construction vehicle parking and/or staging of construction equipment or materials, including vehicles of construction personnel, is prohibited along both Calle Real and Ellwood Station Road.

Plan Requirements & Timing: The applicant shall prepare a construction vehicle parking plan, including provisions for construction personnel parking and construction equipment/materials staging, for both on and offsite locations in the vicinity of the project site the precludes the need for any construction related parking or equipment/materials staging on either Calle Real or Ellwood Station Road. Said plan shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to approval of any Land Use Permit for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall periodically monitor in the field to verify compliance throughout all construction activities.

Alternative Transportation

The following measures are recommended to further encourage use of alternative transportation and reduce project trip generation.

TR 3-1 A total of five (5) bike parking spaces shall be provided. Bicycle racks shall be the "Inverted U" type in compliance with the SBCAG Traffic Solutions recommended bicycle rack. Minor adjustment in bicycle parking locations may be approved by the Planning and Environmental Services Department.

Implementation and Timing. Final plans showing bicycle parking locations and type shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta prior to approval of a Land Use Permit.

Monitoring. The City of Goleta shall perform site inspections to ensure implementation according to approved plan prior to the first occupancy clearance.

TR 3-2 Calle Real shall be re-striped to include an eastbound and westbound bike lane from the east side of the project through Ellwood Station Road as approved by the City Engineer.

Implementation and Timing. Final plans showing the re-striping plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta Community Services Department prior to approval of a Land Use Permit.

Monitoring. The City of Goleta shall perform site inspections to ensure implementation according to approved plan prior to the first occupancy clearance.

Residual Impact

With implementation of these mitigation measures, residual project specific Transportation/Traffic impacts would be considered less than significant.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

Existing Setting

Wastewater Treatment

The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) provides sewer service in the project area. Sewage travels along gravity fed collection sewers to a main trunk line. The trunk line terminates at the GWSD pump house located on the UCSB campus Lot 32, at which point the waste is transferred via a pressurized line running parallel to the Santa Barbara Airport, to the Goleta Sanitary District's (GSD) treatment plant located on

William Moffet Place next to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport[13]. Treatment of wastewater collected by GWSD is provided through a contract with the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD). The GSD treatment plant has a capacity of 9.7 million gallons per day (based on average daily flow) but is currently limited to 7.64 million gallons per day under a National Pollutant discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the US environmental Protection Agency with concurrence from the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Disposal of treated effluent is by ocean outfall offshore from Goleta Beach under its agreement with GSD. GWSD is allocated 40.78 percent of the capacity at the sewage treatment plant, which equates to about 3.12 million gallons per day. GWSD currently generates approximately 1.71 mgd of sewage that is treated at the GSD plant, resulting in about 1.41 mgd of remaining capacity in the GWSD's existing system.[14]

Drainage Facilities

The area of the project is urbanized and contains storm drain systems along Calle Real. Runoff is then directed to El Encanto Creek to the southeast and is then channeled to the Devereux Slough. Adjacent properties have drainage facilities on-site that convey storm water runoff to the appropriate channels.

Water Supply

The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water purveyor for the City of Goleta. The GWD currently has four sources of water: surface water from the Lake Cachuma Project; surface water from the State Water Project; ground water from the Goleta basin; and recycled water. These sources delivered an estimated 15,300 AFY to the GWD in 2005 and together are expected to be able to provide approximately 17,670 Acre Feet per Year (AFY) to the GWD through the year 2030.[15]

The Lake Cachuma Project provides approximately 9,320 AFY, the State Water Project provides approximately 4,500 AFY, ground water sources provide approximately 2,350 AFY, and recycled water facilities provide up to 1,500 AFY.[16] The GWD rights to ground water were adjudicated in a lawsuit that was filed in 1973 *Wright v. Goleta Water District* and finally settled in 1989. "The Wright Judgment" stipulated a safe ground water yield from the ground water basin of 3,410 AFY and gave the GWD rights to 2,350 of that amount based on a ten-year average.[17]

[13] Personal communication with Diane Powers, Goleta West Sanitary District, October 2006.
[14] City of Goleta General Plan FEIR, September 2006, page 3.12-5.
[15] Urban Water Management Plan: Goleta Water District, Final December 20, 2005, Section 3 "Water Sources." Available at www.goletawater.com as of 1/26/05.
[16] Ibid.
[17] City of Goleta, General Plan Report: Water, 3/26/04, p. 9.

