RESOLUTION NO. 06-37

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GOLETA, CALIFORNIA CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ADOPTING CEQA FINDINGS, MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAMS, AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE GOLETA GENERAL PLAN / COASTAL LAND USE PLAN

WHEREAS, on March 25, 2005, the City of Goleta issued a Notice of Preparation for the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Report and caused the Notice of Preparation to be distributed to all responsible agencies, trustee agencies and interested parties for review and comment; and

WHEREAS, in recognition of the comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation, it was determined that the proposed project was subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, that one or more significant effects on the environment may occur, and that preparation of an Environmental Impact Report would be required; and

WHEREAS, a Draft Environmental Impact Report and Final Environmental Impact Report was prepared by Jones & Stokes, Inc. under contract to the City of Goleta; and

WHEREAS, the Draft *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan* was published and released to the public on March 20, 2006; and

WHEREAS, a Notice of Completion was filed with the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and distributed to responsible, trustee, and interested agencies and individuals on May 31, 2006; and

WHEREAS, a Notice of Availability of, and Public Hearing on, the Draft Environmental Impact Report was noticed by publication in a newspaper of general circulation within the County of Santa Barbara on May 28, 2006, and by direct mailing to interested agencies and individuals in the manner prescribed by the State CEQA Guidelines and the City of Goleta CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the Notice of Availability of, and Public Hearing on, the Draft Environmental Impact Report was distributed to the Office of the County Clerk of the County of Santa Barbara for posting for a period of at least 30 days; and

WHEREAS, the State Clearinghouse [SCH #2005031151] assigned a 49-day review period, extending from May 31, 2006 to July 18, 2006; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing to receive comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIR was held on June 26, 2006; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Final *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan* was published and released to the public on August 25, 2006; and

WHEREAS, a total of forty letters or written statements were received on the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, in response to written public comments received, responses to comments were prepared; and

WHEREAS, a proposed Final EIR, reflecting the changes made in the Final *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan*, was released on September 1, 2006, pursuant to the requirements of the State and City CEQA Guidelines, including written responses to comments received on the draft document; and

WHEREAS, Jones & Stokes, under contract to the City of Goleta, prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to meet the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6, as included in the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Final *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan* was the subject of a final noticed joint public hearing by the Planning Agency and City Council held on September 13, 2006, at which time all interested persons were given an opportunity to provide testimony on the proposed Final Plan; and

WHEREAS, following receipt of all public comment at the final noticed public hearing held on September 13, 2006, the Planning Agency and City Council gave final direction for changes to be incorporated into the document to be considered for adoption in September of 2006; and

WHEREAS, following the final public hearing held on September 13, 2006, City staff identified additional minor map edits to be incorporated into the document to be considered for adoption in September of 2006; and

WHEREAS, the City and it's consultant, Jones & Stokes, made the determination that the Final Plan changes resulting from Planning Agency and City Council direction at the September 13, 2006 public hearing and the staff identified map edits do not lead to recirculation; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Agency has, by separate action taken on the 20th day of September, 2006, adopted Resolution 06-09, thereby recommending to the City Council the certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report on the Final *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan*; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Agency has, by separate action taken on the 20th day of September, 2006, adopted Resolution 06-10, thereby recommending to the City Council the adoption of the Final *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan*; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has considered the entire administrative record, including the staff reports, the Draft and Final EIRs, including comments and responses to comments, the MMRP, the recommendation of the Planning Agency, and oral and written testimony from interested persons.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GOLETA AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Recitals. The City Council hereby finds and determines the foregoing recitals, which are incorporated herein by reference, are true and correct.

Section 2. Certification of the Final EIR. The City Council has examined the proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, including the comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR, and finds that the Final Environmental Impact Report has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA Article 9 (§15120 through 15132) and §15168 including direct, indirect, and cumulatively significant effects and proposed mitigation measures; hereby certifies that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report prior to approving the Final Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan; and hereby certifies that the Final Environmental Impact Report constitutes a complete, accurate, adequate, and good faith effort at full disclosure, and reflects the City of Goleta's independent judgment and analysis pursuant to §15090 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Section 3. CEQA Findings. The City Council finds that the proposed project mitigates environmental impacts to the maximum extent feasible, and changes and alterations intended to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Environmental Impact Report, have been incorporated as required conditions of approval where feasible, pursuant to §15090 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The Findings set forth in Exhibit 1 to this Resolution are hereby adopted and incorporated herein by this reference.

Section 4. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs. Public Resources Code §21081.6 (State CEQA Guidelines §15097) requires that the City adopt reporting or monitoring programs for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The procedures for mitigation monitoring and verification are described for each mitigation measure in the Final EIR. The approved project description, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies that reduce impacts, and other mitigation measures as described in the Final EIR, will be monitored as part of the City's requirement under Government Code Section 65400 which requires that the City submit an annual report to the City Council regarding the status of the General Plan and progress on its implementation.

Section 5. Statement of Overriding Considerations. In considering the approval of the General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan, the City Council has balanced the benefits of the projects against unavoidable adverse environmental impacts and finds that the benefits of the project outweigh the adverse environmental effects. The

Council finds that the adverse environmental effects are "acceptable" based on the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Exhibit 1, which is hereby adopted pursuant to §15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Section 6. The City Council hereby further directs that the City's Director of Planning and Environmental Services, or his designee, shall file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk of the County of Santa Barbara within five days of the date of this resolution in accordance with the provisions of Section 21152 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Section 15094 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Section 7. Documents. The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the City Clerk, City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117.

Section 8. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 2nd day of October, 2006.

Jonny Wallis
JONNY WALLIS, MAYOR

ATTEST:

Deborah Constantino
DEBORAH CONSTANTINO
CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Julie Hayward Biggs
JULIE HAYWARD BIGGS
CITY ATTORNEY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA) ss.
CITY OF GOLETA)

I, DEBORAH CONSTANTINO, City Clerk of the City of Goleta, California, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution No. 06-37 was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Goleta at a regular meeting held on the 2nd day of October, 2006, by the following vote of the Council:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS BROCK, HAWXHURST, MAYOR PRO TEMPORE CONNELL AND MAYOR WALLIS.

NOES: COUNCILMEMBER BLOIS.

ABSENT: NONE.

(SEAL)

Deborah Constantino

DEBORAH CONSTANTINO
CITY CLERK

Exhibit 1

Findings
and
Statement of Overriding Considerations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1.0
FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS THAT CAN BE REDUCED BY GP/CLUP POLICIES OR MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (CLASS II)

The City of Goleta finds that, based upon the threshold criteria for significance (City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, and CEQA Thresholds) presented in the FEIR, the following aspects of the project will result in environmental impacts which have been determined by the City to be significant, but which can be reduced by implementation of GP/CLUP policies (mitigation measures) identified in the FEIR, to levels of insignificance. These feasible mitigation measures will be adopted by the City through the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) adoption process, as conditions for project approval. Moreover, these measures are fully enforceable through permit conditions, approvals and agreements. Based upon the environmental analyses presented in the FEIR, no substantial evidence has been submitted to or identified by the City that indicates that the following impacts would in fact occur at levels requiring a determination of significance that cannot be mitigated.

1.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

1.1.1 Significant Impacts

One Aesthetics and Visual Resources Class II impact has been identified related to scenic corridors and key public viewpoints. This impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impact is:

Impact 3.1-3. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Scenic Corridors and Key Public Viewpoints. Scenic corridors within the City include US-101, Hollister Avenue, SR-217, Cathedral Oaks Road, Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road north of US-101, and Fairview Avenue. Proposed development of vacant or underutilized land in accordance with the GP/CLUP (see Figures 3.1-1 and 3.10-2) in the vicinity of certain scenic corridors would potentially create significant impacts to views including US-101 and SR-217 in the southeastern part of the City.

1.1.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

The aesthetics and visual resources in the City were identified and evaluated based upon field reconnaissance. The City's location between the Santa Ynez Mountains and the Pacific Ocean provide a scenic backdrop for Goleta's urbanized area. Visually attractive open spaces within Goleta include public recreation areas and agricultural lands. The City retains a small-scale suburban character, with open spaces and broad vistas that provide a connection to the natural environment.

Discussion

Impact 3.1-3a: Impacts to Views from US-101. Southerly and northerly views of visual resources are available from US-101 throughout the City. Vacant land along US-101 is designated for development with medium-density residential and office/institutional uses by the GP/CLUP in the area south of US-101 primarily near Los Carneros Road and Storke Road. Development of these types of uses in accordance with the designations of the GP/CLUP could result in potentially significant impacts to views from US-101.

Impact 3.1-3b: Impacts to Views from SR-217. The area surrounding SR-217 includes the riparian corridor of the San Jose Creek. There are currently five vacant lots along the creek, which are designated as planned residential, Old Town, visitor serving, and services, respectively. Parcels located along Hollister to the west and east of SR-217 characterized by existing Office and Industrial and Community Commercial Uses are proposed to be modified to allow some residential development. The Page Hotel site adjacent to SR-217 on South Kellogg has a land use designation of Visitor-serving Commercial, although it is currently being used for agriculture. Development consistent with the land use designation would result in a potential loss of land currently used for agriculture. In addition, the GOTRP EIR identifies lands along the SR-217 Scenic Corridor where visual resources would be converted from vacant land to commercial, mixed use and light industrial uses through implementation of the GOTRP. Development of these uses would be visible from SR-217. The addition of residential and commercial development within these areas could result in potentially significant impacts to coastal, ocean, and riparian corridor views and potentially change in an adverse manner the character of the scenic areas in the vicinity of SR-217.

The GOTRP EIR identified potential impacts to views of the Santa Ynez Mountains with the development of the Page Hotel and two to three story buildings along Hollister Avenue. Therefore related development under the GP/CLUP could result in potentially significant impacts to views of the mountains and foothills from SR-217.

Impact 3.1-3c: Impacts from Public Viewing Areas within the City. Views from public viewing areas within the City, including Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, and the Sperling Preserve, could be affected by construction of future development in accordance with the GP/CLUP. Such future development could occur in vacant or underutilized areas that could impact views from these public viewing areas. Northerly and southerly views are currently available from a series of pedestrian trails within the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space, as well as from Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve. Vacant land designated for development along Hollister and US-101 could be visible from these public viewing areas. Future development anticipated along Hollister and US-101 could result in potentially significant impacts on these public views within the City.

Impact 3.1-3d: Impacts to Views from Areas within the Coastal Zone. Pacific Shoreline Sites, including Santa Barbara Shores Park and Sperling Preserve, are designated as Open Space/Passive Recreation by the GP/CLUP. Selected vacant sites within the Coastal Zone are designated for planned residential or visitor serving commercial uses. Such future development would be in close proximity to important coastal resources, including the Sperling Preserve/Ellwood Devereux open space area and Sandpiper Golf course. Vacant sites located in the southeastern portion of the City near San Jose Creek are designated for development of service industrial uses and would be visible from the San Jose Creek riparian area. Development in these vacant sites could result in potentially significant impacts to views from these coastal areas.

Impact 3.1-3e: Light and Glare. Future development of vacant and underutilized land within the City could increase light and glare visible from public viewing areas or from scenic corridors. A substantial increase in light and glare primarily in association with development of vacant land along Hollister and US-101 could result in potentially significant impacts to views from scenic corridors and public viewing areas within the City.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies that Reduce Impact 3.1-3. The Visual and Historic Resources Element proposes the following policies intended to ensure the preservation and enhancement of the visual character and public views within and from Goleta's scenic corridors. These policies would reduce impacts to scenic corridors and key viewpoints associated with the GP/CLUP to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors
- Policy VH 4: Design Review

A discussion of how the policies reduce impacts to views from scenic corridors and key viewpoints is provided below.

GP/CLUP Policies that Apply to Impact 3.1-3a. Views from US-101 that may be adversely impacted by future development of vacant land south of US-101 in the vicinity of Los Carneros Road and Storke Road would be reduced by implementation of GP/CLUP Policies VH 2 and VH 4. Through these policies, the Visual and Historic Resources Element would promote development that does not degrade or obstruct views of scenic areas. In accordance with these policies all future development would be subject to height restrictions, must incorporate existing sensitive landforms into the design, incorporate natural features in the design, minimize grading, and minimize signage. Landscaping must also provide screening. Large building masses in multiple-family residential developments are to be avoided. Use of several small structures rather than one large structure is encouraged. Height restrictions for multiple family residential uses are 35 feet outside the Coastal Zone and 25 feet within the Coastal Zone (Table 2-1 of the Land Use Element). Office and Commercial developments must be compatible with the scale of surrounding development, and roof mounted equipment shall be screened and part of the height restrictions. In addition, applicants for all proposed developments along scenic corridors must prepare a site-specific visual assessment to ensure that development complies with the requirements of the GP/CLUP.

The existing character of views from US-101 would also be considered in assessing impacts of future development. Southerly views from US-101 in the vicinity of vacant land near Storke Road and Los Carneros Road currently include urban uses in the foreground with coastal and ocean views in the distance. Vacant sites in the vicinity of Los Carneros Road are currently bordered by predominantly office, industrial warehousing, and institutional uses. The railroad also borders vacant sites to the north. Considering the type of the existing warehousing and office structures, development of multiple family uses on vacant land in this location would not represent a substantial deviation from the scale of structures in the area. In addition, as shown in Figure 3.1-1, the views of motorists on US-101 in the vicinity of Los Carneros Road are primarily northerly views of the foothills and Bishop Ranch. The locations of these vacant sites are also not foreground views from motorists and therefore would not be visible for extended periods of time considering vehicle speeds in the area. Future development, designed in accordance with GP/CLUP policies, would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the area.

By promoting development that minimizes the scale and height of structures located adjacent to scenic corridors, and considering the existing developed character of the area south of US-101, implementation of GP/CLUP policies would reduce the potential impacts of future development to views from US-101 to a less-than-significant level.

GP/CLUP Policies that Apply to Impact 3.1-3b. The policies listed above would ensure that future development is subject to height restrictions, landscaping requirements, and architectural treatments that reduce potential impacts to views of visual resources including ocean, island, and mountain views from public viewing areas to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the GOTRP EIR identifies lands along the SR-217 Scenic Corridor, including vacant sites where visual resources would be impacted through buildout under the GOTRP. The GOTRP provides development standards that require design to be compatible with surrounding land uses and for use of landscaping that provides screening (DevStds VIS-OT-1.2, VIS-OT-1.4, and VIS-OT-3.3, KS6-6, KS7B-7). It is assumed for purposes of the GP/CLUP EIR that the requirements of the GOTRP regarding the visual character of future development in this area would be incorporated into the design of future projects. As such, the development standards in the GOTRP and the policies of the GP/CLUP would reduce the potential impacts of future development to views from SR-217 to a less-than-significant level.

Implementation of Policy VH 1, "Scenic Views," supports preservation of prominent landforms within the City. This policy protects views of the mountains and foothills. Implementation of the GP/CLUP policies would reduce the potential impacts of future development to views of the foothills from SR-217 to a less than significant level.

GP/CLUP Policies that Apply to Impact 3.1-3c. Adverse impacts to views from public viewing areas resulting from future development of vacant land located between US-101 and Hollister Avenue with a mix of multiple family, office/institutional, and commercial development would be reduced by implementation of GP/CLUP Policies VH 2 and VH 4. As described above, the GP/CLUP policies require that development not degrade or obstruct views of scenic areas. The policies listed above ensure that future development is subject to height restrictions, landscaping requirements, and architectural treatments that reduce potential impacts to views of visual resources including ocean, island, and mountain views from public viewing areas to a less-than-significant level. By promoting development that minimizes the scale and height of structures located adjacent to scenic corridors, and considering the existing developed character of the area north of Hollister Avenue and south of US-101, implementation of GP/CLUP policies would reduce the potential impacts of future development to views from public viewing areas to a less-than-significant level.

GP/CLUP Policies that Apply to Impact 3.1-3d. The GP/CLUP includes Policies VH 1 and VH 2 to ensure that the coastal open space areas are not altered from existing conditions. These policies would reduce potential impacts of development proposed in proximity to coastal resources and coastal scenic corridors to a less-than-significant level. These policies would need to be incorporated into the design of sites 45 through 48, 89, 118, and 119 on Figure 3.10-2 prior to approval of such development by the City. Development planned for sites 89 and 118 would also be located in proximity to existing residential neighborhoods, and would be an extension of those portions of the City within the Coastal Zone that are currently developed with predominantly single-family residential uses. Therefore, buildout under the GP/CLUP would not result in significant adverse impacts to the visual resources of the Coastal Zone through implementation of these policies.

GP/CLUP Policies that Apply to Impact 3.1-3e. Implementation Policy VH 4, "Design Review," would reduce potential impacts from light and glare associated with future development to a less-than-significant level by ensuring that lighting is designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent overlighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow.

1.1.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.1.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.2 AGRICULTURE AND FARMLAND

1.2.1 Significant Impacts

One Agriculture and Farmland Class II impact has been identified related to incompatible uses and structures. This impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impact is:

Impact 3.2-2. Incompatible Land Uses and Structures. The introduction of incompatible uses and structures within or adjacent to agriculture land uses and agricultural operations could result in land use conflicts and could impair the productivity of agricultural lands. Residential uses can have adverse impacts on farming operations because of the introduction of pests, disease, and weeds as well as increased traffic, vandalism, trespassing, and citizen complaints. Commercial and industrial uses have fewer conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations but nevertheless can pose potential conflicts between neighboring land uses and agricultural production. Such incompatibilities with lands designated for agricultural use would be considered potentially significant.

1.2.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

In the Goleta Valley, and specifically in the City of Goleta, urban agriculture (cultivated land within the designated urban boundary line) comprises small active farms of only a few acres to major producers of 100 acres or more. The agricultural land that still remains in the Goleta area provides a multitude of benefits for area residents. Agricultural uses in the foothill areas provide a scenic visual backdrop for the City, and open rangeland and orchards provide a healthy habitat for a variety of species to flourish.

Discussion

The proposed GP/CLUP would not result in conflicts with agricultural uses on adjacent or nearby unincorporated lands. The existing vacant lands near the City boundaries are not proposed for development near existing agricultural areas outside of the City. The proposed land use developments on the east side are primarily infill and would be developed in an already primarily built-out area. Areas in the northern portion of the City are proposed primarily for agricultural land uses, or the golf course, which would not conflict with agricultural uses. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.2-2. Policies and objectives incorporated into the GP/CLUP in order to preserve and protect agricultural resources include:

- Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands

A discussion of how the policy reduces impacts associated with incompatible land uses and structures is provided below.

The GP/CLUP includes Policy CE 11 to address potential land use incompatibility issues associated with the urban-agriculture interface. Specifically, Policy subsection CE 11.3 (Compatibility of New Development With Agriculture) provides for design and location of lands adjacent to agriculture to avoid or minimize potential conflicts with agricultural activities, which

may include requirements for right-to-farm covenants and disclosure notices for new development located adjacent to agricultural land. Additionally, Policy subsection CE 11.4 (Buffers Adjacent to Agricultural Parcels) provides for buffer zones and other measures such as landscape screening for new development adjacent to property designated for agricultural uses to minimize potential conflicts with agricultural activities. Furthermore, Policy subsection CE 11.8 (Mitigation of Impacts of New Development on Agriculture), provides for additional application of appropriate conditions to reduce any potential impacts through the review and analysis of land use development proposals near the designated agricultural lands (which may result in potential project denial If such impacts cannot be mitigated).

1.2.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.2.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.3 AIR QUALITY

1.3.1 Significant Impacts

One Air Quality Class II impact has been identified related to construction emissions. This impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through SBCAPCD techniques to limit emissions. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impact is:

Impact 3.3-1. Construction Emissions. Construction activity that would be accommodated over the next 20 years under the GP/CLUP land use scenario would cause temporary emissions of criteria pollutants. Criteria pollutants such as NO_X, CO, VOC (Volatile organic compounds), SO_X, and PM_{10} would be emitted by the operation of construction equipment, while fugitive dust (PM_{10}) would be emitted by activities that disturb the ground, such as grading and excavation, road construction, and building construction. These air quality impacts could be potentially significant.

This impact also applies to the future City service areas.

1.3.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

The State of California and the Federal Government have established air quality standards and emergency episode criteria for various pollutants. Generally, State regulations have stricter standards than those at the Federal level. Air quality standards are set at concentrations that provide a sufficient margin of safety to protect public health and welfare. Episode criteria define air pollution concentrations at the level where short-term exposures may begin to affect the health of a portion of the population particularly susceptible to air pollutants. The health effects are progressively more severe and widespread as pollutant concentrations increase.

The City of Goleta and Santa Barbara County generally have good air quality, as it attains or is considered in maintenance status for most ambient air quality standards. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) is required to monitor air pollutant levels to assure that Federal and State air quality standards are being met. Air quality measurements indicate that Santa Barbara County is in attainment area for all other Federal and State air quality standards, with the exception for the State ozone and PM_{10} standards.

Discussion

Information regarding specific development projects, soil types, and the locations of receptors would be needed in order to quantify the level of impact associated with construction activity. Impacts associated with individual construction projects are not generally considered significant because of their temporary, short-term nature. Nevertheless, given the amount of development that the GP/CLUP would accommodate over the next 20 years, it is reasonable to conclude that some major construction activity could be occurring at any given time. Such impacts could also be complicated by the fact that multiple construction projects could occur simultaneously in any portion of the City.

Impacts to air quality from construction are directly associated with the amount of land disturbance and development that will take place. As discussed in Chapter 2.0, "Project Description," the GP/CLUP would accommodate an estimated 3,730 new residential units and 2.081 million square feet if nonresidential development through 2030.

The GP/CLUP could accommodate the demolition of existing older structures that were constructed with asbestos-containing materials. Demolition activity that disturbs friable asbestos could potentially create health hazards for receptors in the vicinity of individual demolition sites. However, demolition activity involving asbestos is required to be conducted in accordance with SBCAPCD Rule 1001, which requires SBCAPCD notification and use of licensed asbestos contractors to remove all asbestos prior to demolition. Compliance with Rule 1001 on all future demolition and construction activity with asbestos-containing materials would reduce impacts to less-than-significant level.

