

9. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The Citrus Village project site is a 0.94-acre vacant property within an urbanized, predominantly residential area of the City. The site is bound on three sides by urban development, which includes attached condominiums to the north and east and a neighborhood commercial center (convenience retail, gas station, restaurants) to the west. South of the site are Calle Real and transportation corridors of the U.S. Highway 101 and the Union Pacific Railroad.

The site is sparsely vegetated with predominantly ruderal grasses and dirt trails. The west boundary of the site, near the 7-Eleven store, is somewhat littered with trash and miscellaneous debris. The property slopes from west to east. According to records, the property has remained undeveloped and was used in the 1950s for agricultural production before being filled with soil from development of the surrounding neighborhood in the 1960s. The Brookside condominium complex is situated below the project site to the north and east. A sloping embankment to the north and east with a row of Myoporum trees defines the property boundary on those sides. The front of the site contains a curb and gutter and does not currently contain driveway access. The frontage contains a right of way for Calle Real and a sidewalk that stretches the length of the frontage.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the project must be evaluated to determine and disclose environmental impacts that could be expected as a result of the proposed project. This Final Mitigated Negative Declaration is intended to disclose potential environmental impacts of the project.

10. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS CONSIDERED:

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

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing

- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

11. DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier environmental document, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project and that a subsequent document containing updated and/or site specific information should be prepared pursuant to CEQA Sections 15162/15163/15164.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier environmental document, including revisions or

mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Patricia S. Miller, Manager, Current Planning Division Date

12. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- (a) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including project specific, cumulative, construction, operational, onsite, offsite, direct, and indirect impacts. The explanation of each issue should identify the existing setting, any applicable threshold of significance, impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impact statement.
- (b) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact". The discussion must be supported by appropriate information sources. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to requests such as the proposed project.
- (c) The checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is: Potentially Significant, Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated, Less than Significant, or No Impact.
- (d) A "Potentially Significant" response is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant" entries when the determination is made, then an EIR is required.
- (e) A "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" response is appropriate where such incorporation of mitigation would reduce a potentially significant impact to a less than significant level. If there are one or more "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" entries when the determination is made, then a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared.
- (f) Supporting Information Sources: References and sources should be attached, including but not limited to, reference documents, special studies, other environmental documents, and/or individuals contacted.

13. ISSUE AREAS:

AESTHETICS

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

Existing Setting

Terrain of the Project Site and Vicinity

As shown by the Dos Pueblos, California U.S.G.S. 7.5 minute topographic map quadrangle, the historical terrain surfaces in the project site's immediate vicinity descend in elevation in even gradients east-southeasterly across the site from a broad local hill summit (elevation 110 feet as measured on Calle Real) to El Encanto Creek (elevation approximately 50 feet). El Encanto Creek (a locally applied stream course name) flows from the Santa Ynez Mountains northwest of the site southeasterly, passing via culverts, under Calle Real, the U.S. Highway 101, and the Union Pacific RR tracks east of the project site. The creek is an intermittent blue line stream course that contributes seasonal flows to Devereux Slough to the south. Devereux Slough is identified by the City of Goleta as a scenic area, the views of which are deemed worthy of protection. The slough is located 6,000 feet south of the site. Existing terrain features, development/landscaping, and particularly the raised, engineered roadbeds of the U.S. Highway 101 and Union Pacific RR tracks combine in the intervening distance to eliminate views from the project site vicinity of Devereux Slough and nearby coastal features.

Residential and commercial development along Calle Real to the north, east, west, and around the vicinity of the Calle Real/Elwood Station Road intersection has been

accommodated on graded/leveled lot pads which ascend in tiered elevations to the west and north of the project site. The former natural terrain slopes along El Encanto Creek located north and west of the site, and, apparently the surface of the site as well, have been altered by grading such that only vestiges of natural terrain surfaces, stream courses and/or riparian vegetation remain. The terrain surface along the eastern side of the project site is marked by an abrupt change in slope that increases gradually in height to the north, such that the northeast corner of the site has a raised terrace appearance relative to the property located to the north and east. At its northeast corner the project site's terrace level elevation is approximately 75 feet and at the immediately adjacent toe-of-slope it is 66.84 feet. Natural landscape features are not present. The only remaining elements of such natural landscape features are present in a 9.4 acre undeveloped parcel that lies 200 feet east of the project along the north side of Calle Real. According to Figure 6-1 of the City's General Plan, the closest scenic view to the project site that is to be protected occurs from the U.S. Highway 101 / Calle Real / Railroad ROW north in the vicinity of the project site. However, this view does not include the project site.

General Site Visibility

As the site is bound on three sides (west, north and east) by existing development on the adjacent properties, public visibility of the site is effectively limited to foreground views from Calle Real, and from the U.S. Highway 101 and Union Pacific Railroad in intermittent northerly views that are variously screened through roadside plantings of shrubs and trees that define the fenced northern boundary of the Caltrans ROW for the U.S. Highway 101.

Site Views from Calle Real

Of the transportation features that bypass the southern side of the site, Calle Real most closely reflects the original "lay of the land". The roadway climbs 55-60 feet in elevation as it passes by the frontage of the site from a low point near the culvert crossing of El Encanto Creek (approximately 250 feet east of the project site) and ascends the hill west of the Elwood Station Road intersection and the corner of the adjacent Padre Shopping Center. The Calle Real street frontage closely matches the frontage elevations of the property. The street gains approximately three feet of elevation as it bypasses the frontage of the project site (from 66.4 feet at the site's southeast corner to 69.4 feet at the southwest corner). As illustrated by existing condition photographic views of the project shown in **Figure A-1 Views A & B**, views of the Santa Ynez Mountains are typically blocked by development on the raised terrain situated west and northwest of the project site for motorists traveling west along Calle Real. In views oriented directly north from the front of the project site along Calle Real, portions of the Santa Ynez Mountain skyline are visible. Structures and taller eucalyptus and palm trees break up the mountain skyline view, however.

City of Goleta
Final Mitigated Negative Declaration
Citrus Village
August 15, 2008

The project site has a frontage of 143.44 feet along Calle Real. At a speed of 45 miles per hour motorists would pass by the site in approximately 2.2 seconds in either easterly or westerly directions. Further, such views of the mountain skyline northerly across the project site that may be possible from moving vehicles would have to be oriented at angles that are peripheral to the directions of travel.