Landfill Capacity and Solid Waste

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

The 80-acre Tajiguas Landfill, located 26 miles west of Santa Barbara, has a permitted capacity of 23.3 million cubic yards and is permitted to operate through 2020. The South Coast recycling and transfer Station processes 550 tons of waste per day.[18]

Thresholds of Significance

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

Project Specific and Cumulative Impacts

Wastewater Treatment

The project would connect to an existing 10-inch diameter sewer main under Calle Real. The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) would collect wastewater generated by the project's 11 condominiums and convey it to the GSD's main treatment plant. Based on an average sewage generation rate of 184 gallons per day per household[19], the proposed project's 11 units would generate 2,024 gallons per day (or 0.002 mgd) of wastewater. As described above, the GWSD has 1.41 mgd of remaining allocated capacity at the GSD treatment plant. The quantity of wastewater generated by the proposed project would not exceed either the GSD's or GWSD's sewage collection and treatment capacity. However, the applicant has yet to provide a District Sewer Service Connection Permit from the GWSD to ensure its capacity can be utilized. Until such a commitment is given by the GWSD, a final determination as to the availability of central sewer service by the GWSD to serve the proposed project cannot be made. As such,

[18] City of Goleta City of Goleta General Plan FEIR, page 3.12-5.
[19] City of Goleta General Plan FEIR, page 3.12-5.

the proposed project poses a potentially significant impact on the availability and adequacy of sewage disposal service (**Impact WW 1**).

Storm Water Drainage Facilities

The project would construct surface water drainage facilities on-site that would connect to existing off-site drainage facilities on Calle Real. The physical impacts of this construction are within the envelope of the entire project. Surface runoff is then directed west to El Encanto Creek and ultimately discharges into the Devereux Slough. Although the project would increase the amount of impermeable surface, which could increase the amount of surface water runoff, the off-site conveyance facilities would not require improvements to increase capacity. Therefore, the project would not result in the need for construction of new storm water drainage facilities off-site that would create significant environmental effects. Impacts as a result of storm drainage facilities are considered less than significant.

Water Supply

The 11 condominiums would use approximately 2.2 AFY[20] of water. This represents approximately 0.014 percent of the water received by GWD in 2005,[21] approximately 0.013 percent of the water available to the GWD in the near future,[22] and between 0.09 and 0.07 percent of the expected increase in water demand over the next twenty years in the area served by the GWD.[23] Given these projections, the GWD has sufficient supply to service this project. However, the applicant has yet to provide a Can & Will Serve letter from the GWD. Until such a commitment is given by the GWD, a final determination as to the availability of central water service by the GWD to serve the proposed project cannot be made. As such, the proposed project poses a potentially significant impact on the availability and adequacy of central water service (**Impact WS 1**).

The project also would not contribute to groundwater overdraft as no wells are proposed onsite. Projects served by the GWD would not cause or contribute to groundwater basin overdraft pursuant to the requirements of the Wright vs. Goleta Water District judgment.

[20] (11 multi-family residential units x 0.20 AFY = 2.2 AFY for the project) See, City of Goleta, General Plan Report: Water, 3/26/04, p. 30-31, for use of 0.20 AFY in projected water demand for multi-family residential units.
[21] See above, the GWD estimated that they received 15,300 AFY in 2005 (11/15,300).
[22] See above, the GWD estimated that they will be able to receive 17,600 AFY for the next 25 years (11/17,600).
[23] The GWD estimates an increase in water demand between 2,500 and 3,300 AFY over the next 20 years. (11 / 3,300) and (11/2,500) See, City of Goleta, General Plan Report: Water, 3/26/04, p. 30.

Solid Waste

Based on the County's averages of 2.65 people per attached residential unit, and the County's solid waste generation rate of 0.95 tons per year per resident, the proposed project's residential units would generate approximately 27.69 tons per year.

The quantity of solid waste to be disposed of at landfills (non-recycled waste) is typically estimated at 50 percent of the total solid waste generation. The non-recycled waste from the proposed project is therefore estimated at 13.85 tons per year. This amount does not exceed the City's project specific threshold of 196 tons per year.[24] Therefore, the proposed project's specific impact on solid waste disposal capacity at the Tajiguas Landfill would be considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Although project level impacts are considered less than significant, cumulative increases in solid waste generation ultimately lead to reduced landfill capacity over time. However, project generation of 27.69 tons per year is below the City thresholds of 40 tons per year as a significant contribution to cumulative impacts.[25] Therefore, impacts related to solid waste generation are considered less than significant from a cumulative standpoint. Although not required, mitigation has been provided to reduce solid waste generation.

Required Mitigation Measures

Wastewater Treatment (Impact WW 1)

WW 1-1: The applicant shall obtain a Sewer Service Connection Permit from the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD).

Plan Requirements & Timing: The applicant shall obtain the Sewer Service Connection Permit from the GWSD and submit it to City staff prior to map recordation.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance prior to map recordation.

Water Supply (Impact WS 1)

WS 1-1:` The applicant shall obtain a Can & Will Serve letter from the Goleta Water District (GWD).

[24] City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds Guidelines Manual, October 2002
[25] City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds Guidelines Manual, October 2002

Plan Requirements & Timing: The required Can & Will Serve letter from the GWD shall be submitted to the City prior to map recordation.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance prior to map recordation.