The impact of construction-related emissions upon sensitive receptors such as residences, schools, and hospitals depends upon the location of individual construction projects relative to sensitive receptors. Some new development within the City may occur adjacent to or near sensitive receptors. The SBCAPCD has not adopted significance thresholds for construction-related emissions since such emissions are short-term and temporary. Nevertheless, the SBCAPCD's Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents (updated March 2006) recommend various techniques to reduce construction-related emissions associated with individual developments. These include techniques to limit emissions of both ozone precursors (NO_X and VOC) and fugitive dust (PM_{10}) and are identified below.

- Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated "clean" diesel engines) should be utilized wherever feasible.
- The engine size of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be the minimum practical size.
- The amount of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient construction management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
- Construction equipment shall be maintained per the manufacturer's specifications.
- Construction equipment operating on site shall be equipped with two or four degree engine timing retard or precombustion chamber engines.
- Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
- All diesel-powered equipment shall use ultra low sulfur diesel fuel.
- Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, and diesel particulate filters, as certified and/or verified by EPA or California, shall be installed, if available.
- Diesel-powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.
- Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading should be limited to five minutes; auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible.
- Construction worker's trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch on site.

Prior implementation of all of the following measures, as necessary, is assumed to reduce fugitive dust emissions to a less-than-significant level and is strongly recommended for all discretionary projects involving earthmoving.

- During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems should be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for

the day. Increased watering frequency should be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.

- Minimize the amount of disturbed area and reduce on site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.
- Gravel pads must be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads.
- If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be covered with a tarp from the point of origin.
- After clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the disturbed area should be treated by watering, revegetating, or spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.
- The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SBCAPCD prior to land use clearance for map recordation and land use clearance for finish grading for the structure.
- Prior to land clearance, the applicant shall include, as a note on a separate informational sheet to be recorded with map, these dust control requirements. All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans.

Although construction-related impacts are not considered individually significant, the measures listed above are recommended to reduce construction-related emissions to the maximum degree feasible. These protective measures have been included in the GP/CLUP FEIR to address air quality impacts of future construction projects on a case-by-case basis.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

The SBCAPCD techniques identified above would satisfactorily address potential construction-related emissions associated with the GP/CLUP. No additional policies addressing construction emissions are proposed in the GP/CLUP.

1.3.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.3.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1.4.1 Significant Impacts

Ten Biological Resources Class II impacts have been identified related to: temporary impacts to special status habitats and special status species; loss of special status habitats; long-term degradation of special status habitats; fragmentation of special status habitats; harm to listed species; loss, reduction, or isolation of local populations of native species; reduction in amount or quality of habitat for special status species; break or impairment of function of existing wildlife linkages; loss or degradation of conserved habitat; and inconsistency with approved conservation program or local conservation policy. These impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impacts are:

Impact 3.4-1. Temporary Impacts to Special Status Habitats and Special Status Species. Development of vacant sites and the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities have the potential to temporarily remove or degrade special status habitats and to have temporary adverse impacts on species status species. Such losses are potentially significant.

Impact 3.4-2. Loss of Special Status Habitats. Development of vacant sites and the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities entail activities that would permanently remove some existing special status habitats. Such losses are potentially significant.

Impact 3.4-3. Long-term Degradation of Special Status Habitats. Development of vacant sites and the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities entail activities that could result in the long-term degradation of special status habitat. Such impacts are potentially significant.

Impact 3.4-4. Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats. Development of vacant sites and the construction (but not the maintenance) of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities entail activities that could result in the fragmentation of existing areas of special status habitats, especially in riparian corridors. Such effects are potentially significant.

Impact 3.4-5. Harm to Listed Species. Development of vacant sites and the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities entail activities that could result harm to listed species.

Impact 3.4-6. Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species. Development of vacant sites and the construction (but not the maintenance) of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities entail activities that could result in the loss, reduction, or isolation of local populations of native species, primarily through habitat loss and degradation. Such impacts are potentially significant, especially given the small size and scattered distribution of habitat for native species of plants, wildlife, and fish.

Impact 3.4-7. Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species. Development of vacant sites and the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities entail activities that could reduce the amount and/or the quality of habitat for special status species.

Impact 3.4-8. Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages. Development of vacant sites and the construction (but not maintenance) of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities entail activities that could result in the break of an existing wildlife linkage or impairment of the linkage's function. Loss of a linkage or impairment of a linkage's function is a potentially significant impact.

Impact 3.4-9. Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat. Development of vacant sites and the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities entail activities could result in potentially significant impacts on biological resources in areas of conserved habitat. These potential impacts are similar to those included in Impacts 3.4-1 through 3.4-8.

Impact 3.4-10. Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy. Development of vacant sites and the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities may entail proposed activities that are inconsistent with approved conservation programs and local conservation policies. Such effects would be potentially significant under CEQA.

These impacts also apply to the future City service areas.

1.4.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

There are four biogeographic regions in and near the City: Mountain Region, Foothill, Coastal Plain, and Coastal Mesa. The City is situated primarily on coastal terraces in the Coastal Mesa Region, in the middle of a narrow ecological transition area that extends from the top of the Santa Ynez Mountains to the intertidal zone of the Pacific Ocean. Twelve creeks cross the City, draining from the foothills south to the Pacific Ocean and linking the City to the surrounding bioregions. Most of the streams exhibit intermittent, seasonal flows, and creek conditions vary greatly. Most of the lands in the City have been converted to urban and agricultural uses. The remaining natural habitats occur in the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains, along narrow riparian corridors, in protected open space areas such as Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area and Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve, and in small, scattered patches on agricultural and undeveloped lands.

Approximately 1,209 acres (24 percent) of the City are natural aquatic and terrestrial habitats. The three primary habitat types are nonnative grassland, eucalyptus woodland, and riparian, marsh, and vernal types. Habitats in the City support a wide variety of wildlife and fish species, but the diversity and abundance of species vary greatly between the habitats. The abundance and variety of wildlife are greatest in riparian and oak woodland habitats due to the presence of shelter, food, and linkages to the foothills. Annual grassland, although dominated by nonnative species, provides important foraging habitat for local raptors and nesting habitat for many birds. Fish are present in the estuaries at the mouths of Winchester/Bell and Tecolote Canyons, and the perennial reaches of major drainages support a combination of introduced and resident fish species.

Special-status habitats include areas that qualify as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) under the GP/CLUP; regulated waters, wetlands, and streambeds; and critical habitat designated for Federally listed and proposed species. For purposes of the FEIR, special-status habitats are presented in terms of habitats that meet the definition of or are designated as ESHAs in the Conservation Element of the GP/CLUP (see Conservation Element, Policy CE 1). Special-status species are defined as plant, fish, and wildlife species that have limited

distribution or abundance, are particularly vulnerable to human disturbances, or have special educational, scientific, or cultural/historic interest. Habitat linkages are physical connections that allow wildlife to move between patches of suitable habitat in both undisturbed landscapes as well as environments fragmented by urban development.

Discussion

Impact 3.4-1. Temporary Impacts to Special Status Habitats and Special Status Species. Impacts to temporary habitat impacts include brush clearing and scraping to provide temporary access roads, pathways, and storage areas; and clearing and trenching in connection with pipeline maintenance and repairs. Although temporary, such impacts are potentially significant when they affect regulated habitats (riparian and wetlands), habitats occupied by listed species, habitats with nesting birds, and special status habitats that occur only in small isolated patches (e.g., native grassland). Examples of temporary impacts to special status species include noise and lighting during construction and temporary displacement from suitable habitat due to disruption by adjacent activities.

Impact 3.4-2. Loss of Special Status Habitats. Vacant sites identified in the GP/CLUP include approximately 40 acres of ESHA. Most of the ESHAs on or near vacant sites are located near creeks or existing preserves. The actual ESHA impacts of each development would be calculated as part of the planning process and CEQA documentation for individual projects. Although the GP/CLUP policies require impact avoidance and restrict development in ESHA areas, exceptions are allowed. Some loss of existing special status habitats would occur as a result of site development.

Proposed roads, trails, parks, and public facilities are planned mainly for areas outside of ESHAs. However, the GP/CLUP explicitly allows for the inclusion of trails and some roads in ESHAs and ESHA buffers. Plans for the proposed facilities are not at a stage where impacts to ESHAs can be calculated with reasonable certainty. Actual ESHA impacts will be calculated as part of the planning process and CEQA documentation for individual projects. Some loss of existing special status habitats would occur as a result of road, trail, park, and other public facility construction.

Maintenance of existing and future facilities (roads, trails, parks, other facilities) will occur in areas with ESHAs and in ESHA buffers. Actual ESHA impacts will depend on the type, timing, and location of the maintenance and management activities. A limited amount permanent habitat loss may result from some maintenance activities.

Impact 3.4-3. Long-term Degradation of Special Status Habitats. Impacts to special status habitats include increased occurrence of invasive nonnative species within special-status habitats due to the proximity of such nonnative species in adjacent landscaping, changes in hydrology and water flow that would degrade the quality and function of riparian systems, or habitat disturbances from unauthorized recreation activities. Because of the relatively small size and fragmented distribution of the ESHAs in the City, degradation of habitat conditions has the potential to result in permanent habitat loss as well as impaired habitat functions.

Impact 3.4-4. Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats. Given the limited amount of ESHAs and the linear nature of the riparian areas, fragmentation of ESHAs has the potential to result in permanent habitat loss as well as permanently impaired habitat functions.

Impact 3.4-5. Harm to Listed Species. Currently listed and proposed species that are known to occur in the City or potentially occur in the City's remaining habitats include vernal pool fairy

shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi),* Southern California steelhead (Southern California ESU) (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus),* tidewater goby (*Eucylogobius newberryi),* red-legged frog, *Rana aurora draytonii,* Belding's savannah sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi),* brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus),* burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia),* California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni),* least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus),* light-footed clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris levipes),* peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum),* and western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus).* Of these species, vernal pool fairy shrimp, red-legged frog, least Bell's vireo, and burrowing owl are most at risk of direct impacts because of the occurrence of their habitats in or near areas designated for development. The habitats of these species are subject to Federal and State regulations as well local ordinances and policies that are designed to protect the species from impacts, except as authorized under the Federal and State Endangered Species Acts. The other currently listed species are similarly protected by regulation and also occur primarily in already conserved habitat area. Other special status species may become listed during implementation of the GP/CLUP. The GP/CLUP policies provide essentially the same protection for listed and non-listed special status species. However, it is possible that other species may be proposed and become listed during implementation of the GP/CLUP.

Impact 3.4-6. Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species. Populations of endemic species such as vernal pool invertebrates and plants generally are at most risk. Most known areas of native grassland (the rarest native habitat in the City) are conserved within an existing reserve; a few areas exist on the residences at Sandpiper site and the Comstock Homes site.

Impact 3.4-7. Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species. Species associated with grassland habitats (including nonnative grassland) and endemic species such as vernal pool plants and invertebrates are potentially most at risk from habitat reduction.

Impact 3.4-8. Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages. Riparian corridors, which also provide movement corridors to upland habitats, are most at risk because of the tenuous nature of existing linkages and impacts from existing surrounding development.

Impact 3.4-9. Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat. Potential impacts are similar to those included in Impacts 3.4-1 through 3.4-8.

Impact 3.4-10. Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy. Development of vacant sites and the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities may entail proposed activities that are inconsistent with approved conservation programs and local conservation policies. Such effects would be potentially significant under CEQA.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.4-1. The following GP/CLUP policies reduce the potentially significant impacts of temporary habitat loss and modification by requiring impact avoidance where feasible, setting design criteria and management guidelines, and requiring mitigation for impacts to special status habitats:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands

- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.4-2. The following GP/CLUP policies reduce the potentially significant impacts of permanent loss of existing habitat by requiring impact avoidance where feasible, setting design criteria and management guidelines, and requiring that any allowed impacts to special status habitats be fully mitigated:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan

- Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.4-3. The following GP/CLUP policies reduce the potentially significant impacts of activities that directly or indirectly result in habitat degradation by requiring buffers and setbacks separating ESHAs from adjacent uses, identifying standards for uses in and adjacent to ESHAs and ESHA buffers, and requiring that impacts to EHSA be fully mitigated:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.4-4. Impact 3.4-4 would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by the same GP/CLUP policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-2.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.4-5. Impact 3.4-5 would be reduced to less-than-significant levels by GP/CLUP Policy CE 8: Protection of Special Status Species, and by the habitat-related policies identified for Impacts 3.4-1 and 3.4-2. These policies provide for the protection of listed and proposed species, plus other nonlisted special-status species. The protections are largely habitat-based, which provides protection to listed and non-listed species in the same locations. Harm to any listed species would require authorization from USFWS, NMFS, and/or DFG as appropriate in accordance with the Federal and State Endangered Species Acts. Such authorization would be a condition of any City approval of any project that would result in harm to a listed species. In addition, Policy CE 8 would apply to any species that fit the definitions of special status species.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.4-6. Impact 3.4-6 would be reduced to less-than-significant levels by the same GP/CLUP policies that reduce Impact 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 3.4-5.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.4-7. Impact 3.4-7 would be reduced to less-than-significant levels by the same GP/CLUP policies that reduce Impact 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 3.4-5.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.4-8. Impact 3.4-8 would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by the same GP/CLUP policies that would reduce Impacts 3.4-2, 3.4-3, and 3.4-4.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.4-9. Impact 3.4-9 would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by the same GP/CLUP policies that would reduce Impacts 3.4-1 through 3.4-8.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.4-10. Impact 3.4-10 would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by the same GP/CLUP policies that would reduce Impacts 3.4-1 through 3.4-9.

1.4.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.4.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

1.5.1 Significant Impacts

Three Cultural Resources Class II impacts have been identified related to: damage to sites of cultural, historical, or paleontological significance; loss or destruction of an important historical building, archaeological site, or paleontological site; and loss or destruction of significant cultural resource. These impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impacts are:

Impact 3.5-1. Damage to Sites of Cultural, Historical, or Paleontological Significance. Damage to an archeological site, Native American site, paleontological site, or historic building is, by definition, a long term impact. Exceptions to this might include a temporary impact to the setting, aesthetics, and integrity of a building or structure as the result of adjacent construction. In this instance, projects contiguous to historic buildings or structures could cause short-term, potentially significant but mitigable impacts.

Impact 3.5-2. Loss or Destruction of an Important Historical Building, Archaeological Site, or Paleontological Site. It is possible that future development proposed under the GP/CLUP could involve the loss or destruction of an important historical building, archaeological site, or historical site that could result in adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated to below the level of significance. Examples might include National Register or California Register buildings that require demolition, destruction, or damage to burial grounds. The only potential impact to paleontological resources resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP would involve the loss of a rare find of terrestrial mammal fossils during excavation of a key site for development.

Impact 3.5-3. Loss or Destruction of Significant Cultural Resource. The loss or destruction of significant cultural, historical, or paleontological resources within the City as a whole would constitute a long-term impact because such resources are nonrenewable and unique. However, for all but the most significant and unique sites, it would be possible to implement mitigation measures that can reduce the level of impacts to less-than-significant levels (Class II).

These impacts also apply to the future City service areas.

1.5.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, historical structures and buildings, sites of ethnic significance, and paleontological resources. Prehistoric archaeological sites consist of surface and subsurface deposits containing human related artifacts, burial interments, food refuse and/or food preparation features such as hearths, and bedrock associated features containing milling elements, rock art, or living shelters. Historic archaeological sites consist of surface or subsurface trash deposits containing artifacts or food refuse and surface-exposed features such as building foundations, wall footings, and other features associated with former historic dwellings and related structures, as well as commercial or agricultural facilities. Historic archaeological sites are distinguished from historic buildings and structures, which consist of still-intact homes as well as other buildings associated with commercial or agricultural activities. Paleontological resources (i.e., fossils) are the remains and/or traces of prehistoric (i.e., older than approximately 10,000 years) plant and animal life

Discussion

The loss or destruction of significant cultural, historical, or paleontological resources within the City as a whole would constitute a long-term impact because such resources are nonrenewable and unique. However, for all but the most significant and unique sites, it would be possible to implement mitigation measures that can reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.5-1 to a Level of Insignificance. The following policies would typically serve to reduce the potential impacts of implementing the GP/CLUP to Sites of Cultural, Historical, or Paleontological Significance to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources
- Policy VH 5: Historic Resources
- Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes

Some projects within the GP/CLUP may require a mixed strategy to include inventory, excavation, and avoidance/preservation. Elements of the built environment, such as buildings and structures, would typically require onsite preservation; archaeological sites may require data recovery excavation and/or preservation.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.5-2 to a Level of Insignificance. The following policies would typically serve to reduce the potential impacts of implementing the GP/CLUP to Loss or Destruction of an Important Historical Building, Archaeological Site, or Paleontological Site to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources
- Policy VH 5: Historic Resources
- Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes

Some projects within the GP/CLUP may require a mixed strategy to include inventory, excavation, and avoidance/preservation. Elements of the built environment, such as buildings and structures, would typically require onsite preservation; archaeological sites may require data recovery excavation and/or preservation.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.5-3. Overall, the standards and requirements identified in the following policies would serve to reduce the potential impacts involving Loss or Destruction of Significant Cultural Resource resulting from implementation of the GP/CLUP to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources
- Policy VH 5: Historic Resources
- Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes

Some projects may require a mixed strategy to include inventory, excavation, and avoidance/preservation. Elements of the built environment, such as buildings and structures, would typically require onsite preservation; archaeological sites may require data recovery excavation and/or preservation.

1.5.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.5.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.6 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES

1.6.1 Significant Impacts

Four Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources Class II impacts have been identified related to: soil erosion and loss of topsoil; exposure of people or structures to effects of seismic activity; exposure of people or structures to substantial adverse landslide effects; and location of development on expansive and/or compressible soil that could lead to risks to people or structures. These impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impacts are:

Impact 3.6-1. Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil. Development would cause groundbreaking and vegetation removal during construction. As a result, soil would be exposed to rain and wind, potentially causing accelerated erosion and deposition of sediment into nearby drainages and/or waterways. Erosion and sedimentation could result in a short-term increase in turbidity in these waterways, potentially causing water quality degradation. Accelerated erosion and loss of a substantial amount of topsoil resulting from buildout under the GP/CLUP would be considered a potentially significant impact.

Impact 3.6-2. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from the Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault, Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismically Induced Landsliding, or Liquefaction. The City is in a seismically active region, and seismic activity could cause surface fault rupture, strong ground shaking, seismically induced landslides, and/or liquefaction. Exposure of people or structures to these events would be considered a potentially significant impact.

Impact 3.6-3. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting from Buildout on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils or Steep Slopes. Buildout in areas with moderate to steep slopes or unstable geologic units or soils could be susceptible to landslides. Exposure of people or structures to landslides would be considered a potentially significant impact.

Impact 3.6-4. Location of Development on Expansive and/or Compressible Soil That Could Lead to Risks to People or Structures. Expansive and/or compressible soils occur in the City, and development on these soils could lead to significant damage to structures and utilities. The location of development on expansive and/or compressible soils that could lead to risks to people or structures would be a potentially significant impact.

In addition, three Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources Class II impacts have been identified for the future City service areas. These impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impacts are:

Impact 4.6-1. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting During Construction on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils. Development in selected portions of the northern and southern subareas could cause a higher likelihood of landslides.

Impact 4.6-2. Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil. Development in selected portions of the northern and southern subareas could cause a higher likelihood of accelerated erosion.

Impact 4.6-3. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from Seismically Induced Landsliding or Liquefaction. Development in selected portions of the northern and southern subareas could be subject to risks from landslides and/or surface ruptures.

1.6.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

The City of Goleta occupies a portion of the eight-mile long and three-mile wide flat alluvial plain known as the Goleta Valley. This valley is bordered on the south by the coastal plateaus that encompass the Ellwood Mesa, Isla Vista, the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB), and the More Mesa areas. The western portion of the City of Goleta extends to the coast and includes the Ellwood Mesa area. The northern limit of the Goleta Valley is defined by the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains and is roughly coincident with the northern limit of the City. To the east, the Goleta Valley extends to the hills near the western edge of the City of Santa Barbara. Most of the valley drains into the Goleta Slough, a coastal salt marsh located south of Goleta and within the City of Santa Barbara airport property. The Goleta Slough is connected to the Pacific Ocean at the gap in the coastal plateaus located near Goleta Beach County Park.

The geologic structure that underlies the City of Goleta generally consists of a southerly dipping, east-west trending homocline (i.e., all the rock layers dip uniformly in one direction), similar to the overall structure of the Santa Ynez Mountains. In the foothills north of the City, a more complex geologic structure with folds and faults has been mapped in the exposed bedrock. None of the faults that cross the City have been designated as active by the California Geological Survey.

Due to the nature of the parent bedrock material in the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains, alluvial soils present in various parts of the City of Goleta (and most of the South Coast) are commonly classified as expansive. *Expansive soils* will change volume (shrink and swell) with changes in moisture content. If not adequately addressed in foundation design, buildings can be damaged by repeated swelling of the supporting soil. *Compressible soils* are near-surface (uppermost 50 feet) deposits that contain a high proportion of organic material. When a load (such as a new building) is placed on these deposits, the organic matter can compress and cause localized ground subsidence.

Discussion

Impact 3.6-1. Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil. Federal and state jurisdictions require that an approved SWPPP be prepared. A SWPPP specifies BMPs that will prevent all construction pollutants from contacting stormwater with the intent of keeping all products of erosion from moving off site into receiving waters. In addition, construction projects will need to adhere to the City's grading ordinances. These ordinances and State/Federal requirements set forth the procedures, standards, and enforcement that will be used to manage soil erosion and subsequent sedimentation in order to sustain the goal of clean water.

Impact 3.6-2. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from the Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault, Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismically Induced Landsliding, or Liquefaction. Surface fault rupture and strong ground shaking caused by local or regional earthquakes could result in severe damage to structures and utilities and pose a significant risk to public safety. Unless constructed to withstand the potential fault rupture and shaking caused by an earthquake, structures could collapse or be shifted off their foundations, roads could be damaged, and pipelines could fail. A seismic event could also trigger landsliding in unstable geologic or soil units (described in Impact 3.6-3) or on steep (i.e., greater than 20 percent) slopes. Unstable units and steep slopes occur primarily in northern portion of the City. In addition, the extensive unconsolidated deposits in the City that overlie shallow groundwater could become unstable as a result of liquefaction caused by strong ground shaking.

Impact 3.6-3. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting from Buildout on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils or Steep Slopes. Landslides are most likely in very small areas in the in the northern portion of the City with unstable geologic or soil units or with steep slopes, or in the southern portion of the City along coastal bluffs. Buildout in these high landslide potential areas under the GP/CLUP is planned at Sites #14 and #15. Unstable geologic and soil units of particular concern are the Rincon Formation and the Ayars series, as these are known for their landslides and slope failures.

Impact 3.6-4. Location of Development on Expansive and/or Compressible Soil That Could Lead to Risks to People or Structures. Although expansive/compressible soils can lead to structural damage, the City's policies for general safety and soil stability related to expansive/compressible soils reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 4.6-1. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting During Construction on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils. See discussion above for Impact 3.6-3.

Impact 4.6-2. Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil. See discussion above for Impact 3.6-1.

Impact 4.6-3. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from Seismically Induced Landsliding or Liquefaction. See discussion above for Impact 3.6-2.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.6-1. Although construction can potentially lead to accelerated erosion, the City's policies for general safety, soil and slope stability, bluff erosion and retreat, and beach erosion, together with implementation of the SWPPP and the grading ordinances, would prevent substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil and reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level. The City's policies are:

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
- Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.6-2. Although building in a seismically active region is potentially dangerous, the City's policies for seismic and seismically induced hazards reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level. The City's policies, listed below, include maintaining up-

to-date geologic information, complying with the CBSC, prohibiting building within a fault trace corridor, requiring geotechnical reports, pursuing retrofitting older masonry buildings, requiring a higher level of seismic safety for critical buildings minimizes this impact, and discouraging construction with high liquefaction potential.

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically Induced Hazards
- Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.6-3. Although buildout on unstable geologic units or soils or steep slopes can be susceptible to landslides, the City's policies for general safety, soil and slope stability, bluff erosion and retreat, and beach erosion reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
- Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.6-4. Although expansive/compressible soils can lead to structural damage, the City's policies for general safety and soil stability related to expansive/compressible soils reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.6-1. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting During Construction on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils. See policies above for Impact 3.6-3.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.6-2. Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil. See policies above for Impact 3.6-1.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.6-3. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from Seismically Induced Landsliding or Liquefaction. See policies above for Impact 3.6-2.

1.6.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.6.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1.7.1 Significant Impacts

Seven Hazards and Hazardous Materials Class II impacts have been identified related to: risk of upset at S.L. 421 wells; risk of upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal; Santa Barbara Municipal Airport; wildland fires; surface water; exposure of population to listed/contaminated sites; and contaminated soil. These impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impacts are:

Impact 3.7-3. Risk of Upset at S.L. 421 Wells. The recommissioning of oil production at the idled oil well would create risks to marine and land resources and neighboring populations associated with spills, leaks, or pipeline ruptures. Impacts due to releases oil emulsion during pumping from the S.L. 421 production well to the EOF would be significant but mitigable.

Impact 3.7-4. Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal. Oil storage and transfer operations at EMT create risks to marine and land resources and planned neighboring populations associated with spills, leaks, or pipeline ruptures. Impacts due to oil releases would be significant but mitigable through implementation of SPCC Plans, pursuant to 40 CFR Part 112, that are currently required of the EMT and implementation of a pipeline safety, maintenance, operation and inspection program.

Impact 3.7-5. Airport. Nearly the entire City of Goleta is contained within the influence area of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. A significant exception is the Venoco's EOF, located at the west end of the City and outside of the influence area. Within the influence area, the areas underneath the takeoff and landing paths are subject to the greatest risk from accidents involving flight operations. Given the amount of potential office/institutional, commercial, business park, and hotel development that could occur within the one-mile markers of the airport, under the GP/CLUP with buildout of these properties would be considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.7-6 Wildland Fires. The City includes areas that are classified by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) as wildland fire hazard areas. Future residential development is planned for three parcels totaling 9.06 acres within the high wildfire hazard area of the City under the GP/CLUP. Due to the proximity of these vacant properties to undeveloped wildland, the fire risk to future homes and other structures within these areas resulting from GP/CLUP implementation is considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water. Surface water quality could be adversely affected by ordinary use or spills of hazardous materials used during site grading and construction activities. This impact would be considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.7-8. Exposure of Population to Listed/Contaminated Sites. The City of Goleta contains numerous locations that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, could present significant hazards to the public or the environment.

Impact 3.7-9. Contaminated Soil. Areas within the City affected by hazardous materials associated with past oil development activities may include contaminated soils. Contaminants of concern include petroleum hydrocarbons (benzene, crude oil, waste oil, and light petroleum

distillates), metals, volatile organic compounds, semi-volatile organic compounds, and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). Construction activities associated with future residential or other development could potentially uncover contaminated soils and expose construction workers and the public to potential health hazards.

In addition, four Hazards and Hazardous Materials Class II impacts have been identified for the future City service areas. These impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impacts are:

Impact 4.7-1 Wildland Fires. Development in Areas E and C could be located in wildland fire hazard areas, and result in significant fire risk to homes and other structures.

Impact 4.7-2. Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal. Oil storage and transfer operations at EMT could create risks to marine and land resources and planned neighboring populations associated with spills, leaks, or pipeline ruptures.

Impact 4.7-3. Listed Contaminated Sites. Area D may contain listed sites that use and/or store hazardous materials. The release of hazardous materials associated with oil and gas production, processing, and transport may result in significantly adverse impacts.

Impact 4.7-4. Surface Water. Surface water quality could be adversely affected by ordinary use or spills of hazardous materials used during site grading and construction activities. Impacts would be potentially significant.

1.7.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

Existing and potential hazards relevant to the City of Goleta include: hazards associated with naturally occurring phenomenon such as fire; hazards associated with the use, storage, transportation, and manufacturing of hazardous materials as well as the generation and management of hazardous wastes; and man-made hazards associated the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport and electricity generation and transmission (i.e., electromagnetic fields).

The GP/CLUP was analyzed with respect to potential buildout that would result in potential public safety hazards caused by the presence, use, manufacture, or transport of hazardous materials within the City. Available site investigation reports were reviewed to assess whether potential hazardous materials release sites exist within the City and, if so, to assess the status of those sites. A qualitative assessment of potential impacts on the community was then made based on the location and condition of the sites and on the current and planned uses of the location. To evaluate impacts on the environment, the risk of upset impact analysis (focused on impacts to humans) assessed potential impacts from accidents, explosions, and other releases.

Impacts to public safety from hazards and hazardous materials and wastes due to upset conditions, accidental releases, or natural phenomena have been evaluated in relation to the GP/CLUP. Corresponding policies and elements assess the adequacy to which the GP/CLUP and the corresponding policies and elements address hazards and hazardous materials related impacts. No quantitative analysis of the risk potential was performed for this report.

Discussion

Impact 3.7-3. Risk of Upset at S.L. 421 Wells. Processing at the EOF rather than at the pier well would reduce the risk of oil processing related spills at the pier and potential releases of BLEVEs, both of which would impact marine and nearshore environments and potential new populations in the surrounding area. The volume of such an oil emulsion spill may also be reduced if oil processing is limited to the EOF since a produced water separation tank at the pier would not be necessary. The resulting risk associated with pumping oil emulsion to the EOF could be reduced by the implementation of a pipeline safety, maintenance, operation, and inspection program. A QRA will be required by the City as stated in SE 8.6 to assess potential releases from pumping oil emulsion to the EOF, if recommissioning of oil production at S.L. 421 is permitted.

Impact 3.7-4. Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal. The EMT is located on 17 acres of property immediately east of the City-owned Sperling Preserve/Santa Barbara Shores. Located outside but adjacent to the City limits, the EMT is located on UCSB-leased land. The onshore storage facilities are located south of the planned Ocean Meadows residential project and about 0.5 mile from UCSB residential development at its North and West Campus areas. A 10-inch diameter, then 6-inch, diameter oil pipeline connects the EMT to the EOF; this pipeline is 3.7 miles, nearly all of which is within the City's jurisdiction. A second oil pipeline consists of a 12-inch, then 10-inch, diameter pipeline from the onshore transfer pumps at the EMT to the offshore loading connection. A QRA will be required by the City as stated in SE 8.6 to assess potential releases from the EMT and the associated risks to neighboring populations.

Impact 3.7-5. Airport. The Runway Safety Areas (RSAs) at each end of Runway 7-25 (east-west) do not meet the current FAA design standard of 1000 feet long. Currently, the safety areas are 215 feet long on the east end terminating at San Pedro Creek and Fairview Avenue, and 320 feet long on the west end terminating at Tecolotito Creek (SBA website 2006). This adds to the inherent risk associated with takeoff and landing routes. To alleviate such hazards, the City of Santa Barbara is currently in the process of shifting Runway 7-25 800 feet to the west. Construction will be completed in 2007. When complete, the new RSAs will meet the FAA design standards of 500 feet wide and 1000 feet long at both ends of this runway.

In the City, existing land uses within any of the Airport's Clear Zones are limited to the business park at 6300 Hollister and portions of the existing Cabrillo Business Park, and a mix of industrial development along Kellogg west of SR-217. There are two existing residential areas within the One-Mile Zone. A portion of an existing residential area zoned for single-family use north of US-101 and east of La Patera Lane falls within the northern one-mile marker of the Approach Zone for Runway 15-33. The area inside of the one-mile marker of the Approach Zone off the east end of Runway 7-25 includes a portion of the existing Rancho Goleta mobile home park. Other existing land uses within the one-mile markers of the Approach Zones of Runways 7-25 and 15-33 include general industrial, office and institutional, and business park developments.

Under the GP/CLUP, approximately 20 acres of currently undeveloped land within the airport's Clear Zone off the east end of Runway 7-25 would be designated for future Service Industrial development with approximately 26 acres of undeveloped land within the Clear Zone off the west end of Runway 7-25 proposed for Service Industrial. Within the one-mile marker inside of the Approach Zone off the west end of Runway 7-25, the GP/CLUP proposes a mix of future office/institutional (3.09 acres), community commercial (3.82 acres), and business park (16.82 acres) development. In addition, a two-acre portion of the business park at 6300 Hollister that lies within the one-mile marker of the northerly Approach Zone of Runway 15-33 is designated as a future hotel site with a Hotel Overlay on the property. Assuming no other development

constraints exist on these properties, buildout under the Plan based on the maximum allowable floor area ratios (FARs) for various land use classifications noted in the Land Use Element could result in the following:

- approximately 28 acres of service industrial development within Airport Clear Zones;
- approximately 12 acres of office/institutional development within Airport one-mile markers;
- approximately 7 acres of business park development within Airport one-mile markers;
- approximately 1.5 acres of community commercial development within Airport one-mile markers; and
- a possible hotel at 6300 Hollister.

Under the ALUP, only storage type land uses generating a population of less than 25 people/acre are considered compatible uses if approved by the ALUC. Within the one-mile marker, commercial and business park land uses may be acceptable if population densities are below 25 people/acre and such projects are approved by the ALUC.

Impact 3.7-6 Wildland Fires. The undeveloped hills and canyons that border the City to the north can feature rough terrain, vegetation, and high velocity winds. This combination of existing natural conditions creates a challenge to firefighting crews and puts homes and property at risk.

Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water. Fuels, solvents, paint, and other similar substances used during grading and construction could adversely impact local surface water quality if they were spilled directly into the runoff drainage system.

Impact 3.7-8. Exposure of Population to Listed/Contaminated Sites. None of the sites identified by EDR within the City are currently listed on the NPL, although a single site (Gibralter Mining, 6144 Calle Real) is currently being reviewed/assessed for possible inclusion on the NPL. The significance of NPL sites is that the level of contamination and the toxicity of the chemicals of concern found in soil and groundwater at such sites may pose a risk to human health and the environment within one mile or more from the NPL site. Impacts to human health and the environment from exposure routes, such as vapor migration from contaminated soil and/or groundwater to the surface or into overlying buildings, and ingestion of contaminated groundwater if used without well head treatment or municipal treatment, may occur. Short-and long-term mitigations (e.g., remediation and engineered controls) would be or have been developed under the direction of EPA, DTSC, and local oversight agencies (i.e., SBCFPD) to reduce public safety hazards. Exposure to contaminated soil or groundwater associated with a NPL or listed hazardous waste site could present long-term health hazards to residents directly exposed on a daily basis, and to the public from recreational activities, if assessment and remediation activities were not conducted in the area to be used for development.

Impacts due to releases of hazardous materials from LUSTs sites (approximately 100 sites were identified in the EDR report) are usually limited to the specific site with the LUSTs, or in some cases, to the adjoining properties within 0.5 mile of the documented release. Exposure to impacted soil or groundwater associated with a LUST site could present long-term health hazards to residents directly exposed on a daily basis, and to the public from recreational activities, if assessment and remediation activities were not conducted in the area to be used for development.

Impact 3.7-9. Contaminated Soil. Although some sites impacted from past oil development have been assessed and remediated, there are additional areas that have not been assessed

or, in some potential cases, even identified. Exposure to contaminated soil left in place could present long-term health hazards to residents directly exposed on a daily basis, and to the public from recreational activities, if assessment and remediation activities were not conducted in the area to be used for development. Left unmitigated, contaminated soils present a significant hazard to the public.

Impact 4.7-1 Wildland Fires. See discussion above for Impact 3.7-6.

Impact 4.7-2. Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal. See discussion above for Impact 3.7-4.

Impact 4.7-3. Listed Contaminated Sites. See discussion above for Impact 3.7-8.

Impact 4.7-4. Surface Water. See discussion above for Impact 3.7-7.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policy That Would Reduce Impact 3.7-3. The following policy should ensure that impacts associated with oil production at the idled S.L. 421 production well are identified and reduced to the extent feasible:

- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
  - LU 10-3a: Oil and Gas Transport and Storage Facilities
  - LU 10-4a and b: State Lands Commission Lease 421

If resumption of production is considered for approval, the City contends in Part b. of Policy LU 10 that on-pier processing of the oil at the site within the tidal zone should not be approved unless it is demonstrated that there is no feasible and less environmentally damaging alternative to processing on the pier. The development of new processing facilities over the sea would result in an increased and unacceptable level of risk of environmental damage. Implementation of Policy LU 10 ensures that alternatives to on-pier processing of the oil would be evaluated.

- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
  - SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required
  - SE 8.6: Quantitative Risk Assessment
  - SE 8.9: Safety Requirements for New Petroleum Pipelines
  - SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines
  - SE 8.14: Pipeline Burial Depths
  - SE 8.15: Pipeline Marking and Warning

Implementation of elements of Policy SE 8, including the subpolicies above, would minimize the risk of hazards associated with the operation of S.L. 421 oil production well and associated oil emulsion transportation equipment and facilities. Proper implementation of these policies would ensure that any new onshore oil pipelines associated with S.L. 421 would be adequately designed, installed, marked, operated, and inspected so as to reduce the risk of hazards associated with the operation and transfer of oil to a less-than-significant level.

Policy That Would Reduce Impact 3.7-4. The Safety Element includes policies that would ensure that impacts associated with oil storage and transfer operations are identified and mitigated to the extent feasible.

- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
  - SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required
  - SE 8.5: Inventory of Oil and Gas Pipelines
  - SE 8.9: Safety Requirements for New Petroleum Pipelines
  - SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines
  - SE 8.14: Pipeline Burial Depths

Implementation of Policy SE 8 would minimize the risk of hazards related to risk of upset at the Ellwood Marine Terminal by reducing the probability of an oil leak and ensuring that a leak if one were to occur would be promptly identified and effectively addressed. In particular, Annual Safety Audits would examine the integrity of storage tanks, secondary containment, pipelines, and related equipment, as well as insure safety and emergency response procedures are up-to-date and effective. Aspects related to ample pipeline inventories, marking/warning, and burial depths would help avoid pipeline exposure and third party damage to oil pipelines.

In addition, a detailed characterization of the hazards associated with an oil release will be developed as part of the QRA for the facility as required by SE 8.6 in the event of any alternations to the EMT. Proper implementation of these policies would ensure that any risk of upset associated with the operation of the EMT is reduced to a less than significant level.

Policy That Would Reduce Impact 3.7-5. Land use and building restrictions contained within the following policy would be imposed on all future development within the various Airport safety zones to minimize the risks to people and property in the event of an airplane crash during takeoff or landing:

- Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards
  - SE 9.1: Clear Zone and Airport Approach Zone Regulations
  - SE 9.2: Height Restrictions
  - SE 9.3: Limitations on Development and Uses
  - SE 9.4: Maintenance of an Airport Safety Corridor for Runway 7
  - SE 9.5: Limitations on Density
  - SE 9.6: Limitations on Residential Development
  - SE 9.7: Real Estate Disclosure
  - SE 9.8: Limitations on Hazardous Facilities

Implementation of this policy, along with compliance with ALUC and FAA standards and requirements, would ensure that the residual impacts associated with future buildout of the Plan within the various safety zones of the Airport would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.7-6. The following policies should ensure that fire hazards for future development as a result of Plan implementation are identified and mitigated to the extent feasible:

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
  - SE 1.1: Maintenance of Maps and Resources on Hazards
  - SE 1.2: Guidelines for Siting Highly Sensitive Uses and Critical Facilities
  - SE 1.3: Site-Specific Hazards Studies
  - SE 1.4: Deed Restriction in Hazardous Areas
  - SE 1.5: Subdivision of New Lots in Hazard Areas
  - SE 1.6: Enforcement of Building Codes
  - SE 1.7: Abatement of Public Safety Hazards
  - SE 1.8: Reduction of Non-Conforming or Substandard Structural Conditions
- Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards
  - SE 7.1: Fire Prevention and Response Measures for New Development
  - SE 7.2: Review of New Development
  - SE 7.3: Identification of Fire Hazard Areas
  - SE 7.4: Fuel Modification Plans
  - SE 7.5: Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems
  - SE 7.6: Standards for Rebuilding in High Fire Hazard Areas

Implementation of the policies above would expect to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.7-7. Implementation of SWPPPs and SPCC Plans as discussed in the GP/CLUP would greatly reduce the impact to the environment of any spills. These plans would help minimize the potential for spills of hazardous materials in drainages and creeks. In addition, implementation of the following policies identified in the Conservation Element of the GP/CLUP would ensure that construction impacts on surface water quality resulting from Plan implementation would be less than significant.

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
  - CE 1.1: Definition of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas
  - CE 1.2: Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas
  - CE 1.3: Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs
  - CE 1.4: Illegal Destruction of ESHAs
  - CE 1.5: Corrections to Map of ESHAs
  - CE 1.6: Protection of ESHAs
  - CE 1.7: Mitigation of Impacts to EHSAs
  - CE 1.8: ESHA Buffers
  - CE 1.9: Standards Applicable to Development Projects
  - CE 1.10: Management of ESHAs
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas

- CE 2.1: Designation of Protected Creeks
- CE 2.2: Streamside Protection Areas
- CE 2.3: Allowable Uses and Activities in Streamside Protection Areas
- CE 2.4: Dedication of Easements or Other Property Interests
- CE 2.5: Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems
- CE 2.6: Restoration of Degraded Creeks

- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
  - CE 3.1: Definition of Wetlands
  - CE 3.2: Designation of Wetland ESHAs
  - CE 3.3: Site-Specific Wetland Delineations
  - CE 3.4: Protection of Wetlands
  - CE 3.5: Wetland Buffer Areas
  - CE 3.6: Mitigation of Wetland Fill
  - CE 3.7: Lagoon Protection
  - CE 3.8: Vernal Pool Protection

- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
  - CE 10.1: New Development and Water Quality
  - CE 10.2: Siting and Design of New Development
  - CE 10.3: Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management
  - CE 10.4: New Facilities
  - CE 10.5: Beachfront and Blufftop Development
  - CE 10.6: Stormwater Management Requirements
  - CE 10.7: Drainage and Stormwater Management Plans
  - CE 10.8: Maintenance of Stormwater Management Facilities
  - CE 10.9: Landscaping to Control Erosion

Policy That Would Reduce Impact 3.7-8. The following policy would help ensure that the community is protected from exposure to residual contamination:

- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
  - SE 10.1: Identification of Hazardous Materials Facilities
  - SE 10.3: Hazard Assessment Required for Hazardous Materials Facilities
  - SE 10.4: Prohibition on New Facilities Posing Unacceptable Risks
  - SE 10.5: Restriction on Residential Development near Hazardous Facilities
  - SE 10.6: Responsibility for Cleanup by Responsible Party
  - SE 10.7: Identification, Transport, and Disposition of Potentially Contaminated Soil

Cleanup of contaminated sites prior to proposed future development (recreational, residential, commercial or industrial) pursuant to Policy SE 10 would reduce potentially significant exposure of the public to hazardous waste associated with listed/contaminated sites to less-than-significant levels.

Policy That Would Reduce Impact 3.7-9. The following policy would help ensure that the community is protected from exposure to contaminated soils:

- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
  - SE 10.1: Identification of Hazardous Materials Facilities
  - SE 10.2 Compliance with Law
  - SE 10.5: Restriction on Residential Development near Hazardous Facilities
  - SE 10.6 Responsibility for Cleanup by Responsible Party
  - SE 10.7 Identification, Transport, and Disposition of Potentially Contaminated Soil (formerly MM 3.7-1)

Furthermore, these policy subsections would ensure that uses and development incompatible with exposure to hazardous materials are not allowed on a given site unless and until any required remediation has been completed.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.7-1 Wildland Fires. See policies above for Impact 3.7-6.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.7-2. Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal. See policies above for Impact 3.7-4.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.7-3. Listed Contaminated Sites. See policies above for Impact 3.7-8.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.7-4. Surface Water. See policies above for Impact 3.7-7.