Solid Waste

The following measures are recommended to further reduce the less than significant contribution to cumulative solid waste impacts to the maximum extent feasible:

SW 1-1: The applicant shall develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Program. A letter from the trash/recycle hauler stating that they can provide pickup for individual units shall be required. The program shall identify the amount of waste generation projected during processing of the project. The program shall include the following measures, but is not limited to those measures:

Construction Only

a. Development of a Source Reduction Plan ("SRP"), describing the recommended program(s) and the estimated reduction of the solid waste disposed by the project. For example, the SRP may include a description of how fill will be used on the construction site, instead of sending excess fill material to a landfill, or a detailed set of office procedures such as use of duplex copy machines and purchase of office supplies with recycled content.
b. Implementation of a program to purchase materials that have recycled content for project construction and/or operation (i.e., plastic lumber, office supplies, etc.). The program could include requesting suppliers to show recycled materials content. To ensure compliance, the applicant shall develop an integrated solid waste management program, including recommended source reduction, recycling, composting programs, and/or a combination of such programs, subject to City staff review and approval prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy

Residential Only

a. Provision of at least 50% space and/or bins for the storage of recyclable materials within the project site;
b. Implementation of a curbside recycling program to serve the development;
c. Development of a plan for accessible collection of materials on a regular basis;
d. Implementation of a backyard composting yard waste reduction program.
e. Implementation of a green waste source reduction program focusing on recycling of all green waste generated onsite.

Plan Requirement and Timing: The applicant shall provide a letter from the trash/recycle hauler prior to approval of a land use permit. The applicant shall submit the Solid Waste Management Program to City staff for review and approval prior to approval of any LUP for the project. Program components shall be implemented prior to occupancy clearance and throughout the life of the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall site inspect during construction and prior to occupancy to ensure solid waste management components are established and implemented. Once the project is occupied, the developer and homeowners association shall be responsible for implementation of the Solid Waste Management Program. City staff shall inspect the site periodically to verify compliance with the Solid Waste Management Program. The developer shall be responsible for funding such inspections through a permit compliance account to be established with the City to verify compliance with all project conditions of approval.

SW 1-2: A Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan (WRRP) shall be submitted to the Community Services Department for review and approval. Said plan shall indicate how a 50% diversion goal shall be met during construction. Demolition and/or excess construction materials shall be separated onsite for reuse/recycling or proper disposal (e.g., concrete asphalt). During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials and brush shall be provided onsite. The applicant/property owner shall contract with a City approved hauler to facilitate the recycling of all construction recoverable/recyclable material. (Copy of contract to be provided to the City.) Recoverable construction material shall include but not be limited to asphalt, lumber, concrete, glass, metals, and drywall. At the end of the project, applicant shall submit a Post-Construction Waste Reduction & Recycling Summary Report documenting the types and amounts of materials that were generated during the project and how much was reused, recycled, composted, salvaged, or landfilled.

Plan Requirements and Timing: This requirement shall be printed on the grading and construction plans submitted for approval of any building, grading, or Land Use Permit. The permittee shall provide receipts for recycled materials or for separate bins to City staff on a monthly basis. Materials shall be recycled as necessary throughout construction. All materials shall be recycled prior to occupancy clearance. Materials shall be recycled as necessary throughout all phases of construction.

Monitoring: City staff shall review receipts on a monthly basis and conduct periodic site visits to verify compliance in the field until completion of project construction.

SW 1-3: To prevent construction and/or employee trash from blowing offsite, covered receptacles shall be provided onsite prior to commencement of any grading or construction activities. Waste shall be picked up on a daily basis and receptacles emptied on a weekly basis or more frequently as directed by City staff.

Plan Requirements and Timing: Prior to any Land Use Permit approval for the project, the applicant shall designate and provide to Planning & Environmental Services the name and phone number of a contact person(s) to monitor trash/waste and organize clean-up crews. Additional covered receptacles shall be provided as determined necessary by City staff. This requirement shall be noted on all plans. Trash control shall occur throughout all grading and construction activities.

Monitoring: City staff shall inspect periodically throughout all grading and construction activities to verify compliance.

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative impacts on Utilities & Service Systems, would be considered less than significant.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		✓			
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?			✓		
c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			✓		
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		✓			

ADDENDUM
DATED MARCH 18, 2009
TO THE CITRUS VILLAGE PROJECT
FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (007-MND-004)
CASE NO. 04-226-TM, -DP
7388 CALLE REAL, APN 077-490-043

A. LOCATION

The Citrus Village project site is located at 7388 Calle Real (APN 077-490-043). The property includes 0.94 acres situated near the northeast corner of the intersection of Calle Real and Ellwood Station Road in western Goleta.

B. BACKGROUND

Mitigated Negative Declaration

A Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (Draft MND) was prepared by Envicom Corporation under contract to the City of Goleta for the originally proposed 11-unit project. The Draft MND was circulated for public review between December 21, 2007 and January 22, 2008. A Final MND was prepared by Envicom Corporation under contract to the City of Goleta and was released on August 15, 2008.

The project was subsequently revised to delete requested General Plan Amendments to Land Use Element Policy LU 1.10, Multifamily Residential Development; the Land Use Element Table 2-1, Allowable Uses and Standards for Residential Use Categories; and the Conservation Element Policy CE 10.3, Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management. Two affordable units were also removed from the proposal, reducing the total unit count to nine market rate units, thereby eliminating the request for application of State Density Bonus Law and the associated granting of concessions related to the provision of affordable units. Site drainage was modified based on the revised site plan.