1.7.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.7.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.8 POPULATION AND HOUSING

1.8.1 Significant Impacts

Four Population and Housing Class II impacts have been identified related to: the Physical Alteration of Vacant and Previously Developed Land within the City; increased population; additional residential units; and additional jobs. These impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impacts are:

Impact 3.8-1. The Result of the Increased Population Would Be the Need for Additional Housing and Jobs, Which Would Result in the Physical Alteration of Vacant and Previously Developed Land within the City. Although population growth would not in itself create physical effects to the environment, it could result in secondary or indirect impacts. The result of the increased population would be the need for additional housing and jobs, which would lead to the physical impact of residential and commercial development.

Impact 3.8-2. Population Growth Associated with Implementation of the GP/CLUP Is Anticipated to Result in an Increase in the Population by 24 Percent at Full or Ultimate Buildout. Population growth associated with implementation of the GP/CLUP is anticipated to result in an additional 7,421 people, resulting in a population of about 38,100 by the end of the timeframe of the GP/CLUP. The indirect impacts of the population increase could be considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.8-3. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Could Result in the Addition of 3,880 Residential Units to the City's Housing Stock. Population growth that could be accommodated under the Land Use Element would increase the demand for housing in the City. Based on the proposed Land Use Plan, an estimated 3,880 housing units could be constructed under full Plan buildout, and would be a significant impact.

Impact 3.8-4. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Would Result in the Addition of Approximately 3,400 to 3,900 Jobs. Implementation of the GP/CLUP would result in an estimated 3,400 to 3,900 additional employment opportunities, for a total of up to 26,900 jobs citywide at full Plan buildout, and would be a significant impact.

These impacts also apply to the future City service areas.

1.8.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

According to the California Department of Finance, the City of Goleta's population in January 2005 was 30,679, which was 7.3 percent of Santa Barbara County's population (California Department of Finance, 2005). The 2000 median age within the City was 37.2 years, compared to the County median of 33.4 years, and the State median of 33 years of age. In 2000, approximately three-quarters of the City's population were considered white with no other race identified in their heritage. The estimated 2000 average household size for the City was 2.99, and the average family size was 3.55. The 1999 median annual household income within the current City limits was $54,000, compared to the County median of $46,677 and State median of $47,493. The largest sector of employment in Goleta Valley was the public sector (refer to Chart 3.8-1), which includes County and City employees and educational workers in all public institutions. As of January 2005, there were an estimated 11,486 housing units in the City,

which represented 7.7 percent of the County's housing units at that time (California Department of Finance 2005).

The jobs-housing balance concept is a comparison of the number of jobs provided at workplaces located in an area to the number of workers who reside in that same area. The jobs to employed residents ratio is a more refined measure than the jobs to housing ratio since it takes into account variations in labor force participation. This is especially important in settings, such as Goleta, where there are larger than average proportions of households that may have atypical labor force participation, such as households composed of elderly persons and students. Data indicate that the cities of Santa Barbara and Santa Maria have excess jobs relative to the number of employed residents and are therefore net importers of labor or workforce from outside their boundaries. The Goleta CDP and the cities of Carpinteria and Lompoc, on the other hand, have more employed residents than jobs, or a net out-commute.

California law requires each city and county, when preparing its State-mandated Housing Element, to include local housing programs to provide sufficient sites to accommodate its allocated share of housing needs for all income groups. As a result of SBCAG's Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA), the City of Goleta was allocated a total of 2,388 units for the 2001 to 2009 planning period. The City must demonstrate that adequate sites will be made available to address its share of the regional housing need for the same planning period. It should be noted that the planning period of the Housing Element's Action Program is from 2001 to 2009, which is shorter than the planning period of the Goleta GP/CLUP as a whole. The Housing Element is required to be updated by 2009 to respond to new regional housing needs allocated for the next Housing Element planning period.

Discussion

Impact 3.8-1. The Result of the Increased Population Would Be the Need for Additional Housing and Jobs, Which Would Result in the Physical Alteration of Vacant and Previously Developed Land within the City. Environmental issues associated with increased development include land use compatibility, noise, air quality, traffic, biology, water resources, cultural resources, hazardous materials, geology/soils, aesthetics, public services, cultural/archaeological, and public utilities. Indirect environmental impacts and mitigation measures associated with construction of housing and commercial development within the City are addressed under those topics.

Impact 3.8-2. Population Growth Associated with Implementation of the GP/CLUP Is Anticipated to Result in an Increase in the Population by 24 Percent at Full or Ultimate Buildout. Projected population growth under the GP/CLUP represents an increase of 24 percent over the current 2005 population of 30,679. The estimated population increase of 24 percent over the next 24 years is not considered in and of itself to be a significant impact; however, the indirect impacts of the population increase could be considered potentially significant. Sections 3.1 through 3.13 of the EIR programmatically address the indirect impacts and mitigation measures associated with population increase.

Impact 3.8-3. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Could Result in the Addition of 3,880 Residential Units to the City's Housing Stock. The GP/CLUP Housing Element includes targets for the City's fair share allocation to provide adequate housing and address regional growth. Under guidelines set forth by SBCAG, an additional 2,388 dwelling units would be required by June 30, 2009 to meet regional goals. Table 10A-20 of the Housing Element Technical Appendix identifies 3,681 potential residential units that could be built by June 2009 (this number is slightly less than the 3,880 maximum allowable units identified in the

Land Use Plan). Additional residential development at redevelopment sites and in mixed-use projects could accommodate a small number of additional units in the long term, since the Housing Element focuses on sites reasonably expected to be available for development within just the near-term. Construction of these units would enable the City to meet the total RHNA allocation of 2,388 units for the period from January 1, 2001 to June 30, 2009, as well as longer-term housing needs.

Impact 3.8-4. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Would Result in the Addition of Approximately 3,400 to 3,900 Jobs. The additional housing units resulting from full Plan buildout would help maintain an existing balance between jobs and housing, or between jobs and employed residents. The jobs to housing ratio at full buildout could range from 1.49 to 1.74. By achieving a 1.74 jobs-to-housing ratio, the proposed project benefits the overall City jobs-to-housing balance.

The increase in employment opportunities would be gradual over the next 24 years due to the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance, which regulates the rate of nonresidential development in order to ensure an appropriate balance between the rate of development of commercial-industrial space and the rate of housing growth in the City. It should be noted however that any increase in jobs resulting from the development of additional commercial/industrial space not coordinated with the construction of new residential development within the City could result in an exacerbation of the current job to housing balance and could result in an increase in the net out-commute, thereby potentially increasing the existing traffic volumes between Goleta and Santa Barbara on US-101.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.8-1. GP/CLUP policies that would reduce indirect environmental impacts associated with construction of housing and commercial development within the City are addressed under other topics, including land use compatibility, noise, air quality, traffic, biology, water resources, cultural resources, hazardous materials, geology/soils, aesthetics, public services, cultural/archaeological, and public services and utilities.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.8-2. The GP/CLUP includes the following policy and implementation action that would help control the rate of growth and its associated indirect impacts.

- Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management

Implementation of this policy is anticipated to reduce population growth and housing impacts to a less-than-significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

Existing Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.8-3. The Housing Element includes quantified housing objectives programs, which identify specific numerical targets for units and anticipated dates by which the RHNA targets are proposed to be accomplished. The programs are intended to be implemented in a timely manner and monitored for effectiveness in achieving the housing goals. The City's Housing Element includes the following policies related to the provisions of providing adequate housing stock and meeting the RHNA targets:

- Policy HE 1: Equal Housing Opportunities
- Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships
- Policy HE 4: Variety of Housing Choices and Affordable Housing Opportunities

- Policy HE 5: Special Needs Housing and Support Programs
- Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta's RHNA
- Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods
- Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design
- Policy HE 10: Production of New Affordable Housing
- Policy HE 11: Inclusion of Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income Housing in New Development
- Policy HE 12: Funding for Affordable Housing

Several factors may constrain the City's ability to address housing needs, such as physical and environmental considerations, governmental regulations, and market factors. Housing goals may at times need to be balanced with the need to achieve other important City goals, such as the desire to provide open space and recreational facilities, protect historic and environmental resources, and maintain adequate service levels. The Housing Element includes a constraints analysis to analyze potential and actual governmental and nongovernmental limitations to the production, maintenance, and improvement of housing for all persons of all income levels, including persons with disabilities. In addition, the Housing Element includes implementation programs that would address potential constraints to future housing construction.

Implementation of these Housing Element policies and implementation programs is anticipated to reduce potential impacts related to providing an adequate and serviceable housing stock to a less-than-significant level. No additional mitigation is required. Additional goals within the Housing Element are included to address other objectives, such as affordability, equal housing, preferences for affordable housing, the needs of the disabled, and the use of energy-conserving materials in housing construction.

The indirect impacts associated with the projected housing increase are discussed in those respective chapters of the FEIR. The indirect impacts associated with increased residential development within the City include land use compatibility, noise, air quality, traffic, biology, water resources, cultural resources, hazardous materials, geology/soils, aesthetics, public services, and public utilities.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.8-4. The Land Use Element includes Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management. The objective of the policy is to manage the amount and timing of nonresidential development within the City based upon actual residential construction so as to maintain an appropriate balance between jobs and housing in the City.

In addition, the GP/CLUP includes the following policies for locating job and housing growth near activity centers and transportation corridors, and organizes the growth in mixed-use clusters:

- Policy HE 3: Linkage of Housing and Jobs (GP)
- Policy HE 7: Opportunities for Mixed-Use Housing (GP)
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses

- Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses
- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
- Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management
- Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System
- Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management
- Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development
- Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation

Implementation of the above policies would reduce impacts from anticipated population growth to a less-than-significant level.

1.8.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.8.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.9 WATER RESOURCES

1.9.1 Significant Impacts

Seven Water Resources Class II impacts have been identified related to: degradation of water quality from construction-related contaminants; adequacy of water supplies to serve new development; changes in groundwater supply resulting from new development; alterations in existing drainage patterns and downstream flooding and erosion; construction of structures or housing in a 100-year flood hazard area; risk to new development from inundation by a tsunami, mudslide, or seiche; and increases in point source and nonpoint source pollution from new development. These impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impacts are:

Impact 3.9-1. Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants. Construction-related earth disturbing activities would occur during future development and infrastructure projects associated with buildout of the GP/CLUP. These activities could have potentially significant impacts to local water ways.

Impact 3.9-2. Adequacy of Water Supplies to Serve New Development. New commercial, residential, and industrial developments could be constructed as a result of the City's GP/CLUP. Additional development in the City would have a significant impact if it would result in overall demand for water in excess of water supplies available in normal, critical dry, and multiple dry years with water from all existing entitlements and sources, or if such development would require new or expanded water entitlements or resources.

Impact 3.9-3. Changes in Groundwater Supply Resulting from New Development. Buildout of the GP/CLUP could incrementally increase the amount of impervious surfaces and decrease the amount of rainfall that is able to recharge the groundwater basin. This is a potentially significant impact.

Impact 3.9-4. Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion. New development, infrastructure, and public facilities resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP have the potential to alter existing drainage patterns, potentially causing flooding or erosion impacts downstream. This impact is considered potentially significant

Impact 3.9-5. Construction of Structures or Housing in a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area. The GP/CLUP area consists of approximately 640 acres located within a FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain. New development or redevelopment within these areas could expose people or structures to risks from flooding. This impact is considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.9-6. Risk to New Development from Inundation by a Tsunami, Mudslide, or Seiche. Portions of the City are situated in tsunami run-up areas, or located adjacent to steep slopes that could be subject to mudslide. New development or redevelopment within existing areas subject to such hazards could expose people or structures to risks. This impact is considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.9-7. Increases in Point Source and Nonpoint Source Pollution from New Development. New development associated with the GP/CLUP would increase the amount of wastewater generated, with corresponding increases in the volume of treated wastewater that is

discharged. Point source and non-point source pollution from this new development could adversely affect water quality. This impact is considered potentially significant.

These impacts also apply to the future City service areas.

1.9.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

The City of Goleta is situated on a coastal terrace bordered on the south by the Pacific Ocean and on the north by the Santa Ynez Mountains. Within Goleta, 12 creeks drain from the foothills south to the Pacific Ocean. Most of the creeks exhibit intermittent, seasonal flows, and creek conditions vary greatly. The Goleta Groundwater Basin (GGWB; or Basin) underlies the City of Goleta. The Basin is divided into three subbasins: the North Subbasin, the Central Subbasin, and the West Subbasin. The majority of useable groundwater in storage in the GGWB is present within the Central Subbasin.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) categorize and rank areas that are susceptible to flooding. Some portions of the City are within the 500-year floodplain, and 640 acres within the City are identified as within the FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain. A seismic event on any moderate offshore fault could result in a tsunami, which would affect the project area.

Stormwater runoff may carry pollutants from *nonpoint* sources such as city streets, parking lots, lawns, gardens, and industrial areas to surface waters. Discharges within the City's creek system are regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program.

The Goleta Water District (GWD) supplies water to the City, University of California, Santa Barbara Airport, and water users in the unincorporated County of Santa Barbara. GWD relies on four sources of water to meet its existing and future demands: (1) surface water via the Cachuma Project; (2) surface water from the State Water Project (SWP); (3) groundwater from the Goleta Groundwater Basin; and (4) recycled water. Water demand in the GWD's service area is primarily dependent on the number of water users (i.e., population) and the types of water uses.

Discussion

Impact 3.9-1. Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants. Construction-related earth disturbing activities could cause soil erosion and sedimentation to local waterways. Construction and grading would also require heavy equipment with potential to leak hazardous materials that may include oil and gasoline. In addition, improper use of fuels, oils, and other construction-related hazardous materials, such as pipe sealant, may also pose a threat to surface or groundwater quality.

Impact 3.9-2. Adequacy of Water Supplies to Serve New Development. A comparison of GWD's available water supplies and its water demands during normal, critical dry, and multiple dry years (based on the Urban Water Management Plan of 2005) indicates that sufficient water supplies would be available during all water year types to meet GWD's projected demands. During a normal year, surplus water supplies would be available for groundwater recharge or banking. The multiple dry year reliability assessment assumes that banked groundwater will be used during the 6-year dry period to meet demands and prevent shortages. The GWD currently has banked greater than 35,000 AF, which is sufficient to supply the projected groundwater

demands under these various climatic scenarios. However, sufficient water supplies would only be available if GWD's actual future demands are not greater than the projected demands, actual future water supplies are not less than GWD's projected supplies, and banked groundwater supplies are sufficient to allow for pumping at the projected levels during critical dry and multiple dry years.

If the estimated average water demands for a normal water year underestimate the actual demands, then the City and GWD could have inadequate water supplies for the new development. Another factor that could result in inadequate water supplies is the reliability of SWP deliveries. Excerpts from the working draft of the SWP Delivery Reliability Report indicate that deliveries could be as low as 4 percent in a single dry year. Because the Final Reliability Report has not been published, GWD's projected supply values use previously published data of 20 percent for a single dry year. If the Final Reliability Report indicates that SWP deliveries in a critical dry year are 4 percent of allocated deliveries, this could cause inadequate water supplies. Therefore, this impact is considered potentially significant.

The adoption of the GP/CLUP represents a discretionary action subject to CEQA and Water Code Section 10910(b); therefore, the City has requested that GWD prepare a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) for the project (refer to Appendix B, Water Supply Assessment). The adequacy of GWD's water service to meet the demands of the proposed GP/CLUP, as well as all other projected future demands was evaluated for a normal year, a critically dry year, and a series of dry years. The available water supply during each of these scenarios is compared to the anticipated demand, including those associated with the proposed GP/CLUP, to identify potential shortages in deliveries. The major conclusions of the study are summarized in the list below.

- In a normal year over the period 2005-2030, GWD estimates that it would have sufficient supplies to meet all currently identified water demands, including those associated with the proposed maximum buildout under the GP/CLUP.
- Water supplies in a critically dry year would meet normal year demands until the year 2020. In that year, and years after, GWD would implement demand reduction measures to reduce demands to meet the available supplies in a critically dry year. The maximum demand reduction would be 9 percent in one year to meet a water supply shortage. If GWD increases its groundwater pumping capacity by the year 2020, the predicted shortages may be avoided by producing groundwater at more than the soon-to-be maximum rate of 5,600 AFY, utilizing GWD's annual legal entitlement and banked groundwater. Hence, GWD estimates that it would have sufficient supplies to meet all currently identified water demands, including those associated with the proposed maximum buildout under the GP/CLUP, with the possibility of only a minor, short-term demand reduction in one year.
- For the multiple dry year analysis, GWD assumed six-year dry periods that would end in 2010, 2015, 2020, 2025, or 2030 and estimated that it would have sufficient supplies to meet the annual demands in a 6-year dry period that occurs during the years 2005-2030. Under a multiple-dry year scenario, GWD estimates that it would have sufficient supplies to meet all currently identified water demands, including those associated with maximum buildout under the GP/CLUP.

Impact 3.9-3. Changes in Groundwater Supply Resulting from New Development. New commercial, residential, and industrial developments could be constructed as a result of the GP/CLUP. To meet the water demands of these new developments, particularly during a critical dry year or multiple dry years, GWD may need to increase groundwater pumping. However, the increased groundwater pumping would be limited to GWD's allocation (2,350 AFY) of the

adjudicated groundwater basin's supply, plus banked groundwater up to GWD's 5,600 AFY pumping capacity. Under no circumstances would GWD pumping exceed the District's allocation and banked groundwater amount. Therefore, new development would not be expected to decrease the groundwater supply such that other groundwater users were affected.

However, new development would also result in increased amounts of impervious surface, reducing the ability for stormwater to percolate and recharge the groundwater basin. The primary recharge zone consists of the existing stream system in the northern part of the City, which would not be affected by buildout of the GP/CLUP. In other areas that may provide lower levels of groundwater recharge, the GP/CLUP does not call for a substantial increase in development density that would affect groundwater recharge.

Impact 3.9-4. Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion. While development is unlikely to be approved in locations that would directly impede or redirect flows (e.g., within active floodways), new development would result in new impervious surfaces, reducing the amount of precipitation that would infiltrate, and increasing the volume of stormwater runoff. This could result in an increase in drainage flows and cause peak flows to occur earlier, potentially causing flooding or erosion impacts downstream.

Impact 3.9-5. Construction of Structures or Housing in a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area. While much of the GP/CLUP area within a FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain is located within open space or other areas that are at low risk of flood damage, the 100-year floodplain includes areas of existing or potential future residential, commercial, office, and industrial land uses. Proposed buildout associated with the GP/CLUP within the boundary of the 100-year floodplain is located along creeks and the slough areas including vacant sites 37, 38, 40, 46 through 48, 75, 78, 91, 94, 95, and 118. New development or redevelopment within these areas could expose people or structures to risks from flooding.

Impact 3.9-6. Risk to New Development from Inundation by a Tsunami, Mudslide, or Seiche. The City does not contain any large water bodies that could be subject to a seiche. However, portions of the City are situated in tsunami run-up areas. While the GP/CLUP would not result in an increase in the areas subject to tsunami hazard, new development or redevelopment within existing areas subject to such hazards could expose people or structures to risks from flooding caused by a tsunami. In addition, portions of the City are located adjacent to steep slopes that could be subject to mudslide. A mudslide could cause significant damage to structures and also cause injury or death to people living in those structures.