City of Goleta Planning Commission Review

On August 25, 2008, the Planning Commission reviewed the revised nine unit project and voted to continue the item to September 8, 2008, with direction to the applicant to submit a redesign which addressed concerns related to, among other things, affordable units, compatibility with adjacent uses, lighting, and parking. At the September 8, 2008 hearing, the Planning Commission directed the applicant to move forward with consideration of a 12 unit alternative plan, to include review by the Design Review Board (DRB) with the ability for the applicant and DRB to consider a 10 unit alternative plan if the 12 unit alternative plan is found to be problematic during the review process, and continued the item to the November 10, 2008 Planning Commission hearing. At the November 10, 2008 hearing, the Planning Commission expressed support for moving the 12 unit alternative plan forward with direction to install story poles at the site and continued the item for further review at a special meeting of the Planning Commission on January 26, 2009. At the January 26, 2009 hearing the item was taken off calendar to be rescheduled at a later date because the story pole installation had been delayed. Story poles were installed onsite from January 27 to January 29, 2009.

The current 12 unit proposal includes two moderate income affordable units and a request for application of State Density Bonus Law including one concession.

C. ADDENDUM

The revised project is reviewed in this addendum to the Final MND as per California Environmental Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15164. CEQA Section 15164 allows an addendum to be prepared when only minor technical changes or changes that do not create new significant impacts would result. Based on analysis contained herein, an Addendum is considered the appropriate environmental review for this project. This conclusion is based on the fact that all previously identified impacts will remain the same. There are no new significant impacts (i.e. no new Class I or Class II impacts) or an increase in severity of previously identified impacts (i.e. a Class III impact has not become a Class II or Class I impact; a Class II impact has not become a Class I impact). State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 provides that an addendum need not be circulated for public review, but can be included in, or attached to, the Final MND. The Guidelines further provide that the Planning Commission must consider the addendum together with the Final MND prior to taking action to approve the project.

D. REVISED PROJECT

The originally proposed 11 unit project has been revised as follows:

1. General Plan Amendment: the proposed General Plan Amendments (04-226-GPA) to Land Use Element Policy LU 1.10, the Land Use Element Table 2-1, and the Conservation Element Policy CE 10.3 have been deleted. The proposed change to LU 1.10, Multifamily Residential Development, is not necessary, as the applicable land use designation for the subject property is Planned Residential; LU 1.10 simply does not apply to the subject property. The proposed change to Table 2-1, Allowable Uses and Standards for Residential Use Categories, regarding standards for building intensity, has been deleted as a result of the City's adoption of changes in June 2008 to make such standards recommended and to allow changes to the standards based upon a finding of good cause (Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Track 2 Amendments). The proposed change to CE 10.3, Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management, has been deleted as a result of the City's adoption of changes to the policy with approval of the Village at Los Carneros project in February 2008.

2. Final Development Plan: The total number of units has been increased to 12 including two moderate income affordable units. The associated application of State Density Bonus Law to the project includes a request for a concession granting relief from the required private outdoor space to allow approximately 10%-15% of the gross floor area of the residence served, rather than the 20% required. Based on the revised site plan for 12 units, site drainage has been modified to allow for detention of the stormwater runoff difference from the pre-development condition to the post-development condition for a 25-year storm event. Finally, with the revised layout, the Fire Department no longer requires a road naming and the units would have Calle Real addresses.

The revised project continues to include the following applications:

Vesting Tentative Tract Map (04-226-TM):

Per proposed Tentative Tract Map 32,027, the project would include a one lot subdivision of the 0.94-acre property for airspace condominium purposes. The proposed map is attached.

Final Development Plan (04-226-DP):

The revised project includes a request to allow the construction of 12 residential condominiums within three 3-story structures arranged along the east side of the property and oriented towards the Brookside residential condominium development to the east (Buildings A-C). The maximum height would be 33'6". Each unit would include a detached 248 gross square foot single car garage separated from the rear of each unit by private open space areas that range from 150-180 square feet. The total structural development including garages would be 20,772 gross square feet. The total building footprint would be 9,752 square feet (24% of the site). The project site plan depicting the layout of the proposed development is shown on Sheet A1.

Building A would contain three, 3-bedroom market rate units and one affordable 2-bedroom unit (1,059 – 1,613 gross square feet), Building B would contain four 3-bedroom market rate units (1,610 – 1,672 gross square feet), and Building C would contain two 3-bedroom market rate units (1,613 – 1,672 square feet), one affordable 2-bedroom unit (980 square feet), and one 2-bedroom market rate unit (1,123 square feet). All units would have natural gas fireplaces. Floor plans for the units are shown on Sheets A4 – A6.