Impact 3.9-7. Increases in Point Source and Nonpoint Source Pollution from New Development. Collection of contaminants from cars on roadways and parking lots, such as hydrocarbons, metals, and volatile and semi-volatile organics, can wash into local waterways during storm events. In addition, other urban activities such as lawn and landscape maintenance and industrial activities can be a source of nonpoint source contaminants such as pesticides, nutrients, and trash. New development would increase the amount of wastewater generated, with corresponding increases in the volume of treated wastewater that is discharged. Improper transport or storage of hazardous materials at facilities developed under the auspices of the GP/CLUP could result in release of hazardous materials to surface or ground water. Other new commercial or industrial uses could result in point-source discharges associated with production processes that could adversely affect water quality.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.9-1. Adherence to the requirements of the NPDES General Construction Permit and the provisions for new construction under the City's Municipal Stormwater NPDES permit would reduce these impacts. In addition, implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality

Specifically, Policies CE 2, CE 3, and CE 6 restrict activities within riparian zones, wetlands, and marine habitat areas, respectively, reducing the potential for construction-related water quality degradation in these areas. Policy CE 10 most directly addresses new development, requiring that it does not result in the degradation of water quality. The policy includes requirements related to development siting, design, incorporation of BMPs into project design, implementation of stormwater management requirements, drainage and stormwater management plans, and other measures to effectively protect water quality. The measures contained in these policies are sufficient to ensure that impacts on water quality are less than significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.9-2. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies would reduce impacts associated with the adequacy of water supplies to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 12: Land Use in Goleta's Environs
- Policy CE 15: Water Conservation and Materials Recycling
- Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development

Policy LU 1 contains a requirement that water infrastructure capacity is sufficient to serve new development or would be available by the time new development is constructed. Policy LU 12 stipulates that no additional rural lands would be annexed to the Goleta Water District and opposes the creation of new private service systems for water in rural areas north and west of Goleta, with the effect of constraining the potential additional water demand on the District. Policy CE 15 contains requirements for water conservation that would reduce the potential water demand in the City. Policy PF 4 addresses coordination with the Goleta Water District, and contains an objective that ensures that adequate water supply and distribution facilities are available to meet the cumulative needs of both existing users and new development in the city as well as outside Goleta's boundaries. Finally, Policy PF 9 requires that adequate capital facilities, such as water supply infrastructure, are provided when they are needed to support new development. The measures contained in these policies are sufficient to ensure that impacts on water supply are less than significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.9-3. Several GP/CLUP policies would help protect recharge areas, allow for stormwater infiltration, and limit the amount of new impervious surfaces. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy CE 15: Water Conservation and Materials Recycling
- Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities

Policy CE 2 would restrict development in streamside areas; because these are some of the primary groundwater recharge areas, this measure allows for continued infiltration of stormwater. Policy CE 10 has an objective to prevent the degradation of the quality of groundwater basins in and adjacent to Goleta, as well as minimizing the amount of new impervious surfaces that could reduce percolation to the aquifer. Policy CE 15 contains an objective that involves conserving scarce water supply resources, and would help limit the use of groundwater. Finally, under Policy PF 4, the City would seek to protect the quantity of groundwater resources. The measures contained in these policies are sufficient to ensure that impacts on groundwater are less than significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.9-4. The GP/CLUP policies indicate that construction in such areas would be discouraged unless no other location is available for the facility. In this case, a detailed hydraulic study would need to be performed to determine the impacts associated with the construction. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities
- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards
- Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character

Specifically, Policy LU 1 requires that the zoning code include performance standards related to drainage and stormwater runoff, and that infrastructure capacities (including stormwater infrastructure) are sufficient to serve the new development or will be available by the time that the development is constructed. Policy CE 2 contains requirements that protect natural drainage systems from development, as well as restoration to maintain or improve flow capacity and minimize channel erosion. Policy CE 6 requires that new beach or ocean bluff areas adjacent to marine and beach habitats are sited and designed to prevent impacts that could significantly degrade the marine ESHAs, such as through measures such as erosion or changes in drainage. Policy CE 7 contains protections for marine habitat areas and beach and shoreline areas that would reduce the potential for drainage impacts. Policy CE 10 addresses new development, requiring implementation of stormwater management requirements and drainage and stormwater management plans. Under Policy PF 8, construction of public buildings will be discouraged in areas that would alter drainage patterns and cause downstream flooding. Policy SE 1 would similarly require mapping and restrictions on development in hazardous areas, including areas of flood hazard. Policy SE 6 contains components to minimize damage to

structures and the danger to life caused by stream flooding, dam failure inundation, and other flooding hazards. Policy TE 6 requires that new transportation facilities be designed in a manner that minimizes impacts on natural drainage patterns. The measures contained in these policies are sufficient to ensure that impacts on drainage are less than significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.9-5. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards
- Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities

The main objective of Policy SE 1 is to avoid siting of development or land use activities in hazardous areas, and where this is infeasible, require appropriate mitigation to lessen or minimize exposure to hazards, including flooding. Policy SE 6 contains components to minimize damage to structures and the danger to life caused by stream flooding, dam failure inundation, and other flooding hazards. Policy SE 11 contains components for emergency preparedness. The main objective of the components of Policy SE 11 are to attain a high level of emergency preparedness to limit damage and risks to public safety from natural and industrial hazards and to have effective and efficient emergency recovery procedures in place to minimize social, environmental, and economic disruption during the aftermath of an emergency. Policy PF 8 requires that critical structures and facilities (including hospitals, fire stations, police stations, water reservoirs, and communications facilities) be restricted from hydrological hazardous areas. The measures contained in these policies are sufficient to ensure that impacts related to flooding are less than significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.9-6. As part of the GP/CLUP, the City, in cooperation with the County and/or State Offices of Emergency Services, encourages development of an emergency notification and evacuation plan in response to a tsunami warning. The City will cooperate with these agencies to develop educational materials informing people of the causes of tsunamis, tsunami characteristics and warning signs (such as locally felt earthquake or unusual recession of near shore waters), and appropriate tsunami response measures. The GP/CLUP policies include a tsunami warning plan and coastal bluff setbacks for structures. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically Induced Hazards
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards
- Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities

The main objective of Policy SE 1 is to avoid siting of development or land use activities in hazardous areas, and where this is infeasible, require appropriate mitigation to lessen or minimize exposure to hazards. Policy SE 4 contains components to minimize the potential for loss of life and property and economic and social disruption resulting from seismic events and seismically induced hazards. Policy SE 5 contains components to promote safely sized, sited,

and designed development in erosion-prone hazard areas. To reduce the potential loss of both public and private property in areas subject to steep slopes and erosion hazards. The main objective of the components of Policy 11 are to attain a high level of emergency preparedness to limit damage and risks to public safety from natural and industrial hazards and to have effective and efficient emergency recovery procedures in place to minimize social, environmental, and economic disruption during the aftermath of an emergency. Policy PF 8 contains components to ensure compatible and aesthetically appropriate integration of public buildings and facilities into the city's built and natural environments at appropriate locations. The measures contained in these policies are sufficient to ensure that impacts related to tsunami, mudslide or seiche are less than significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.9-7. Adherence to the requirements of the relevant NPDES permitting process, such as obtaining individual NPDES permits for new or increased point source discharges and the source control activities under the City's Municipal Stormwater NPDES permit to address nonpoint source discharges, would reduce these impacts. In addition, implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities
- Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character

Policy CE 2, CE 6, and CE 7 contain numerous measures protecting water quality in streams, marine and shoreline areas, such as streamside buffers, use restrictions, and implementation of stormwater treatment BMPs for new development. Policy CE 10 specifically addresses water quality protection associated with new development in great detail. Policy SE 8 contains components to minimize the risk of potential short- and long-term hazards associated with the operation of the Venoco Ellwood facilities and other oil and gas extraction, processing, and transportation facilities that could adversely affect water quality in the event of an upset. Policy SE 10 contains similar requirements related to hazardous materials and facilities. Policy LU 10 contains components to promote the discontinuation of onshore processing and transport facilities for oil and gas, the removal of unused or abandoned facilities, and the restoration of areas affected by existing or former oil and gas facilities within the city. Policy PF 4 requires that new development is connected to the public sewage collection system and therefore protect water quality from the effects of septic systems. Policy TE 6 requires that new transportation facilities be designed in a manner that protects water quality. The measures contained in these policies are sufficient to ensure that impacts related to pollution from new development are less than significant.

1.9.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.9.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.10 LAND USE AND RECREATION

1.10.1 Significant Impacts

Seven Land Use and Recreation Class II impacts have been identified related to: conflict with applicable land use policies and/or regulations due to buildout (construction) of the GP/CLUP; adverse physical effect on the environment due to construction of planned recreational facilities; conflict with other applicable land use policies and/or regulations due to buildout of GP/CLUP land uses, transportation improvements, and public facilities; conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan due to buildout of GP/CLUP land uses; loss of privacy and/or neighborhood incompatibility due to buildout of GP/CLUP land uses; adverse physical effect on the environment due to buildout of planned recreational facilities; and substantial physical deterioration or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational facilities due to buildout of GP/CLUP land uses. These impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impacts are:

Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities. Construction-related activities associated with buildout of the adopted GP/CLUP land uses, transportation improvements, and public facilities have potential to result in temporary impacts due to conflicts with applicable land use policies and/or regulations that apply to construction-related effects such as, but not limited to, impacts on biological and cultural/archaeological resources, noise, traffic, and air quality. These impacts would be considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities. The construction of new or expanded recreational facilities, parks, and open spaces, expansion and enhancement of existing vertical public coastal access (Policy OS 2), and the planned conversion of a shoreline parcel currently occupied by the Venoco EOF to Open Space/Active Recreation uses (Policy LU 9), have potential to result in potentially significant physical effects on the environment due to short-term construction activities.

Impact 3.10-3. Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities. Buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses have potential to conflict with the applicable environmental impact mitigation policies and/or regulations of the other agencies that maintain full or partial jurisdictions within the City planning area. These impacts would be considered potentially significant. The proposed elements of the GP/CLUP include goals, policies, implementation actions, and implementation programs that are designed to consider the requirements of the various jurisdictional agencies.

Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due To Buildout of *GP/CLUP* Land Uses. Buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses have potential to conflict with Coastal Zone policies that protect ESHAs. These impacts would be considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.10-5. Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due To Buildout of *GP/CLUP* Land Uses. Buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses, including the development of some existing vacant sites, have the potential to impact the quality of life of City residents by

introducing new or modified land uses that would cause or contribute to the loss of privacy or would otherwise cause or contribute to conditions that are incompatible with existing neighborhoods. These impacts would be considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities. New and expanded recreational facilities have the potential to result in adverse physical effects on the environment due to overuse and/or lack of adequate maintenance. These impacts would be considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.10-7. Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due To Buildout of *GP/CLUP* Land Uses. Buildout of the adopted GP/CLUP land uses have potential to lead to greater wear and tear of existing recreational facilities due the introduction of new development. The potential for impacts involving the substantial physical deterioration or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational facilities due to buildout of GP/CLUP land uses would be considered a potentially significant impact.

In addition, one Land Use and Planning Class II impact has been identified for the future City service areas. This impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impact is:

Impact 4.10-1. Potential Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of Future Service Area Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities. The future service area/sphere of influence includes lands within the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara, UCSB, California Coastal Commission, and a variety of special districts. Limited buildout of future service area/sphere of influence land uses may have the potential to conflict with policies and/or regulations of those agencies with jurisdiction.

1.10.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

The built character of the City of Goleta largely consists of compact single family residential areas of moderate density, a central area with larger but lower intensity commercial and industrial uses, and more intensely developed areas in Old Town and around Entrance Drive in the southwestern area of the City. Most of the northwest, southwest, and northeast areas of the City are dominated by an organized and compact pattern of smaller, single-family dwellings interspersed with larger structures, mainly churches or schools. The development pattern in the Old Town area in the southeast portion of the City is somewhat more compact. The south-central part of the City consists of larger commercial structures, sharply contrasting with surrounding development patterns. Large open areas are found in the north-central area (Bishop Ranch and Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve) and the most southwestern part of the City (Sperling Preserve/Santa Barbara Shores Park and Sandpiper Golf Course). At the geographical center of Goleta lies a noncontiguous portion of the territory of the City of Santa Barbara. These lands are owned by Santa Barbara and encompass the regional airport, including a passenger terminal for air carrier service, general aviation facilities, and vacant and developed lands north of Hollister Avenue for nonairport uses.

The GP/CLUP has identified the following eight individual subareas characterized by their respective geography and land use: Old Town; Central Area; Southwest Residential

Community; Coastal Resource Area; Northwest Residential Community; Central Resource Area; Northeast Residential Community; and Northeast Community Center.

The City contains 16 public parks, four private parks and open space areas, and 18 public open space areas with a total of 526 acres. The three larger City-owned regional open space preserves—the Sperling Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, and Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve—collectively account for 363 acres of these 526 acres.

Discussion

Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities. Construction-related activities associated with buildout of the adopted GP/CLUP land uses, transportation improvements, and public facilities have potential to result in temporary impacts due to conflicts with applicable land use policies and/or regulations that apply to construction-related effects such as, but not limited to, impacts on biological and cultural/archaeological resources, noise, traffic, and air quality. These impacts would be considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities. The construction of new or expanded recreational facilities, parks, and open spaces listed in Table 3.10-3, expansion and enhancement of existing vertical public coastal access (Policy OS 2), and the planned conversion of a shoreline parcel currently occupied by the Venoco EOF to Open Space/Active Recreation uses (Policy LU 9), have potential to result in potentially significant physical effects on the environment due to short-term construction activities.

Impact 3.10-3. Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities. The City of Goleta Planning Area includes lands within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara Municipal Airport; lands within the UCSB campus subject to the jurisdiction of the University of California Board of Regents; and others), the California Coastal Commission, and a variety of special districts (Goleta Water District, Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Embarcadero Community Services District, Isla Vista Recreation and Park District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, Santa Barbara County Flood Control District, Metropolitan Transit District, and others). In addition to local agency jurisdictional requirements, certain activities conducted within the City are subject to state and federal agency regulations.

Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses. The California Coastal Act requires that Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) be protected; therefore, any land uses proposed within the Coastal Zone must comply with the Coastal Zone policies that protect ESHAs. Existing ESHAs are identified at certain locations within the City and Coastal Zone. Some of the ESHAs also fall within the boundary of the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Habitat Management Plan area.

Impact 3.10-5. Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses. Buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses, including the development of some existing vacant sites, have the potential to impact the quality of life of City residents by introducing new or modified land uses that would cause or contribute to the loss of privacy or

would otherwise cause or contribute to conditions that are incompatible with existing neighborhoods. These impacts would be considered potentially significant.

Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities. The GP/CLUP includes new and expanded recreational facilities, parks, and open space, new trail segments, expansion and enhancement of existing public vertical coastal access facilities (Policy OS 2), and the planned conversion of a shoreline parcel currently occupied by the Venoco EOF to Open Space/Active Recreation uses (Policy LU 9).

Impact 3.10-7. Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses. The City currently has a low level of service for active-use parks and recreational services. This level of service will be degraded further if additional parks and other recreational facilities (i.e. trails, open space and recreation-oriented community centers) are not provided to support both new and existing development. The quality of existing facilities will also be degraded (deteriorated) due to overuse from new and existing development if additional recreational facilities are not provided. Adequate financial sources and staffing are also needed to protect and maintain existing facilities. Located within the Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve, the Stow House is recognized by the City as an historic resource, and is thus subject to specific requirements for its protection. Increased use of Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve from new development under the GP/CLUP has potential to cause degradation to the Stow House. Note that new park development will offset increased demand associated with increased population allowed by the Plan.

Impact 4.10-1. Potential Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of Future Service Area Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities. See discussion above for Impact 3.10-3.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-1. The following GP/CLUP policies are designed and intended for the purpose of guiding development and avoiding or reducing potential environmental impacts resulting from construction activities:

- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands
- Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality

- Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest
- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards
- Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
- Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-2. The following GP/CLUP policies would ensure that impacts involving the construction of planned recreation facilities are reduced to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites
- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands
- Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality
- Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest
- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards
- Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
- Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-3. The following GP/CLUP policies would ensure that impacts involving land use conflicts are reduced to less-than-significant levels:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses
- Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses
- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area

- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality
- Policy HE 5: Special Needs Housing and Support Programs
- Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta's RHNA
- Policy HE 12: Funding for Affordable Housing
- Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
- Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-4. Elements of the proposed GP/CLUP include policies that are designed to protect ESHAs from land use conflicts or other indirect effects from development and specify appropriate development procedures to ensure the protection of ESHAs within the Coastal Zone. The GP/CLUP policies also address consistency with the goals and policy provisions of the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Habitat Management Plan. Therefore, the potential for conflict with Coastal Zone policies that protect ESHAs due to buildout are less than significant with implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites
- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat

- Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy VH 3: Community Character
- Policy TE 9: Parking

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-5. Loss of privacy due to buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses is addressed by proposed Policies LU 2 of the Land Use Element and VH 4 of the Visual and Historic Resources Element. Both policies provide for the protection of privacy in residential settings. The proposed land use designations of the GP/CLUP would remain generally consistent with existing land uses, with the exception of selected vacant parcels (principally located south of US-101, in the vicinity of Los Carneros Road and Storke Road). The following GP/CLUP policies would ensure that potential impacts associated with changes in land use that may result in neighborhood incompatibility would be reduced to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses
- Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses
- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs
- Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships
- Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods
- Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design
- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy VH 3: Community Character
- Policy VH 4: Design Review
- Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development
- Policy PF 5: School Facilities
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities
- Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-6 The following GP/CLUP policies would ensure that potential impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs

- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites
- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
- Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
- Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards
- Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards
- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy TE 9: Parking
- Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-7. The GP/CLUP provides for the protection of existing open space areas and set-aside park sites in the capacity analysis of designated housing sites (Housing Element Technical Appendix); however, additional facilities will also be needed in order to provide adequate active-use recreation opportunities (e.g. sports fields, tennis courts, swimming pools, and trails) for existing and future residents and to maintain the quality and service of existing facilities. Future planned recreation facilities, in addition to policies and implementation actions supporting the maintenance of existing and provision of new facilities, will contribute to a reduced potential for impacts to existing recreational facilities. GP/CLUP Policy VH 5 includes the provision that the City shall preserve and rehabilitate publicly owned historic resources.

GP/CLUP policies from the Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Elements also address potential impacts to existing recreation facilities. The following GP/CLUP policies would ensure that potential impacts are reduced to less-than-significant levels:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- Policy OS 9: Financing Public Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Facilities
- Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest
- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors
- Policy VH 5: Historic Resources
- Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta
- Policy PF 5: School Facilities

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.10-1. Potential Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of Future Service Area Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities. See policies above for Impact 3.10-3.

1.10.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.10.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.11 NOISE

1.11.1 Significant Impacts

There are no Class II impacts to Noise associated with implementation of the City's GP/CLUP.

1.11.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Not applicable.

1.11.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

Not applicable.

1.11.4 Findings

Not applicable.

1.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

1.12.1 Significant Impacts

Six Public Services and Utilities Class II impacts have been identified related to increased demand: for police protection; for fire protection; for wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal; for utility services; on local school districts; and on library facilities. These impacts can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impacts are:

Impact 3.12-1. Increased Demand for Police Protection. Additional residents resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP would increase the demand for law enforcement and police service in the City of Goleta.

Impact 3.12-2. Increased Demand for Fire Protection. Additional residents resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP would increase the demand for fire protection services in the City of Goleta. Based on the existing deficiencies in fire protection service to the City, the additional population resulting from the GP/CLUP would create a significant impact to the ability of the Fire Department to provide adequate service.

Impact 3.12-3. Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection, Treatment, and Disposal. Implementation of the GP/CLUP and Land Use Plan would increase the demand on the City's wastewater collection and service providers, GSD and GWSD.

Impact 3.12-4. Increased Demand for Utility Services. Implementation of the GP/CLUP would increase the demand for utilities such as electricity and natural gas.

Impact 3.12-5. Increased Demand on Local School Districts. Implementation of the GP/CLUP would increase the demand on local school districts.

Impact 3.12-6. Increased Demand on Library Facilities. Implementation of the GP/CLUP would increase the demand on library facilities. Based on the existing deficiencies of library facilities that service the City, the additional population resulting from GP/CLUP buildout would create a significant impact to the ability of the current library to provide adequate service.

These impacts also apply to the future City service areas.

1.12.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

Police services are provided to the City of Goleta through a contract with the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department. Fire protection and related services are provided by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department. Two separate special districts, Goleta Sanitary District (GSD) and Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD), provide wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal services to the Goleta Valley and territory within the City. GWSD serves the western portion of the City with a collection system only. The eastern portion of the City is served by GSD, which collects, treats, and disposes all wastewater, including wastewater received from GWSD.

Solid waste collection services in Goleta are provided by Marborg Industries and BFI Waste Systems. All nonhazardous solid waste in the City and the surrounding South Coast area is

handled at two local facilities: the South Coast Recycling and Transfer Station, and Tajiguas Landfill. Both sites are owned and operated by the Santa Barbara County Public Works Department, Resource Recovery and Waste Management Division.

Other utilities and services are provided to residential and commercial users in Goleta by private companies, subject to franchise agreements with the City. These include solid waste collection and disposal, provision of natural gas and electrical energy, telephone, cable television, and Internet service providers.

Public education services are provided within Goleta and the remainder of the Goleta Valley by the Goleta Union School District (GUSD) and the Santa Barbara High School District (SBHSD). Services at the Goleta Public Library are provided by contract with the City of Santa Barbara in a facility owned by the City of Goleta at 500 North Fairview Avenue.

Discussion

Impact 3.12-1. Increased Demand for Police Protection. It is estimated that 7,500 additional residents would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP, which would create a total population of 38,097 in the City. The Sheriff's Department currently maintains a staff of approximately 34 sworn officers assigned to the City of Goleta. In order ensure that adequate police protection is provided to the City over the course of time up to and through buildout, an additional seven to ten police officers providing law enforcement services to the City would be needed. Equipment such as patrol vehicles, weapons, radios, computers and other operations related equipment would also need to be considered with the addition of officers to the force. Support staff as well as the possibility of added capital projects such as additions to existing facilities or the building of new facilities would also need to be considered to accommodate this additional growth (Pappas 2006).

In order to accommodate projected population growth, the City of Goleta has identified multiple policies and objectives in the GP/CLUP that address police protection. Among these are the potential of the addition of a new police station and the incorporation of service standards such as 5-minute response times for emergencies. In conjunction with the planning for a civic center, the City should establish a community planning process to evaluate the need for a police station, identify appropriate sites, and plan for its development (see Objective PF 2).

Impact 3.12-2. Increased Demand for Fire Protection. The Santa Barbara County Fire Department employs the following three standards with respect to provision of fire protection services, which are incorporated into the GP/CLUP:

1. A firefighter-to-population ratio of one firefighter on duty 24 hours a day for every 2,000 in population as the ideal goal with one firefighter per 4,000 population as the absolute maximum population that can be adequately served.

Fire stations #11 and #12 fell short of this service standard as of 2005, as indicated in Table 3.12-2. The current ratio of fire fighters to population is 1 per 4,909 citywide.

2. A ratio of one engine company per 16,000 population with a four-person crew. The National Fire Protection Association guidelines state the engine companies shall be staffed with a minimum of four on-duty personnel.

Currently all three fire stations within the Goleta city limits are staffed with 3 person crews.

3. Achieve a 5-minute response time in urban areas.

Most of Goleta falls within the 5-minute response time from existing fire stations; however, the western edge and some northern neighborhoods may experience longer response times.

The City of Goleta has identified multiple policies and objectives in the GP/CLUP intended to address fire protection service and to accommodate projected growth. Among these is the addition of a new fire station (Station 10) to be located in western Goleta. In conjunction with the Fire Department, the City will provide a site consisting of approximately two acres of land for the new fire station. As indicated in Objective PF 3, the Santa Barbara County Fire Department will construct Fire Station 10 as soon as funding becomes available.

Impact 3.12-3. Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection, Treatment, and Disposal. The GP/CLUP would have a maximum buildout of 3,880 residential units and 2,081,000 square feet of commercial/industrial development. Utilizing the generation factors previously discussed, the growth identified in the GP/CLUP could create a total of .92 mgd to 1.06 mgd increase in wastewater demand (184 gpd to 220 gpd for residential units and 100 gpd per 1,000 sf of commercial development) shared between the GSD and the GWSD. As outlined in Table 3.12-2, the GSD has 1.12 mgd of unused, available capacity under its portion of the current, maximum NPDES permitted daily effluent discharge volume and GWSD has 1.41 mgd of remaining capacity under that existing maximum permitted daily effluent discharge volume.