The architectural style is described as California Craftsman vernacular including hip roofs with exposed rafter tails, wooden brackets and gable pediment decoration, shutter and vinyl clad wood windows, canvas awnings, stone treatments, and built-up columns with cement plaster finishes. Building elevations showing the structural design are provided on Sheets A7 – A9 and site elevations are shown on Sheet A10. An aerial view of the proposed project and photo-realistic perspectives are shown on Sheets A11 – A12.

Access and Parking

A single access to and from the condominiums would be provided from Calle Real. The minimum 24-foot wide drive aisle to the west of the garages would include a hammerhead turnaround for emergency vehicles near the tot lot between Buildings B and C. Parking would include 12 single car garage parking spaces and 24 uncovered spaces, most of which would be located along the western property boundary, for a total of 36 parking spaces. A common trash enclosure would be provided adjacent to these spaces across from Building B. The driveway and parking area would encompass and area of approximately 11,563 square feet (28% of the site). Parking spaces are depicted on Sheet A1.

The project would include an offer to dedicate back to the City an approximately 4,016 square foot right of way area along the Calle Real frontage for roadway purposes.

Grading and Drainage

The site would require approximately 1,720 cubic yards of cut and 50 cubic yards of fill, including 1,670 cubic yards of export. A 4' tall screen wall would be constructed along the southern property boundary, exclusive of the drive aisle entrance. A retaining wall and 5' screen wall would be constructed along the length of the western property boundary and the western portion of the northern property boundary the width of the

parking spaces and drive aisle. A 40" railing would run along side almost the entire length of the eastern property boundary between unit 2 in Building A to unit 12 in Building C. A 6' sound wall would be constructed on either side of the eastern entrance to the tot lot area. Storm water runoff would be directed to landscaped areas, bioswales, and the storm drains equipped with cleaning inserts for all catch basins. A detention basin is proposed south of Building A east of the drive aisle to retain the difference in the stormwater runoff from the pre-development condition to the post-development condition during a 25-year storm event. Swales that drain to drop inlets are proposed along the northern property boundary, between buildings, as well as along the western property which drains to the detention basin. The Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan is shown on Sheet C1.

Landscaping

A landscape plan for the site depicts a mixture of native, drought tolerant trees, shrubs and groundcovers. Project perimeter and internal landscaping is proposed to screen and soften views of the buildings. Landscaping would occur within the common open space areas as well as the private yards. Private landscaped yards would cover approximately 2,084 square feet of the site (5%). A preliminary Landscape Plan is depicted on Sheet A2.

Common open space would total approximately 17,344 square feet (42% of the site) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated back to the City for transportation purposes, and includes a tot-lot play area. Common open space is depicted on Sheet A3.

Modifications Requested

The proposal includes requests for modifications to certain standards of the Article III, Inland Zoning Ordinance, as follows:

- A modification for zero lot line on all attached units, rather than the 10 feet required. (Section 35-222.8.2).
- A modification from the required parking design to allow vehicles to encroach into the private street when backing out. (Section 35-262.3(d)).
- A modification from the required minimum perimeter landscaping to allow 6'6" rather than the 10 feet required. (Section 35-322.13.4)

Application of State Density Bonus Law

The proposed project includes a request for application of State Density Bonus Law (Government Code §65915 *et. seq)* relative to the granting of one incentive for the provision of two affordable units. The 11 condominium units with associated garages and common open space over 0.94 acres would result in a density of approximately 11.7 dwelling units per gross acre. With the addition of one density bonus unit, the density would be 12.77 dwelling units per gross acre, which exceeds the maximum allowed density of 12.3 dwelling units per gross acre in the zone district, but which is allowed under the State Density Bonus program. The proposal includes a request for granting of

one concession related to private outdoor patio area requirements per City Code §35-292(f).4(1), Density Bonus for Affordable Housing Projects, Development Incentives[1].

E. IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES ASSOCIATED WITH THE REVISED PROJECT

1. Aesthetics

One unit has been added, increasing the total number of units from 11 to 12. The change in number of units has resulted in a different proposed number and configuration of buildings onsite. The total number of residential buildings decreases from five of the originally proposed project, to three with the redesign. All buildings would be arranged along the east side of the property and oriented towards the adjacent residential condominium development rather than in a courtyard setting around a central drive aisle. Uncovered parking spaces would abut the entirety of the western property boundary leaving this area, along with the drive aisle open. Additionally, three detached garage buildings are added, separated from the rear of each unit by private open space areas. Each of these buildings would include four single car attached garages with a maximum height of 14 feet. The revised project includes an FAR of 0.51, exceeding the recommended FAR of 0.30 and while open space would increase on the site with the redesign from approximately 33% to 42%, the project may result in aesthetic impacts related to its perceived scale relative to adjacent development. The three–story residential structures would be 33 feet 6 inches, an increase of 3 feet 6 inches over the originally proposed two-story courtyard project, but below the zoning ordinance limit of 35 feet. Additional visual simulations with views from Calle Real and with the story poles superimposed were provided by the applicant and are attached.

Within the planned residential development adjacent to the southeasterly side of the project, the two-story residential building closest to Calle Real is set back approximately 120 feet from the street, 60' farther than the proposed residential structures. The first street-facing unit consists of a single story design element. The building pads of this adjacent development are situated at a slightly lower elevation nearest the street which descends gradually toward the interior of the project toward the rear and northerly side of the project site. The surfaces of the project site were previously raised and leveled with imported fill. The site plan shows the front, southeast corner of Building A to have a finished pad elevation approximately 5.5 feet higher than that of the nearest adjacent residential structure that is situated closest to the street. Along its western boundary the surface of the lot is at grade with that of the paved parking lot of the shopping center that abuts the site. The gas pump canopy of the gas station closest to Calle Real is set back approximately 45 feet from the curb and edge of pavement of the street, 15' closer than the proposed residential structures.

[1] A reduction in site development standards or a modification of zoning requirements, including but not limited to a reduction of the minimum open space requirement to 30%, allowing zero side yard setbacks throughout the development, building height, distance between buildings, setbacks, parking, building coverage, screening, or a reduction in architectural design requirements which exceed minimum building code standards.

The Calle Real frontage of the project site is 143.44-feet wide. With the combination of sidewalk and parkway strip widths, a 28-foot right-of-way for potential future use by the City of Goleta, and an additional 23-foot setback, the side wall of Building A facing the street would be set back approximately 64 feet. Therefore, the project would function as a transition between business uses and single and multi-family residential neighborhoods. Building A would have an effectual 21-foot setback from the easterly boundary with the adjacent planned residential development. The internal driveway access to the proposed project site provides a minimum 24-foot separation between the garages and the uncovered parking. As viewed from street level along Calle Real the combination of the side yard set back, the 24-foot wide interior access driveway, and the uncovered parking with landscaped perimeter would account for approximately 33 percent of the frontage width of the lot. Thus maintaining a view corridor through the parcel to the backdrop of the foothills and Santa Ynez Mountain skyline.

Project landscaping is an integral component of any development proposal to soften building masses, reinforce pedestrian scale, provide a transition between adjacent properties and provide screening along public streets. The project's Preliminary Landscaping Plan (Sheet A2) proposes large canopy trees around the perimeter of the site such as 24" boxed coast live oaks and jacarandas estimated to reach between 30-50 feet at maturity, and medium canopy trees along the western property boundary such as 24" boxed fruitless olives estimated to reach between 25-30 feet at maturity. Tall shrubs and large shrub massings including 5 gallon pittosporum, ceanothus, flannel bush, and bush anemone are proposed throughout the site. The planting plan includes four large canopy trees and three medium canopy trees within the open setback area between Calle Real and Building A. The plan indicates that the southeast property boundary near Building A would be landscaped with a large canopy tree and three medium flowering trees estimated to reach between 10-30 feet at maturity to visually screen the front half of the building from the neighboring uses and in westbound views from Calle Real. Toward the northeasterly side of the project site, an existing 195-foot long hedgerow (of tall Myoporum shrubs) would be left undisturbed and a large canopy tree and flowering trees would be added to further screen that portion of the development.

Prior to assurances that specific elements of the project such as landscaping that is appropriately sized and located to sufficiently screen and soften the visual impact of the buildings fronting Calle Real, as well as HVAC equipment and utility connections that are properly screened from view, the effect of the proposed project on neighborhood compatibility and the visual character of the surrounding area, including impacts to views of the site as one travels westward along Calle Real, would be considered potentially significant. There would be no changes to impacts on aesthetics described in the Final MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

Impact AES 1: *The proposed project would result in short-term aesthetic impacts during construction.* (Class II)

Impact AES 2: *The proposed project design including appropriately sized and located landscaping would be compatible with the surrounding development pending Final approval by the City of Goleta, including the Design Review Board.* (Class II)

Impact AES 3: *The proposed utilities and mechanical equipment would be properly screened from view pending Final approval by the City of Goleta, including the Design Review Board.* (Class II)

Impact AES 4: *The proposed project would result in night lighting and glare from structures, and the drive aisle and walkway illumination.* (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on aesthetics would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

AES 1-1, AES 2-1, AES 2-2, AES 2-3, AES 2-4, AES 3-1, AES 3-2, AES 4-1

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative aesthetic impacts would be considered less than significant.

2. Agricultural Resources

The revised project would not result in any impacts on agricultural resources. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

3. Air Quality

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) accumulate in the atmosphere, where these gases trap heat near the Earth's surface by absorbing infrared radiation. This effect causes global warming and climate change, with adverse impacts on humans and the environment.

Greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) would be associated with the construction phase of the proposed project through the use of heavy equipment and vehicle trips. Emissions of greenhouse gases during this phase would be short-term. Increased development, including the proposed project, would cause GHG emissions to be generated. Emissions associated with energy use would arise from the combustion of fossil fuels to provide energy for the operational phase of the development. The proposed project would contribute incrementally to long-term increases in GHGs as a result of traffic increases and minor secondary fuel combustion emission from project elements such as space and hot water heating. Additional incremental increases in GHG emissions would occur as a result of the generation of electricity necessary to meet project-related increases in energy demand.