As such, although wastewater services demand would increase as a result of Plan implementation, the existing facilities and service providers have sufficient, currently unused and available treatment capacity to accommodate the increased flows resulting from the buildout of the GP/CLUP. Additionally, the GP/CLUP includes several policies and objectives to ensure that appropriate wastewater infrastructure and treatment capacities are available to accommodate projected growth.

Impact 3.12-4. Increased Demand for Utility Services. In general, Goleta has not experienced shortages of natural gas and electricity. Population increases in Goleta could contribute to increased demand for electricity; however, for a 30-year term, the City is allowing SCE the use of City streets and property to use and construct poles, wires, conduits, and other facilities necessary for the transmission and distribution of electricity within the City. This will help to ensure that SCE can continue to provide an adequate level of service to the existing and future population.

The Gas Company does not anticipate future gas supply problems, and expects that local distribution lines can be expanded for future development without disrupting existing service.

Although the level of service from gas and utility providers is considered adequate to meet population growth, the GP/CLUP identifies measures for managing growth, such as close communication and coordination between the City and the service providers, to ensure development that gets approved can be adequately serviced without impacting existing users.

Impact 3.12-5. Increased Demand on Local School Districts. The Goleta Union School District utilizes a student generation factor of 0.20 per residential unit. Based upon GP/CLUP buildout levels of 480 single-family homes and 3400 multiple-family homes (for a total of 3,880 homes), 776 students would be generated as a result of project buildout. The GUSD is currently experiencing an approximate 4 percent annual decline in student attendance, which translates to more than 100 students per year leaving GUSD. If this trend continues (with City buildout in

seven or more years), then GUSD facilities would not be adversely affected by implementation of the GP/CLUP (Boomer, GUSD, 2006).

Impact 3.12-6. Increased Demand on Library Facilities. The local library branch was opened in 1973 and has remained virtually unchanged for the 30 years. The current number of volumes is estimated to be approximately 90,000 to service a population of 87,000 (including persons from surrounding areas). Use of the library continues to increase, and space constraints allow less and less room to enlarge the total volume of materials. In 1999, an AB 1600 Fee Justification Study was conducted by David Taussig and Associates. A portion of that study focused on the Goleta Library branch. The study concluded that the facility had a current deficit of 155,855 volumes and needed an additional 26,330 square feet.

The City of Goleta has identified multiple policies and objectives in the GP/CLUP to address demand of library facilities. Those objectives include preparation of a long-term Library Development Plan to assess the adequacy of the current facility and expand or develop a satellite facility as necessary to accommodate projected demand.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.12-1. The GP/CLUP includes the following policies, which are intended to ensure that acceptable police protection is provided:

- Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta
- Policy PF 3: Public Safety Services and Facilities
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development

The implementation of these policies would reduce impacts on police protection services as a result of Plan Implementation to less-than-significant levels.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.12-2. The GP/CLUP includes the following policies, which are intended to ensure that acceptable fire protection is provided:

- Policy PF 3: Public Safety Services and Facilities
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development
- Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards

The implementation of these policies would reduce impacts to fire protection services as a result of Plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.12-3. The following policies have been incorporated into the GP/CLUP in order to ensure adequate wastewater collection and treatment capability is provided:

- Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities
- Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development

The implementation of these policies would reduce impacts on the City's wastewater treatment facilities and service providers resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP to less-than-significant levels.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.12-4. The following policies have been incorporated into the GP/CLUP in order to ensure acceptable electricity and gas services are provided:

- Policy PF 6: Utilities
- Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development
- Policy CE 13: Energy Conservation

The implementation of these policies would reduce impacts on utility service providers resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP to less-than-significant levels.

Policy That Would Reduce Impact 3.12-5. A policy has been incorporated into the GP/CLUP that is intended to ensure that future development resulting from Plan implementation can be adequately served by the GUSD and SBHSD:

- Policy PF 5: School Facilities

The implementation of this policy would reduce student enrollment impacts on area schools resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP to less-than-significant levels.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.12-6. The following policies have been incorporated into the GP/CLUP in order to ensure that acceptable library services are provided:

- Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta
- Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities

The implementation of these policies would reduce impacts on library facilities serving the City as a result of buildout under the Plan to less-than-significant levels.

1.12.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.12.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

1.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

1.13.1 Significant Impacts

One Transportation and Circulation Class II impact has been identified related to exceedance of a LOS standard established by local jurisdictions for designated roadways or highways. This impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through policies in the GP/CLUP. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impact is:

Impact 3.13-2. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways. Implementation of the GP/CLUP would exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a LOS standard established by local jurisdictions for designated roadways or highways.

This impact also applies to the future City service areas.

1.13.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

The City of Goleta is situated along the U.S. Highway 101 (US-101) and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) corridors, which traverse the City from east to west and divide it into northern and southern sections. Transportation in and through the City is provided through a variety of modes, including vehicular traffic, bicycle and pedestrian travel, aviation, and rail. US-101 and State Route 217 (SR-217) are designated as freeways for their entire length in Goleta. Goleta's arterial network includes two east-west arterial roadways that generally parallel the US-101 corridor: Hollister Avenue to the south of the freeway and Cathedral Oaks Road to the north. All major north-south arterials in the City have interchanges with US-101: Patterson Avenue, Fairview Avenue, Los Carneros Road, and Storke-Glen Annie Road. Calle Real is an east-west arterial that runs between Los Carneros Road and Patterson Avenue.

Level of service (LOS) designations measure operational conditions of roadways, taking into consideration such factors as volume, speed, travel time, and delay. LOS standards are used to evaluate the transportation impacts of long-term growth. The City of Goleta has adopted a standard of LOS C, which is applied citywide to major arterials, minor arterials, collector roadways, and signalized intersections. The City's LOS standard is more stringent than the County's regional Congestion Management Program (CMP) standard of LOS D, which applies to City intersections designated as part of the CMP system. GP/CLUP policy subsection 4.2 also lists a modified LOS standard for specific intersections at planned capacity. As of 2005, the Storke-Hollister intersection was the only intersection in the city at "planned capacity," with the applicable standard defined as LOS D.

Discussion

Impact 3.13-2. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways. Class II transportation impacts are classified as those impacts that can be feasibly mitigated or avoided by transportation improvements or transportation policies proposed under the GP/CLUP. Significant impacts are defined at locations where (1) the adopted LOS standard cannot be met, and/or (2) applicable significance thresholds are exceeded. The following long-term Class II transportation impacts have been identified for this project:

Intersections

- Hollister Avenue/Canon Green Drive—LOS F projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS A is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7).
- Hollister Avenue/Pacific Oaks Road—LOS D projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS A. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), with a V/C increase of 0.19 over existing, which is under the significance threshold defined in Table 3.13-5.
- Cathedral Oaks/Los Carneros Road—LOS D projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS B is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7).
- Los Carneros Road/Calle Real Road—LOS E projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS B is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7).
- Los Carneros Road/US-101 SB Ramp—LOS D projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS A is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7).
- Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue—LOS D projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS B. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), with a V/C increase of 0.09 over existing.
- Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road—LOS F (Delay >> 50s) projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which would add additional delay to the existing LOS F. Improvement to LOS B is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7).
- Fairview Avenue/Calle Real—LOS D (V/C = 0.90) projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS D (V/C = 0.81). Improvement to LOS C is expected with recommended transportation improvements (GP-7).
- Fairview Avenue/US-101 NB Ramp—LOS D projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), with a V/C decrease of 0.02 under existing.
- Hollister Avenue/Fairview Avenue—LOS D projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS B. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), with a V/C increase of 0.10 over existing, which is under the significance threshold defined in Table 3.13-5.
- Hollister Avenue/Kellogg Avenue—LOS E projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), with a V/C increase of 0.03 over existing.
- Hollister Avenue/SR-217 SB Ramp—LOS E projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7).
- Patterson Avenue/US-101 NB Ramp—LOS D projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation

of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), with a V/C increase of 0.05 over existing.

- Patterson Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp—LOS F projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS D. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7).
- Hollister Avenue/Patterson Avenue—LOS D projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS C. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), with a V/C decrease of 0.05 under existing.
- Fairview Avenue/US-101 SB-Ramp—LOS D projected under the 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the existing LOS B. Improvement to LOS C is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), with a V/C increase of 0.09 over existing.

Roadway Segments

- ADT is projected to exceed the LOS C threshold at the following three locations, under the 2030 Proposed Land Use Plan. However, with implementation of recommended transportation improvements, ADT is projected to be under the LOS C thresholds.
    - Storke Road south of US-101 Interchange—ADT of 46,400 under 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the LOS C threshold at that location of 34,000. With implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), ADT is projected at 45,700 and the LOS C ADT threshold would increase to 47,000, which would bring ADT at this location to within LOS C standards.
    - Los Carneros Road south of Hollister Avenue—ADT of 24,200 under 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the LOS C threshold at that location of 14,300. With implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), ADT is projected at 23,600 and the LOS C ADT threshold would increase to 34,000, which would bring ADT at this location to within LOS C standards.
    - Storke Road south of Whittier Drive—ADT of 16,400 under 2030 Buildout (GP-10), which exceeds the LOS C threshold at that location of 14,300. With implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), ADT is projected at 17,700 and the LOS C ADT threshold would increase to 34,000 which would bring ADT at this location to within LOS C standards.

GP/CLUP Policies That Would Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.13-2. The City's policies, as listed below, include modifications to LOS standards and transportation improvements that would reduce identified impacts. In addition, these policies include continuous monitoring of future traffic conditions and standards, to ensure that improvements will be aligned with the traffic conditions that result from future development.

- Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System
- Policy TE 4: Target Level of Service Standards
- Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements
- Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development

1.13.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

1.13.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP. These policies would lessen the significant environmental effect to below a level of significance.

SECTION 2.0
FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE FEASIBLY MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE (CLASS I)

The City of Goleta finds that, based on the threshold criteria for significance presented in the FEIR the following effects of the project will be significant and cannot be avoided or reduced through mitigation to a level less than significant. Environmental impacts that are significant and unavoidable (Class I) impacts have been identified for aesthetics and visual resources, agriculture and farmland, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and transportation and circulation. Nevertheless, as discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, these impacts are considered to be acceptable when balanced against the economic, social, technological and other benefits of the project.

2.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

2.1.1 Significant Impacts

Two Aesthetics and Visual Resources Class I impacts have been identified relating to views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways, and Citywide visual character. These impacts can be reduced through policies in the GP/CLUP, but not to levels below significance. No additional mitigation has been identified. The impacts are as follows:

Impact 3.1-1. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways. Scenic corridors within the City include Hollister Avenue. Proposed development of vacant or underutilized land in accordance with the GP/CLUP in the vicinity of certain scenic corridors along Hollister Avenue could result in significant impacts to views. Another key public viewpoint that could be impacted in association with development of vacant land includes the gateways to the City located on US-101 at the western and eastern entrances of the City.

Impact 3.1-2. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Citywide Visual Character. Implementation of the GP/CLUP could result in a significant change to the visual character of the City because design standards and policies are subjective. Vacant land that has not already been approved for development comprises 307 acres or 6 percent of the total land area of the City. With the buildout proposed in the GP/CLUP, this vacant land could be developed with predominantly single- and multiple-family residential uses with the exception of the open-space and agriculturally designated parcels. Commercial and industrial uses proposed on vacant land would be developed adjacent to existing commercial areas. Because development of the vacant land would be an extension of the existing residential neighborhoods and commercial areas, impacts from GP/CLUP implementation would be reduced. However, because of the subjective nature of design standards and policies, there is potential for significant impacts to the City's visual character to occur as a result of Plan implementation.

An exception to this is the visual character of Coastal Open Space Areas. As shown in Figure 3.10-2, the GP/CLUP land use designations reflect existing land uses in the coastal areas. Coastal resources, including Santa Barbara Shores Park and the Sperling Preserve, would be designated as open space/passive recreation by the GP/CLUP. The Sandpiper Golf Course would be designated open space/active recreation. Therefore, coastal open space areas would not be impacted by implementation of the GP/CLUP. In addition, Policy VH 1, "Scenic Views," supports the protection and preservation of scenic resources including the open waters of the

Pacific Ocean/Santa Barbara Channel (with the Channel Islands visible in the distance), and the City's Pacific shoreline, including beaches, dunes, lagoons, coastal bluffs, and open coastal mesas. Implementation of the GP/CLUP therefore would not result in significant impacts to the visual character of existing Coastal Open Space Areas.

2.1.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

The aesthetics and visual resources in the City were identified and evaluated based upon field reconnaissance. The City's location between the Santa Ynez Mountains and the Pacific Ocean provide a scenic backdrop for Goleta's urbanized area. Visually attractive open spaces within Goleta include public recreation areas and agricultural lands. The City retains a small-scale suburban character, with open spaces and broad vistas that provide a connection to the natural environment.

Discussion

Impact 3.1-1a: Impacts to Views from Hollister Avenue. Northerly views available from Hollister Avenue could be impacted by development of vacant and underutilized land adjacent to the roadway in accordance with the GP/CLUP. Vacant land near intersections with Los Carneros Road and Storke Road is designated to be developed as medium-density residential and for office/institutional uses by the GP/CLUP. Motorists along Hollister currently have northerly views of the Santa Ynez Mountains and foothills. Development of vacant parcels in the vicinity of Storke Road and Los Carneros Road in accordance with the designations of the GP/CLUP could result in potentially significant impacts to mountain views from Hollister Avenue.

Impact 3.1-1b: Impacts to Views from Gateways. Development in accordance with the GP/CLUP could affect the major gateways to Goleta along Hollister Avenue at the western and eastern boundaries of the City. Vacant and underutilized areas at the eastern and western portions of the City would be designated for planned residential and community commercial uses. Sites in the vicinity of the gateway at the western border of the City, are designated as planned residential and visitor-serving commercial respectively. Other sites in the vicinity of the gateway at the eastern border of the City near Patterson Avenue are designated for medium-density residential, office/institutional, and general commercial uses. Development of these types of uses in accordance with the designations of the GP/CLUP could result in potentially significant impacts to views from the gateways at the western and eastern boundaries of the City.

The existing land uses within the vicinity of the northern and southern City gateways, including Old Town, Cathedral Oaks Road, Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road, Fairview Avenue, and Calle Real would not change with implementation of the GP/CLUP. Therefore, implementation of the GP/CLUP would not impact the visual character of these gateways.

Impact 3.1-2a: Impacts to the Visual Character of City Subareas. The City has designated subareas as shown in Figure 3.1-2. Potential impacts of the GP/CLUP on the visual character within the subareas are as follows.

Central Subarea

A majority of the vacant land to be developed in accordance with the GP/CLUP is located within the Central Subarea. Vacant land within the Central Subarea is located primarily north of Hollister Avenue and south of US-101. These vacant parcels would be developed with medium-density multiple-family residential uses. A vacant site south of Hollister

Avenue and north of Phelps Road would be developed with community commercial uses. The character of the area along Hollister Avenue within the Central Subarea currently consists of a mix of residential and commercial uses. The location of the proposed commercial uses would represent a visual extension of these existing uses; however, the potential for a significant adverse impact to visual character still remains.

Old Town and Residential Subareas
The GP/CLUP Community Commercial land use designation would allow additional residential uses among existing commercial development in the Old Town and Northeast Community Center Subareas. The existing commercial uses are located at the southern border of an existing residential community and would be separated from Old Town by US-101. Nevertheless, the development of these subareas with additional residential uses could result in a visual incompatibility with surrounding land uses.

Development of underutilized land within the Old Town Subarea would be limited to development of commercial uses under the Old Town land use designation. Future development within this designation is subject to design restrictions within the GP/CLUP that require any buildings and other development to conform with the aesthetic and historic character of Old Town.

An Old Town commercial land use designation would be applied to the existing Old Town areas adjacent to Hollister Avenue. This designation is intended to permit a wide range of local- and community-serving retail and office uses. A major purpose of this designation is to enhance the physical and economic environment for existing businesses and uses of the Old Town commercial district. Although new development of two and three story buildings along Hollister Avenue in Old Town may block views of the Santa Ynez Mountains, this is not a scenic corridor and any impacts from new development in the Old Town category would be reduced by measures ensuring that buildings, pedestrian plazas, design amenities, and facilities are consistent with the *Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines*. In addition, Policy VH 4, "Design Review," states that Old Town should retain its unique character through building individuality, avoiding the "false historic look." Pedestrian walkways should be enhanced with trees, landscaping, and benches. Visual resources in the Old Town area would be protected to some degree with implementation of the GP/CLUP, but there is still potential for significant impacts to occur.

The residential subareas are predominantly built out with residential uses and possess limited amounts of vacant land. In addition, the GP/CLUP would not promote conversion of existing uses to other land use types. As a result, implementation of the GP/CLUP would not result in impacts to the visual character of the residential subareas.

Coastal Resource and Central Resource Subareas
Implementation of the GP/CLUP would not result in significant impacts to the visual character of the Coastal or Central Resource Subareas. No changes to the underlying land uses are proposed in these areas. Bishop Ranch would remain as an agricultural use area. The Pacific shoreline sites within the coastal resource areas would remain either coastal visitor-serving commercial, coastal recreation, or coastal open space/passive recreation uses.

The GP/CLUP land use map incorporates the approved Ellwood-Devereux Open Space. The Ellwood-Devereux Open Space area within Goleta is a part of a planned contiguous open space area of over 650 acres along or near the Pacific shoreline. This larger

multi-jurisdictional open space area includes UCSB and County lands. The Ellwood-Devereux project has already been approved by the City, and therefore is not considered to be an impact associated with implementation of the GP/CLUP.

Impact 3.1-2b: Impacts to the Visual Character of Natural Open Space and Agricultural Areas. Natural open space and agricultural areas that represent scenic resources within the City could be adversely impacted with implementation of the GP/CLUP. The open space/passive recreation land-use designation would cover the entire Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve. Bishop Ranch would be designated for Agriculture under the proposed GP/CLUP land use plan. Other agricultural parcels throughout the City would also remain in agricultural use, except for 55.7 acres of existing agriculture that would be designated for urban-type uses. These sites include: a 6.6-acre parcel and a 9.4-acre parcel in the northeast part of the City that are surrounded by residential development and are planned for single-family residential; a 21.2-acre parcel in the southeastern portion of the City north of Hollister Avenue that is planned for medium-density residential (10.26 acres of which is part of an approved but unbuilt project called Sumida Gardens); a 9.4-acre parcel in the western portion of the City of which 3.7 acres are planned for single-family residential; 2.4 acres in the southwestern portion of the City that is planned for business park uses; and 12.2 acres in the southwestern portion of the designated for development of visitor serving commercial uses. These agricultural parcels are surrounded by existing development and the visual character of the area would be altered with the conversion of these parcels to other, more urbanized, uses. Although Policy VH 1, "Scenic Views," supports the protection and preservation of scenic resources including agricultural areas, designation of 55.7 acres of agricultural lands to urban uses still has the potential to result in a significant visual/aesthetic impact because of the subjective nature of design policies.

Impact 3.1-2c: Impacts to the Visual Character of Views of the Santa Ynez Mountains and Foothills. The majority of the land use designations under the GP/CLUP would not result in long-term significant adverse impacts to the visual character of views of the Santa Ynez Mountains and foothills as seen from the City. No features of the GP/CLUP would extend or modify the physical character of the mountains or foothills to the north of the City boundary or the Bishop Ranch Area. In addition, there are very few vacant lands in the northern half of the City that, if developed, would impact views of the mountains. Nonetheless, the potential for residential development of those sites to adversely impact the visual character of views of the mountains and foothills in a significant manner remains.

Impact 3.1-2d: Impacts to Views from Cathedral Oaks Road, Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road North of US-101, and Fairview Avenue. Scenic corridors and views from Cathedral Oaks Road, Glen Annie Road, and Los Carneros Road north of US-101 could be adversely impacted by implementation of the GP/CLUP. A majority of the area adjacent to these roadways is either built out with residential uses or is agricultural or open space associated with Bishop Ranch, and Los Carneros Preserve. Although new office and institutional uses proposed by the GP/CLUP in the vicinity of the scenic corridor along Los Carneros Road north of US-101 would be a visual extension of existing development in this area, this future development still has potential to result in significant impacts on such view corridors because design policies are subjective.

Land use designations in areas characterized by existing commercial uses immediately north of US-101 in the vicinity of Fairview Avenue would be modified to allow for additional residential development. The addition of residential development in this location is not expected to substantially change the character of the area or adversely impact northerly or southerly views from Fairview Avenue. In addition, Policy VH 2, "Local Scenic Corridors," includes measures to

protect views along scenic corridors. However, due to the subjective nature of design policies, the potential for significant adverse impacts to occur as a result of such development cannot be dismissed.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.1-1, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. The Visual and Historic Resources Element proposes the following policies intended to preserve and enhance visual resources and scenic views within the City, including views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways. These policies would reduce impacts to scenic views and City Gateways associated with the GP/CLUP, but not to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors
- Policy VH 4: Design Review

A discussion of how the policies reduce impacts to views from scenic corridors and key viewpoints is provided below.

GP/CLUP Policies that Apply to Impact 3.1-1a. Views from Hollister Avenue that may be adversely impacted by future development of vacant land north of Hollister Avenue would be reduced by implementation of GP/CLUP Policies VH 2 and VH 4, but not to a less-than-significant level. As described above, the GP/CLUP policies require that development not degrade or obstruct views of scenic areas. By promoting development that minimizes the scale and height of structures located adjacent to scenic corridors, and considering the existing developed character of the area north of Hollister Avenue, implementation of GP/CLUP policies would reduce the potential impacts of future development to views from Hollister Avenue, but not to a level of insignificance.

GP/CLUP Policies that Apply to Impact 3.1-1b. Potential adverse impacts to the visual character of City gateways would be reduced but not to a less-than-significant level by implementation of GP/CLUP Policies VH 2 and VH 4. These policies call for enhancement of prominent gateways through landscaping and pedestrian amenities. Policies related to preservation of the visual character of scenic corridors and to views of visual resources within the City would reduce potential impacts of future development along the scenic corridors, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.1-2, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. The Visual and Historic Resources Element proposes the following policies intended to preserve the overall community character of the City.

- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy VH 3: Community Character
- Policy VH 4: Design Review

These policies would promote the preservation of community character by requiring that new development be compatible with existing architectural styles of adjacent development, except where poor quality design already exists. Site plans shall provide for buildings, structures, and uses that are subordinate to the natural topography, existing vegetation, and drainage courses; adequate landscaping; adequate vehicular circulation and parking; adequate pedestrian circulation; and provision and/or maintenance of solar access. The character of public open

spaces would be enhanced by creating well-defined community outdoor gathering places that incorporate focal points such as parks, fountains, public art, and/or landscape features. Overall, these policies would reduce impacts to visual character resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP, but not to a less-than-significant level.

2.1.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

2.1.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP, but that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. As such, the residual environmental effects may be considered acceptable.

2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FARMLAND

2.2.1 Significant Impacts

Two Agriculture and Farmland Class I impacts have been identified relating to conversion of agricultural land and loss or impairment of agricultural productivity. These impact can be reduced through policies in the GP/CLUP, but not to a level below significance. No additional mitigation has been identified. These impacts are as follows:

Impact 3.2-1. Conversion of Agricultural Land and Loss or Impairment of Agricultural Productivity. Buildout under the GP/CLUP of proposed sites for new residential development and other uses such as commercial and recreation would result in the conversion of 55.7 acres of agricultural land and the loss of a large amount of agricultural productivity, resulting in 353.3 acres of remaining agricultural land in the City. Of the agricultural land that would not be converted, only 11.6 acres (Fairview Gardens) are permanently preserved. This conversion of agricultural land would constitute a significant impact by permanently eliminating these lands from agricultural production.

Impact 3.2-4 Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Land. The GP/CLUP would result in the conversion of Prime Farmland and other valuable agricultural lands to nonagricultural use. Many of the other areas where the cumulative projects are located also contain prime farmland, prime soils, and are zoned and/or designated for agricultural uses. Viable agricultural land is becoming scarcer in California, and the South Coast is one of the most important regions economically and physically for agricultural production in the State. The competing growth pressures in the region have led to rapid conversion of agricultural lands in the City, County, and throughout the South Coast. The conversion of approximately 29 acres of important farmland that are currently in active agricultural production represents a significant impact. When combined with other cumulative development projects, the effects are exacerbated. Therefore, the conversion of agricultural land resulting from buildout under the GP/CLUP would represent a significant and unavoidable (Class I) contribution to cumulative impacts on agricultural resources.

2.2.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

In the Goleta Valley, and specifically in the City of Goleta, urban agriculture (cultivated land within the designated urban boundary line) comprises small active farms of only a few acres to major producers of 100 acres or more. The agricultural land that still remains in the Goleta area provides a multitude of benefits for area residents. Agricultural uses in the foothill areas provide a scenic visual backdrop for the City, and open rangeland and orchards provide a healthy habitat for a variety of species to flourish.

Discussion

Buildout under the GP/CLUP would result in the conversion of approximately 6.5 acres of Prime Farmland and approximately 22 acres of Unique Farmland according to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The proposed project would also result in the conversion of approximately 6 acres of Class I Soils and approximately 37 acres of Class II Soils. Buildout under the Plan would not result in the conversion of any Williamson Act Contract Lands or other agricultural preserve areas.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.2-1, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Policies and objectives incorporated into the GP/CLUP intended to preserve and protect agricultural resources include:

- Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands

A discussion of how the policies reduce impacts relating to conversion of agricultural land and loss or impairment of agricultural productivity is provided below.

Policy CE 11 acts to promote and retain Goleta's agricultural heritage by conserving existing agricultural resources for future generations and supporting agricultural production by minimizing activities and uses that may conflict with agricultural use of the land. Conversion of agricultural lands as designated on the GP/CLUP Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1) to other uses is not be allowed and those lands designated for agriculture within the urban boundary are preserved for agricultural use.

The conversion of agricultural land that is not designated as agriculture on the GP/CLUP Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1) does not advance GP/CLUP Goal #3 in the Land Use Element and Goal #8 in the Conservation Element. Though the incorporation and implementation of these policies and objectives would help to discourage further conversion of agricultural lands to noncompatible uses, the loss of agricultural land resulting from buildout of the proposed land uses in the GP/CLUP would remain significant and unavoidable.

2.2.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No mitigation is identified.

2.2.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP, but that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. As such, the residual environmental effects may be considered acceptable.

2.3 AIR QUALITY

2.3.1 Significant Impacts

One Air Quality Class I impacts has been identified relating to the cumulative air emissions from vehicle and nonvehicle operations. This impact can be reduced through policies in the GP/CLUP, but not to a level below significance. No additional mitigation has been identified. This impact is as follows:

Impact 3.3-5. Cumulative ROG and NO_X Emissions
Emissions of ROG and NO_X from Citywide vehicle and nonvehicle operations resulting from buildout under the GP/CLUP would result in a significant contribution to cumulative increases in air emissions within the South Central Coast Air Basin, thereby adversely effecting the ability of all the various local agencies to achieve the goals and objectives of the 2004 County CAP. Santa Barbara County is currently in nonattainment of State standards for ozone emissions, and any project-generated new ozone precursor (ROG and NO_X) emissions could exacerbate such nonattainment. As such, the project's contribution to cumulative levels of ozone emission would be significant and unavoidable (Class I).

This impact also applies to the future City service areas.

2.3.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview
Goleta is located within the South Central Coast Air Basin. Air quality measurements indicate that the South Central Coast Air Basin is a "nonattainment" area for the federal and state standards for ozone and suspended particulate matter 10 micrometers or less in size (PM10). However, the air basin is in an "attainment" area for all other federal and state air quality standards. Although air quality in the city is generally characterized as acceptable, vehicular traffic produces more than half of the onshore smog-forming pollution in Santa Barbara County and is a major contributor of PM10 and toxic air pollution. Other sources of air pollution include the Venoco Ellwood Onshore Oil and Gas Processing Facility as well as, offshore oil and gas production and transport activities, natural oil seeps, and ship traffic in the Santa Barbara Channel.

Discussion
Construction activity that would be accommodated over the next 20 years under the GP/CLUP land use scenario would cause temporary emissions of criteria pollutants. Criteria pollutants such as ROG and NO_X would be emitted by the operation of construction equipment and vehicle traffic. Emissions of ROG and NO_X from Citywide vehicle and nonvehicle operations resulting from buildout under the GP/CLUP would result in a significant contribution to cumulative increases in air emissions within the South Central Coast Air Basin, thereby adversely effecting the ability of all the various local agencies to achieve the goals and objectives of the 2004 County CAP. Santa Barbara County is currently in nonattainment of State standards for ozone emissions, and any project-generated new ozone precursor (ROG and NO_X) emissions could exacerbate such nonattainment. As such, the project's contribution to cumulative levels of ozone emission would be significant and unavoidable (Class I).

2.3.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

Not applicable.

2.3.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP, but that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. As such, the residual environmental effects may be considered acceptable.

2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

2.4.1 Significant Impacts

There are no Class I impacts to biological resources associated with implementation of the City's GP/CLUP.

2.4.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Not applicable.

2.4.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

Not applicable.

2.4.4 Findings

Not applicable.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

2.5.1 Significant Impacts

There are no Class I impacts to cultural resources associated with implementation of the City's GP/CLUP.

2.5.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Not applicable.

2.5.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

Not applicable.

2.5.4 Findings

Not applicable.

2.6 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES

2.6.1 Significant Impacts

There are no Class I impacts to geology, soils, and mineral resources associated with implementation of the City's GP/CLUP.

2.6.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Not applicable.

2.6.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

Not applicable.

2.6.4 Findings

Not applicable.

2.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

2.7.1 Significant Impacts

Two Hazards and Hazardous Materials Class I impacts have been identified relating to risk of upset at Venoco facilities, and transport of hazardous materials through the City. These impacts can be reduced through policies in the GP/CLUP, but not to levels below significance. No additional mitigation has been identified. The impacts are as follows:

Impact 3.7-1. Risk of Upset at Venoco Facilities. The main risk to the existing and GP/CLUP buildout population from the Ellwood Oil Facility (EOF) is due to the separation and storage of LPG and NGL. These gas liquids produce large flame jets or BLEVEs which if released can affect a large area. Potential new populations closest to the EOF would be expected to be at greater risk to released BLEVEs than those populations further away, and the overall risk would be expected to increase following buildout as more population in closer proximity to the EOF is introduced.

Impact 3.7-2. Transport. US-101, SR-217, Hollister Avenue, and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks all pass near high-density residential and commercial areas. These transport lanes can be used to transport hazardous materials to and through the City. Although there are no specific factors to provoke a release of these materials, there is inherent risk associated with the transport of hazardous materials that is enhanced by the close proximity to the community. Hazards include the risk of a trucking or rail accident and subsequent release of hazardous materials. These hazards are considered significant.

2.7.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

Existing and potential hazards relevant to the City of Goleta include: hazards associated with naturally occurring phenomenon such as fire; hazards associated with the use, storage, transportation, and manufacturing of hazardous materials as well as the generation and management of hazardous wastes; and man-made hazards associated the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport and electricity generation and transmission (i.e., electromagnetic fields).

The GP/CLUP was analyzed with respect to potential buildout that would result in potential public safety hazards caused by the presence, use, manufacture, or transport of hazardous materials within the City. Available site investigation reports were reviewed to assess whether potential hazardous materials release sites exist within the City and, if so, to assess the status of those sites. A qualitative assessment of potential impacts on the community was then made based on the location and condition of the sites and on the current and planned uses of the location. To evaluate impacts on the environment, the risk of upset impact analysis (focused on impacts to humans) assessed potential impacts from accidents, explosions, and other releases.

Impacts to public safety from hazards and hazardous materials and wastes due to upset conditions, accidental releases, or natural phenomena have been evaluated in relation to the GP/CLUP. Corresponding policies and elements assess the adequacy to which the GP/CLUP and the corresponding policies and elements address hazards and hazardous materials related impacts. No quantitative analysis of the risk potential was performed for this report.

Discussion

Impact 3.7-1. Risk of Upset at Venoco Facilities. A QRA was required by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department in compliance with Cal ARP for the EOF and Platform Holly; Venoco conducted the QRA for these facilities in 2000. As a result of the QRA, a number of risk-reducing measures were developed to reduce the overall risk from the EOF. The measures included items such as fireproofing the LPG and NGL tanks to reduce the rate of vessel failures due to fire impingement and the installation of remotely operated flow valves and flow orifices to reduce flows in the event of an equipment leak or rupture. The risk-reducing measures identified in the QRA and implemented between 2000 and 2003 have substantially reduced the level of risk associated with the EOF; however, the hazards resulting from an upset condition at the EOF would remain significant.

Platform Holly does not store large quantities of flammable gas liquids and therefore has smaller hazard zones than the EOF. This, combined with the low populations around Platform Holly (boats only), produces an acceptable level of risk. None of the serious injury or fatality hazard zones associated with Platform Holly extends onshore.

Two idle wells, one for oil production and one for wastewater injection, and related piers exist in State tidelands at the Pacific shoreline below the Sandpiper Golf Course property. S.L. 421 is served by several onshore facilities, including pipelines and an access road protected by a riprap seawall at the base of the bluff. Venoco has an interest in recommissioning production at the idled oil well, and if permitted, is contemplating oil separation processes at the pier prior to the EOF. Production has been idled since 1994 when the former owner/operator stopped operations following a pipeline rupture and oil spill. It is the City's intent that oil production not be recommenced at S.L. 421 because of the potential environmental hazards and the impacts to visual resources and recreation at the beach, and possibly to the future proposed development planned located near S.L. 421. If resumption of production is considered for approval, the City contends in Part b. of Policy LU 10.4 that on-pier processing of the oil at the site within the tidal zone should not be approved unless it is demonstrated that there is no feasible and less environmentally damaging alternative to processing on the pier. The development of new processing facilities over the sea would result in an increased and unacceptable level of risk of environmental damage.

The recommissioning of the oil production well would create risks to marine and land resources, and neighboring populations associated with spills, leaks, or pipeline ruptures. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable if releases occurred during oil separation processes at the pier; such risks are discussed above. Pursuant to Policy SE 8.6, a QRA would be required by the City to evaluate the risks associated with oil processing at the pier and the transfer of separated oil and water by pipeline to the EOF. Due to its proximity to marine habitat, residential, and recreational areas, hazards associated with recommencing oil production at S.L. 421 are considered significant. The hazards would be somewhat reduced by Policy LU 10.4b, although they would remain significant.

Impact 3.7-2. Transport. The severity of an accidental release would depend greatly on the amount and characteristics of the hazardous material released. The overall risk associated with transport of hazardous materials would be expected to increase following buildout as more population in closer proximity to the transportation routes is introduced. Conformance with DOT and Caltrans regulations pertaining to the transport of hazardous materials along with the County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan would be expected to reduce but not fully mitigate such impacts.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.7-1, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Hazards associated with the risk of upset at the Venoco Facilities represent a significant impact. GP/CLUP policies and subpolicies listed below would help reduce the impacts by reducing the likelihood of an upset and/or the impacts resulting from upset. Impacts, however, would remain significant.

- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
  - LU 10-4b: State Lands Commission Lease 421
- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
  - SE 1.2: Guidelines for Siting Highly Sensitive Uses and Critical Facilities
- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
  - SE 8.1: Nonconforming Status of EOF
  - SE 8.2: Consideration of Offshore Gas Processing
  - SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required
  - SE 8.4: Enhanced Preparedness for Hydrogen Sulfide Release
  - SE 8.6: Quantitative Risk Assessment
  - SE 8.7: Routing of Gas Pipelines
  - SE 8.8: Development near Gas Pipelines
  - SE 8.9: Safety Requirements for New Petroleum Pipelines
  - SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines
  - SE 8.11: Safety Measures for Pipelines Transporting Produced Gas
  - SE 8.12: Consultation with Pipeline Operators
  - SE 8.13: Setbacks from Gas Pipelines
  - SE 8.14: Pipeline Burial Depths
  - SE 8.15: Pipeline Marking and Warning
- Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness
  - SE 11.1: Education and Awareness Programs
  - SE 11.2: Improved Information Transfer during Emergencies
  - SE 11.4: Incorporation of Emergency Response Plans into GIS
  - SE 11.5: Monitoring of Trends and Improvements in Emergency Preparedness

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.7-2, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Additionally, the CP/CLUP policies below would help reduce hazards associated with transportation of hazardous materials. These policies would help reduce these impacts by reducing the likelihood of an upset and/or the impacts resulting from upset. Impacts would, however, remain significant.

- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
  - SE 8.2: Consideration of Offshore Gas Processing
  - SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required

  - SE 8.4: Enhanced Preparedness for Hydrogen Sulfide Release
  - SE 8.6: Quantitative Risk Assessment
  - SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
  - SE 10.1: Identification of Hazardous Materials Facilities
  - SE 10.2: Compliance with Law
  - SE 10.4: Prohibition on New Facilities Posing Unacceptable Risks
- Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness
  - SE 11.1: Education and Awareness Programs
  - SE 11.2: Improved Information Transfer during Emergencies
  - SE 11.4: Incorporation of Emergency Response Plans into GIS
  - SE 11.5: Monitoring of Trends and Improvements in Emergency Preparedness

2.7.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

2.7.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP, but that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. As such, the residual environmental effects may be considered acceptable.

2.8 POPULATION AND HOUSING

2.8.1 Significant Impacts

There are no Class I impacts to population and housing associated with implementation of the City's GP/CLUP.

2.8.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Not applicable.

2.8.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

Not applicable.

2.8.4 Findings

Not applicable.

2.9 WATER RESOURCES

2.9.1 Significant Impacts

One Water Resources Class I impact has been identified relating to cumulative water quality impacts from discharge to surface water bodies where water bodies are 303(d) listed. This impact can be reduced through policies in the GP/CLUP, but not to a level below significance. No additional mitigation has been identified. The impact is as follows:

Impact 3.9-9. Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies Are 303(d) Listed. Goleta Slough has been listed under Section 303(d) of the CWA as impaired for the following constituents: metals; pathogens; priority organics; and sedimentation/siltation. Under this impairment, the Goleta Slough has no remaining assimilative capacity or ability to accommodate additional quantities of these contaminants, irrespective of concentration. These constituents could be gathered from lawn runoff, rooftops, construction areas, and even indoor household runoff. While concentration of constituents in the discharge from any new development is anticipated to be relatively low, this small increase is still considered a significant contribution to cumulative impacts on Goleta Slough.

This impact also applies to the future City service areas.

2.9.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

Within Goleta, 12 creeks drain from the foothills south to the Pacific Ocean. Most of the creeks exhibit intermittent, seasonal flows, and creek conditions vary greatly. Two creeks, Bell Canyon Creek and Tecolote Creek, form small coastal lagoons at the Pacific Ocean. Sections of some creeks are channelized to provide conveyance for flood flows such as along El Encanto, San Pedro, and Tecolotito Creeks. Creeks in areas subject to human disturbance have impaired water quality and lower biological diversity. With the exception of Bell Canyon and Tecolote Creeks, the creeks within the city drain to one of two sloughs located to the south of the city boundary: Goleta Slough and Devereux Slough. There are 640 acres (about one square mile) within the FEMA-designated 100 year flood plain within Goleta. This is approximately 12 percent of the entire area of the city.

Discussion

Impact 3.9-9. Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies Are 303(d) Listed. While the TMDL process will ultimately address the impairments and develop a plan for reducing the input of contaminants, the process is in its beginning stages and will not be complete until well into the planning horizon of the GP/CLUP. Other measures taken in compliance with the Clean Water Act, such as adherence to the requirements of relevant NPDES permits, would also reduce impacts.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.9-9, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. The GP/CLUP contains multiple polices that would help reduce the subject contaminants. In particular, Policy CE 10, "Watershed Management and Water Quality," would help alleviate sedimentation and siltation issues. Implementation of the GP/CLUP policies listed below would therefore reduce such impacts. However, because none of these policies would ensure that there is no

cumulative loading of these contaminants to Goleta Slough, they would not reduce project contributions to cumulative impacts on Goleta Slough to a less-than-significant level.

- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character

2.9.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

As described under the Cumulative Impact discussion above, Goleta Slough has no remaining assimilative capacity or ability to accommodate additional quantities of metals, pathogens, priority organics, and sediment/silt, irrespective of concentration. Additional inputs of these constituents from new development in the City planning area would result in a significant contribution to cumulative impacts on Goleta Slough. The GP/CLUP contains multiple polices that would help reduce these contaminants. However, because none of these policies would ensure that there is no cumulative loading of these contaminants to Goleta Slough, they would not reduce project contributions to cumulative impacts on Goleta Slough to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, project contributions to cumulative impacts on Goleta Slough would be considered significant and unavoidable.

2.9.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP, but that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. As such, the residual environmental effects may be considered acceptable.

2.10 LAND USE AND RECREATION

2.10.1 Significant Impacts

There are no Class I impacts to Land Use and Recreation associated with implementation of the City's GP/CLUP.

2.10.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Not applicable.

2.10.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

Not applicable.

2.10.4 Findings

Not applicable.

2.11 NOISE

2.11.1 Significant Impacts

Six Noise Class I impacts have been identified relating to: exposure of noise sensitive land uses to noise from single-event and nuisance noise sources; exposure of existing or planned noise sensitive receptors uses to increased noise; exposure of proposed noise sensitive land uses to traffic noise; exposure of proposed noise sensitive land uses to railway noise; and exposure of noise sensitive land uses to industrial and other point sources. These impacts can be reduced through policies in the GP/CLUP, but not to levels below significance. No additional mitigation has been identified. The impacts are as follows:

Impact 3.11-1. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Sources. Noise sensitive land uses in the City may be exposed to significant single-event and nuisance noise sources. These noise sources may include construction and maintenance activities, delivery and pickup activities, playgrounds, athletic fields, schools, resorts, and special events. Temporary nuisance noise would be expected as a result of construction associated with GP/CLUP buildout.

Impact 3.11-2. Exposure of Existing or Planned Noise Sensitive Receptors Uses to Increased Noise. With adoption of the GP/CLUP, traffic volumes on some streets would increase relative to volumes that would occur under the No Action Alternative. Potentially significant noise impacts could occur where traffic noise on adjacent parcels is predicted to increase under the GP/CLUP to a level that exceeds 65 dBA CNEL, or where interior noise levels exceed 45 dBA CNEL.

Impact 3.11-3. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise. Under the GP/CLUP, a number of areas planned for development of noise sensitive land uses could be exposed to traffic noise exceeding 65 dBA CNEL. Assuming nominal exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 20 dB, these noise sensitive land uses could also be exposed to interior noise exceeding 45 dBA CNEL. This impact is therefore considered to be significant.

Impact 3.11-4. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Railway Noise. Under the GP/CLUP, a number of areas planned for residential development could be to be exposed to railroad noise exceeding 65 dBA CNEL. Assuming nominal exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 20 dB, these residential land uses could also be exposed to interior noise exceeding 45 dBA CNEL. This impact is therefore considered to be significant.

Impact 3.11.5. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Industrial and Other Point Sources. Equipment and activities at the Venoco Ellwood facility and other commercial and industrial properties in the City may result in noise that exceeds 65 dBA CNEL at existing or planned noise sensitive land uses. This impact is considered to be significant.

Impact 3.11-7. Cumulative Traffic Noise. The traffic noise modeling results for 2030 presented in the FEIR include the effects of cumulative development in and around the City. Adoption of the GP/CLUP is predicted to increase traffic volumes on some streets relative to volumes that would otherwise occur under the No Action Alternative. Significant cumulative traffic noise is considered to occur along roadways with adjacent residential uses where traffic noise is predicted to exceed 65 CNEL.