Project Cumulative Impacts

While global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact and the impacts of climate change on California human and natural systems would also be substantial, there currently is no agreed-upon methodology to adequately identify, under CEQA, when project-level GHG emissions contribute considerably to this cumulative impact.

At this time, there are no adopted thresholds of significance for GHG emissions and the methodology of analysis is evolving. To that end, until a good threshold is determined, the City believes it is safe to say that any project with GHG emissions (inclusive of construction and operational emissions as estimated by APCD's latest URBEMIS software program – URBEMIS 2007, Version 9.2.4) greater than the GHG reporting requirement required under ARB Resolution 07-54 (25,000 metric tons or more of CO2 equivalent per year) should be considered significant. Projects below these levels remain unclassifiable until more evidence becomes available. The incremental project-specific and cumulative contribution to impacts associated with GHG emissions is considered less than significant in the absence of an adopted threshold and given that climatic change is global in scale.

While no significant impacts have been identified due to the speculative nature of greenhouse gas impact assessment, Mitigation Measures AQ 1-1 through AQ 2-3 would reduce the amount of GHG emissions generated during construction and operation.

The revised project would result in the same short-term and long-term air quality impacts that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

Impact AQ 1: *Ground disturbances and equipment operation during construction activities would produce short-term PM_{10} emissions.* (Class II)

Impact AQ 2: *Exposure risk of sensitive receptors to freeway-related emissions would be adverse.* (Class III)

Cumulative Impacts

The significance of the proposed project's contribution to cumulative global GHG emissions and thereby climate change, pursuant to CEQA, cannot be classified as the project would emit less than the City's interim significance threshold for GHG's of 25,000 metric tons per year. Therefore, cumulative impacts on air quality would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

AQ 1-1

The following mitigation measures would be recommended:

AQ 2-1, AQ 2-2

The following mitigation measure is recommended to further reduce the risks associated with freeway-related emissions:

AQ 2-3 The applicant shall provide an Air Quality Disclosure Statement to potential buyers of units, summarizing the results of technical studies that reflect a health concern resulting from exposure of children to air quality emissions generated within 500 feet of a freeway.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The applicant shall provide this disclosure statement as part of the project CCRs to the City Attorney and Planning & Environmental Services to verify the disclosure statement is fair and adequate. The disclosure shall be reviewed and approved prior to recordation of the Final Map.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify that the Air Quality Disclosure Statement has been incorporated into the CCRs prior to sale of homes. Planning & Environmental Services shall review and approve the statement for objectivity, balance, and completeness.

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and project contributions to cumulative air quality impacts would be less than significant. Project contributions to GHG emissions, would be reduced through implementation of the required and recommended mitigation measures noted above.

4. Biological Resources

The revised project would result in the same impacts to biological resources that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact BIO 1: *Disruption of birds of prey could occur off-site if they are nesting during the construction period.* (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on biological resources would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would still be required:

BIO 1-1

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on biological resources would be less than significant.

5. Cultural Resources

The revised project would result in the same impacts to cultural resources that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact CR 1: *Project construction could result in disturbance of unknown sub-surface cultural resources.* (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on cultural resources would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would still be required:

CR 1-1

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on cultural resources would be less than significant.

6. Geology and Soils

The revised project would result in the same impacts to geology and soils that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact GEO 1: *Project grading would result in a short-term increase in the amount of soil exposed to wind and water erosion.* (Class II)

Impact GEO 2: *Removal of fill material and expansive soils without proper shoring could result in stability impacts along the western property line.* (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on geology and soils would remain as described in the MND. (Class II, Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

GEO 1-1, GEO 1-2, GEO 1-3, GEO 2-1

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on geology and soils would be less than significant.

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The revised project would result in the same impacts from hazards and hazardous materials that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact HAZ 1: *Radon could be a component of the underlying geologic unit which could result in Radon gas exposure levels exceeding EPA guidelines.* (Class II)

Impact HAZ-2: *Exposure to contaminated soils during site preparation activities would be potentially significant.* (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on hazards and hazardous materials would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would still be required:

HAZ 1-1, HAZ 2-1, HAZ 2-2

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts from hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant.

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

As a result of the revised project, minor changes to drainage improvements would occur. Storm water runoff would first be directed to landscaped areas and bioswales prior to reaching the storm drains equipped with cleaning inserts for all catch basins as previously proposed. With the revised project, one detention basin is proposed, south of proposed Building A, to retain the difference in the stormwater runoff from pre-development to post-development conditions. The revised project would result in the same impacts on hydrology and water quality that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact HYDRO/WQ 1: *Surface runoff from the proposed project could result in entry of pollutants into the storm drain system during construction and post-development.* (Class II)

Impact HYDRO/WQ 2: *Onsite drainage improvements would be adequate to detain and convey surface water runoff to prevent flooding pending final approval by the City of Goleta.* (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

HYDRO/WQ 1-1, HYDRO/WQ 1-2, HYDRO/WQ 1-3, HYDRO/WQ 2-1

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.

9. Land Use

The proposed General Plan Amendment to Land Use Element Table 2-1, Allowable Uses and Standards for Residential Use Categories, regarding building intensity standards, has been deleted as a result of the City's adoption of changes in June 2008 (Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Track 2 Amendments). Table 2-1 now includes recommended building intensity standards (including FAR limitations) and allows these standards to be exceeded based on a "good cause" finding. The revised project includes an FAR of 0.51, exceeding the recommended FAR of 0.30. Visual impacts are discussed under Section 1, Aesthetics. The project includes a request for application of State Density Bonus Law relative to the granting of an incentive for the provision of two moderate income affordable units.

The revised project is consistent with existing and planned land uses in the vicinity of the project and would not result in any impacts on land use. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

10. Mineral Resources

The revised project would not result in any impacts on mineral resources. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

11. Noise

The applicant's consulting noise engineer submitted updated estimates of future noise levels for the project based on the revised 12 unit alternative plan (URS, November 10, 2008). The study used the Federal Highway Administration Traffic Noise Model (TNM 2.5, Lau et al 2004), to estimate exterior noise levels on the property at representative locations.

With the private yards now located along the western (rear) side of the residential units and the garages located to the west of the yards, the residences and garages act as barriers that help reduce exterior noise in the yards. Therefore, it is no longer deemed necessary to include the perimeter noise wall that was proposed along the eastern boundary of the previous design. Results showed that future exterior noise levels in the private yards will range from 55.2 to 63.7

dBA, all below the standard of 65 dBA. Placement of 6' walls east of the tot lot would provide some additional reduction to about 57 dBA, but the walls are not deemed necessary since the result without the walls is well below 65 dBA.

Results showed that future exterior noise levels at building sites within the project boundary will range from approximately 62.3 dBA (Unit 5 in Building B south wall, ground level), up to 74.0 dBA (Unit 1 in Building A, south wall, second story). The study states that interior noise level is a function of the sound transmission loss qualities of the construction material and surface area of each element, with doors and windows generally being the acoustical weak link in a building. Further, the study states that by limiting the number and size of these openings on the sides of the building exposed to noise, interior noise levels will be minimized. Unit 1 in Building A would be exposed to the greatest amount of noise and has windows facing south. Unit 1 would have a 6 foot high wall along the southern edge of its private yard to reduce noise levels from Calle Real and Highway 101. Because exterior CNEL values at most of the buildings, particularly along the eastern exposure will continue to be above 65 dBA, it will be necessary to incorporate structural features to ensure that interior CNEL values can be maintained at or below 45 dBA. The revised project would result in the same impacts from noise that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact NSE 1: *Residential uses would be exposed to noise levels greater than CNEL 65dB.* (Class II)

Impact NSE 2: *Construction activity would impact residential sensitive receptors within 1,600 feet of the project site.* (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts from noise would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

NSE 1-1, NSE 2-1, NSE 2-2

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts from noise would be less than significant.

12. Population and Housing

The revised project would not result in any impacts on population and housing. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

13. Public Services

The revised project would not result in any impacts on public services. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

14. Recreation

The revised project would not result in any impacts on recreation. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

15. Transportation/Traffic

As a result of increasing the project by one unit, a corresponding slight increase in trip generation would occur (from 65 ADT to 70 ADT; 6 PM PHT). Proposed parking for the 12 units would exceed the zoning ordinance requirements by three spaces. The proposal no longer includes a request for granting of the modification related to a reduction in the number of required parking spaces, nor is a modification required. The revised project would result in the same impacts to transportation/traffic described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact TR 1: *Emergency access would be deficient if parking along the main drive aisle occurs.* (Class II)

Impact TR 2: *Demand for construction related vehicle parking would create a short term parking impact.* (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative transportation/traffic impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

TR 1-1, TR 2-1

The following mitigation measures would still be recommended:

TR 3-1, TR 3-2

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts from transportation/traffic would be less than significant.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

As a result of addition one unit with the revised project, a slight increase in wastewater generation (from 0.002 mgd to 0.0022 mgd), water use (from 2.2 AFY to 2.4 AFY), and solid waste generation (from 27.69 tons/year to 30.21 tons/year) would occur. The revised project would result in the same impacts to utilities and service systems described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would still occur:

Impact WW 1: *A final determination as to the availability of central sewer service by the GWSD to serve the proposed project cannot be made without a Sewer Service Connection Permit.* (Class II)

Impact WS 1: *A final determination as to the availability of central water service by the GWD to serve the proposed project cannot be made without a Can & Will Serve letter.* (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative utilities and service systems impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

WW 1-1, WS 1-1

The following mitigation measures would still be recommended:

SW 1-1, SW 1-2, SW 1-3

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

F. FINDINGS

It is the finding of the Planning and Environmental Services Department that the previous environmental document as herein amended may be used to fulfill the environmental review requirements of the current project. The current project meets the conditions for the application of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 and preparation of a new EIR or ND is not required. The Citrus Village Project MND (07-MND-004) is hereby amended by this 15164 addendum for the revised Citrus Village Project.