Cumulative noise impacts identified under Impact 3.11-7 would also apply to the future City service areas.

2.11.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

Transportation systems are the dominant mobile noise source in Goleta. Noise related to vehicular and rail traffic, as well as activities at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, contributes most significantly to the local noise environment. Stationary noise sources include industrial noise, and commercial and residential-related noise.

Discussion

Impact 3.11-1. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Sources. Noise from single-event and nuisance sources is by its very nature, short term. With future development in the City, noise sensitive land uses could be located within 1,600 feet of construction activities outside the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays. Other single-event activities could result in significant adverse noise effects..

Impact 3.11-2. Exposure of Existing or Planned Noise Sensitive Receptors Uses to Increased Noise. Adoption of the GP/CLUP is not anticipated to increase aircraft, train, commercial, or industrial operations in the City. However, there are a number of roadways where traffic noise on adjacent parcels is predicted to increase under the GP/CLUP to a level that exceeds 65 dBA CNEL. This is includes the following roadway segments:

- Cathedral Oaks Road east of Patterson Avenue
- Cathedral Oaks Road east of Ribera Avenue
- Fairview Avenue north of Hollister Avenue
- Hollister Avenue west of Pacific Oaks Drive
- Hollister Avenue west of Storke Drive
- Hollister Avenue west of Los Carneros Road
- Hollister Avenue west of Cremona Drive
- Hollister Avenue west of Los Carneros Way
- Hollister Avenue west of La Patera Lane
- Hollister Avenue west of Dearborn Place
- Hollister Avenue west of Lasson Drive
- Storke Road north of Marketplace Drive
- Storke Road north of Phelps Road

Assuming nominal exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 20 dB, interior noise levels could also increase to exceed 45 dBA CNEL.

Impact 3.11-3. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise. The FEIR summarizes predicted traffic noise levels in the City under existing conditions, 2030 conditions under the No Project Alternative, and with buildout of the GP/CLUP. A comparison of the traffic noise contours to locations of proposed residential projects and sites suitable for residential development indicates that under the GP/CLUP, a number of areas planned for development of

noise sensitive land uses could be exposed to traffic noise exceeding 65 dBA CNEL. This includes Areas 2 and 9 depicted in GP/CLUP Figure 10A-2 and all of the potential residential areas depicted in GP/CLUP Figure 10A-3. Assuming nominal exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 20 dB, these noise sensitive land uses could also be exposed to interior noise exceeding 45 dBA CNEL.

Impact 3.11-4. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Railway Noise. The FEIR depicts railway noise contours under 2030 conditions. A comparison of the railroad noise contours to locations of pending residential projects and sites suitable for residential development shown in the GP/CLUP indicates that under the GP/CLUP, a number of areas planned for residential development could be to be exposed to railroad noise exceeding 65 dBA CNEL. This includes Areas 2 and 9 depicted in GP/CLUP Figure 10A-2 and Areas 7, 9, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28, 32, 34, and 37 depicted in GP/CLUP Figure 10A-3. Assuming nominal exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 20 dB, these residential land uses could also be exposed to interior noise exceeding 45 dBA CNEL.

Impact 3.11.5. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Industrial and Other Point Sources. The nature and intensity of noise generated by commercial and industrial uses is dependent upon various factors, including the type of use or activity, the equipment and processes employed, and hours of operation. Ground-mounted or rooftop air compressors, air conditioning units, and refrigeration equipment are a common source of industrial- or commercial-related noise, as is noise from delivery trucks. Under the GP/CLUP, a number of areas planned for residential development could be exposed to commercial or industrial noise exceeding 65 dBA CNEL.

The Venoco Ellwood Onshore Oil and Gas Processing Facility is a large industrial facility that generates noise that comes primarily from compressors and heater-treater units. Noise from the facility exceeds 65 dBA CNEL at certain locations along its property line. Ordinance 2919, Venoco's Development Plan permit, requires that sound levels not exceed 65 dBA CNEL at public receptor locations and not exceed 70 dBA at the perimeter of the facility. Site 37 identified in the GP/CLUP has potential to be exposed to significant noise levels from the Venoco facility.

Impact 3.11-7. Cumulative Traffic Noise. Adoption of the GP/CLUP is not anticipated to increase aircraft, train, commercial, or industrial operations in the City. Accordingly, cumulative noise effects related to the adoption of the GP/CLUP are expected to be limited to noise effects from associated traffic. Implementation of the GP/CLUP is considered to contribute to significant cumulative traffic noise if it would cause an increase in noise along one of these roadways. Implementation of the GP/CLUP is predicted to increase noise along the following roadway segments where there are adjacent residential uses and where noise is predicted to exceed 65 CNEL:

- Cathedral Oaks Road east of Patterson Avenue
- Cathedral Oaks Road east of Ribera Avenue
- Fairview Avenue north of Hollister Avenue
- Hollister Avenue west of Pacific Oaks Drive
- Storke Road north of Marketplace Drive
- Storke Road north of Phelps Road

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.11-1, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies will place specific limits on when single-event and nuisance noise sources can occur and how loud they can be. These policies also place specific limits on noise from construction activity. Implementation of these policies is therefore expected to reduce noise impacts from these sources to a less-than-significant level for most situations. It is, however, likely that there will be occasional instances where practical limitations will preclude reducing noise to a less-than-significant level. This impact is therefore considered to be significant and unavoidable.

- Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards
- Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise
- Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.11-2, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies will help to limit increases in traffic noise along existing roadways. Synchronization of lights will improve traffic flow and reduce the number of vehicle stops and starts along roadway segments. Use of alternative paving materials will reduce tire noise. Programs to promote public transit and high-occupancy vehicles will reduce traffic volumes and thus traffic noise. Implementation of these policies is therefore expected to reduce increases in traffic noise that will result from implementation of the GP/CLUP to a less-than-significant level for many situations. It is, however, likely that projected increases in noise will remain in some cases that will preclude reducing noise increases to a less-than-significant level. This impact is therefore considered to be significant and unavoidable.

- Policy NE 2: Traffic Noise Sources
- Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.11-3, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies will require mitigation where feasible, and may, in some cases, extensively limit development in order to limit the exposure of noise sensitive uses to traffic noise that exceeds the City's noise compatibility standards for noise sensitive uses. Implementation of these policies is therefore expected to reduce noise impacts to a less-than-significant level for most situations. It is, however, likely that there will be occasional instances where practical limitations will preclude reducing noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. This impact is therefore considered to be significant and unavoidable.

- Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards
- Policy NE 2: Traffic Noise Sources
- Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.11-4, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies requires mitigation where feasible, and may, in some cases, prohibit development in order to limit the exposure of noise sensitive uses to railroad noise that would exceed the City's noise compatibility standards. Implementation of these policies is therefore expected to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level for most situations. It is, however, likely that there will be occasional instances where practical limitations will preclude reducing noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. This impact is therefore considered to be significant and unavoidable.

- Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards
- Policy NE 4: Railway Noise
- Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.11-5, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies requires mitigation where feasible or prohibits development, to limit the exposure of noise sensitive uses to commercial and industrial noise that would exceed the City's noise compatibility standards. Implementation of these policies is therefore expected to reduce noise impacts to a less-than-significant level for most situations. It is, however, likely that there will be occasional instances where practical limitations will preclude reducing noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. This impact is therefore considered to be significant and unavoidable.

- Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards
- Policy NE 5: Industrial and Other Point Sources
- Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.11-7, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies will help to limit increases in traffic noise along existing roadways. As discussed above synchronization of lights will improve traffic flow and reduce the number of vehicle stops and starts along roadway segments. Use of alternative paving materials will reduce tire noise. Programs to promote public transit and high-occupancy vehicles will reduce traffic volumes and thus traffic noise. Implementation of these policies and actions are therefore expected to reduce increases in traffic noise that will result from implementation of the GP/CLUP. However, it is not anticipated the predicted increases in traffic noise will be eliminated. Implementation of the GP/CLUP is therefore considered to contribute to a significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic noise effect.

- Policy NE 2: Traffic Noise Sources
- Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise

2.11.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

2.11.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP, but that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. As such, the residual environmental effects may be considered acceptable.

2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

2.12.1 Significant Impacts

There are no Class I impacts to Public Services and Utilities associated with implementation of the City's GP/CLUP.

2.12.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Not applicable.

2.12.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

Not applicable.

2.12.4 Findings

Not applicable.

2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

2.13.1 Significant Impacts

One Transportation Class I impact has been identified relating to exceedance of an LOS standard established by local jurisdictions for designated roadways or highways. This impact can be reduced through policies in the GP/CLUP, but not to a level below significance. No additional mitigation has been identified. The impact is as follows:

Impact 3.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways. A long-term Class I transportation/circulation impact has been identified for the intersection of Hollister Avenue/Storke Road. This intersection is projected to operate at LOS E under Proposed Land Use Alternative (GP-10), which exceeds the existing CEQA threshold of LOS C. Improvement to LOS D is expected with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7). Therefore, this is considered a significant and unavoidable (Class I) transportation impact.

In addition, one Transportation Class I impact has been identified for the future City service areas. This impact can be reduced through policies in the GP/CLUP, but not to a level below significance. No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified. The impact is:

Impact 4.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways. A long-term Class I transportation/circulation impact has been identified on the border between Area B and Area C (Cathedral Oaks/Patterson Avenue). LOS D is expected under cumulative conditions with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), which would exceed the current adopted standard of LOS C at this intersection. This is considered a significant and unavoidable (Class I) transportation impact.

2.13.2 Facts Supporting the Impact Findings

Overview

The City of Goleta is situated along the U.S. Highway 101 (US-101) and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) corridors, which traverse the City from east to west and divide it into northern and southern sections. Transportation in and through the City is provided through a variety of modes, including vehicular traffic, bicycle and pedestrian travel, aviation, and rail. US-101 and State Route 217 (SR-217) are designated as freeways for their entire length in Goleta. Goleta's arterial network includes two east-west arterial roadways that generally parallel the US-101 corridor: Hollister Avenue to the south of the freeway and Cathedral Oaks Road to the north. All major north-south arterials in the City have interchanges with US-101: Patterson Avenue, Fairview Avenue, Los Carneros Road, and Storke-Glen Annie Road. Calle Real is an east-west arterial that runs between Los Carneros Road and Patterson Avenue.

Level of service (LOS) designations measure operational conditions of roadways, taking into consideration such factors as volume, speed, travel time, and delay. LOS standards are used to evaluate the transportation impacts of long-term growth. The City of Goleta has adopted a standard of LOS C, which is applied citywide to major arterials, minor arterials, collector roadways, and signalized intersections. The City's LOS standard is more stringent than the County's regional Congestion Management Program (CMP) standard of LOS D, which applies to City intersections designated as part of the CMP system. GP/CLUP policy subsection 4.2

also lists a modified LOS standard for specific intersections at planned capacity. As of 2005, the Storke-Hollister intersection was the only intersection in the city at "planned capacity," with the applicable standard defined as LOS D.

Discussion

Impact 3.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways. GP/CLUP policy subsection TE 4.2 sets the standard at the intersection of Hollister Avenue/Storke Road to LOS D. However, the planned improvements to improve intersection operations at Storke/Hollister under Plan buildout would not improve operations to the level defined in the City's CEQA significance thresholds. Therefore, this is considered a significant and unavoidable (Class I) transportation impact.

Impact 4.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways. LOS D is expected for the intersection of Cathedral Oaks/Patterson Avenue under cumulative conditions with implementation of recommended transportation improvements (GP-7), which would exceed the current adopted standard of LOS C at this intersection. This is considered a significant and unavoidable (Class I) transportation impact.

GP/CLUP Policies That Reduce Impacts

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.13-1, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policy establishes a standard of LOS D at the intersection of Hollister Avenue/Storke Road. However, the planned improvements to improve intersection operations at Storke/Hollister under Plan buildout would not improve operations to the level defined in the City's CEQA significance thresholds. Therefore, this is considered a significant and unavoidable (Class I) transportation impact.

- Policy TE 4: Target Level of Service Standards
  - TE 4.2: Modified Level of Service Standard for Specific Intersections at Planned Capacity

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 4.13-1, but Not to a Level of Insignificance. Implementation of the following GP/CLUP policy establishes target level of service standards, but does not accommodate a standard of LOS D at att intersection of Cathedral Oaks/Patterson Avenue. Therefore, this is considered a significant and unavoidable (Class I) transportation impact.

- Policy TE 4: Target Level of Service Standards

2.13.3 Mitigation Measure Summary

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies are required, nor is additional mitigation identified.

2.13.4 Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City of Goleta hereby finds that the impacts identified above are substantially lessened by policies incorporated into the GP/CLUP, but that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. As such, the residual environmental effects may be considered acceptable.

SECTION 3.0
FINDINGS THAT THE IDENTIFIED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT FEASIBLE

The Final EIR evaluated the alternatives listed below for their potential to reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts.

- No Project;
- Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1); and
- Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2).

The key project objectives that are pertinent to this analysis are to:

- ensure a high quality environment by protecting and conserving the community's cultural, historical, natural, and environmental assets, values, and resources;
- provide a sustainable economy that is not solely dependent on growth, but provides for economic prosperity and well-being for current and future residents;
- maintain adequate service standards, including level of service (LOS) on area highways; and
- enable income group opportunities to meet current and future housing needs.

The City Council findings that each of the specified alternatives is infeasible and less desirable than the project, and the alternatives are therefore rejected for the following reasons:

3.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project alternative is defined as the existing conditions plus the projects that had received planning approvals but were not completed prior to preparation of the Draft GP/CLUP. The No Project alternative consists of implementing existing zoning and other City regulations and ordinances continued into the future without a GP/CLUP. The interim plan policies are not part of the No Project alternative because the interim plan measures anticipate the adoption of a GP/CLUP.

Buildout under this alternative would result in an additional 1,327 housing units, and 268,000 square feet of commercial/industrial development. No new parks, open space, or street and highway improvement projects would be constructed under this alternative.

A No Project, or no plan, alternative would be illegal under State law, and even if it were not, would place the City in the position of having no comprehensive long-range policy direction, which could lead to no control over development and degradation of the environment. In addition, the project would achieve none of the project objectives, and would forego all of the benefits associated with the project. For these reasons, the No Project Alternative is considered infeasible and is rejected.

3.2 REDUCED DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO 1 (ALTERNATIVE 1)

The Reduced Development Scenario 1 Alternative considers adoption of the Land Use Element and other GP/CLUP elements with reduced numbers of residences and reduced square footage of commercial and industrial development, in comparison to the proposed GP/CLUP. Buildout under this alternative would result in an additional 3,030 housing units, and an additional 1,215,000 square feet of commercial/industrial development. This alternative includes all of the proposed transportation infrastructure improvements identified for the proposed GP/CLUP. The overall reduction in development potential would incrementally reduce impacts across all environmental issue areas.

Impacts under this alternative would be similar or slightly less than the project; however, this alternative would provide less housing and job opportunities within the City. Therefore, this alternative would not achieve the project objectives and would forego some of the project benefits that are addressed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations. For these reasons, the City of Goleta finds that Reduced Development Scenario 1 is infeasible and less desirable than the proposed project, and is therefore rejected.

3.3 REDUCED DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO 2 (ALTERNATIVE 2)

The Reduced Development Scenario 2 alternative also considers adoption of the Land Use Element and other GP/CLUP elements with reduced numbers of residences, and reduced square footage of commercial and industrial development, in comparison to the proposed GP/CLUP. Land uses proposed under this alternative are similar to, but somewhat different than, Reduced Development Scenario 1. Buildout under this alternative would result in an additional 2,270 housing units, and an additional 1,111,000 square feet of commercial/industrial development. This alternative includes all of the proposed transportation infrastructure improvements identified for the proposed GP/CLUP. The overall reduction in development potential would incrementally reduce impacts across all environmental issue areas.

Impacts under this alternative would be similar or slightly less than the project and Alternative 1; however, this alternative would provide less housing and job opportunities within the City. Therefore, this alternative would not achieve the project objectives and would forego some of the project benefits that are addressed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations. For these reasons, the City of Goleta finds that Reduced Development Scenario 2 is infeasible and less desirable than the proposed project, and is therefore rejected.

SECTION 4.0
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA requires the decision-maker to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered "acceptable" (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[a]). However, in such case CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Such reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the FEIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 [b]). The agency's statement is referred to as a "Statement of Overriding Considerations."

Pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines, and to the extent that any impacts from adoption of the GP/CLUP ("Project") are significant and have not been mitigated to a level of insignificance, the City of Goleta adopts and makes the following Statement of Overriding Considerations regarding the potential unavoidable significant environmental impacts and the anticipated economic, social, and other benefits or considerations of the Project.

4.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE

The project may have significant or certain substantial impacts on the environment that cannot be fully mitigated or avoided. These impacts are identified in the Final EIR. All of the impacts associated with the proposed project, with the exception of significant impacts referenced herein, have been reduced by implementation of GP/CLUP policies or mitigated to the extent considered feasible through the incorporation of mitigation measures. The significant adverse impacts identified herein also have been mitigated to the extent feasible; however, these impacts cannot be fully avoided to a level of less than significant.

The City of Goleta is proposing to approve the GP/CLUP and has prepared and certified a FEIR that satisfies the requirements of CEQA. The following adverse impacts of the project are considered significant and unavoidable based on the DEIR, FEIR, MMRP, and the Findings discussed previously in Sections 1.0 and 2.0 of this document:

4.2.1 City of Goleta Impacts

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

1. Impact 3.1-1. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways
2. Impact 3.1-2. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Citywide Visual Character

Agriculture and Farmland

3. Impact 3.2-1. Conversion of Agricultural Land and Loss or Impairment of Agricultural Productivity
4. Impact 3.2.4. Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Lands

Air Quality

5. Impact 3.3-5. Cumulative ROG and NOX Emissions

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

6. Impact 3.7-1. Risk of Upset at Venoco Facilities
7. Impact 3.7-2. Transport

Water Resources

8. Impact 3.9-9. Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies Are 303(d) Listed

Noise

9. Impact 3.11-1. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Sources
10. Impact 3.11-2. Exposure of Existing or Planned Noise Sensitive Receptors Uses to Increased Noise
11. Impact 3.11-3. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise
12. Impact 3.11-4. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Railway Noise
13. Impact 3.11.5. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Industrial and Other Point Sources
14. Impact 3.11-7. Cumulative Traffic Noise

Transportation and Circulation

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

4.2.2 Future Service Area Impacts

Air Quality

16. Impact 3.3-5. Cumulative ROG and NOX Emissions

Water Resources

17. Impact 3.9-9. Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies Are 303(d) Listed

Noise

18. Impact 3.11-7. Cumulative Traffic Noise

Transportation and Circulation

19. Impact 4.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways

The City Council has determined that the project is consistent with applicable plans and policies. Having balanced the benefits of the project against potential significant and unavoidable impacts, the City Council hereby determines that the projects' potential unavoidable impacts are acceptable in light of the projects' benefits, and that approval of the project is warranted, notwithstanding that all identified impacts are not fully mitigated (CEQA Sections 15043, 15092, and 15093). Each benefit set forth below constitutes an overriding consideration warranting approval of the project independent of the other benefits.

4.3 Social, Economic and Other Considerations

Having balanced the benefits of the project against potential significant and unavoidable impacts, the City Council hereby determines that the project's potential unavoidable impacts are acceptable in light of the project's benefits, and that approval of the project is warranted,

notwithstanding that all identified impacts are not fully mitigated (CEQA Section 15043, 15092, and 15903). Each benefit set forth below constitutes an overriding consideration warranting approval of the project independent of the other benefits:

- The Project is intended to preserve and enhance the quality of the community through appropriate use of the land that provides continuity with past and present uses. Land use patterns would remain primarily residential and open, with the majority of nonresidential development concentrated along the primary transportation corridor—east and west along Hollister Avenue and US-101.
- The project would continue to develop and implement programs to revitalize the Old Town area.
- The project would ensure that Bishop Ranch retain an agricultural land use designation consistent with the zoning of the property at the time of incorporation of the City.
- The project would ensure that existing open space areas would be protected by special land use designations.
- The project would allow increases in both the number of residential units and the square footage of commercial and industrial land uses in the City. The project encourages sustained economic growth and recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between jobs and housing.
- The project would ensure protection and enhancement of open space, coastal access, and recreation resources to ensure a quality living environment for current and future residents of the City and South Coast area.
- The project includes policies that are provided to conserve and promote the City's agricultural heritage by designating, reserving, and protecting agricultural resources as open space for current and future generations.
- The project would ensure that Native American, cultural, and archaeological properties and sites are recognized and protected as open spaces.
- The project would add 27.8 to 30.8 acres of new parks and open spaces.
- Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) such as wetlands, riparian vegetation, existing or potential monarch butterfly habitat, significant native grasslands, and oak woodlands would be protected.
- The project would protect fish-bearing streams and establish Streamside Protection Areas to protect the associated riparian habitats and ecosystems.
- The project would protect fish and wildlife resources via policies that require all development activities to be located, designed, constructed, and managed to avoid disturbance to these resources.
- Surface water quality would be protected via policies that require developments to use site-design techniques that allow recharge of ground water and reduce harmful run-off and pollution.
- The project includes policies that focus on the preservation and enhancement of scenic views, ocean and island views, mountain and foothill views, open space views, preservation of natural landforms, scenic corridors, and community character.
- The project includes policies that focus on the protection and preservation of local historic landmarks and resources, as well as historical and cultural landscapes.

- The project includes 14 major planned street and highway improvement projects.
- The project would guide the financing, planning, and coordination of the City's public facilities and would provide an effective strategy to balance land use with public facility development within the fiscal capacity of the City.
- The project includes policies to minimize exposure of residents, workers, and visitors to excessive noise levels, while accommodating land use modifications described in the Land Use Element.
- The project includes policies to provide affordable housing, provide housing options for special need groups, preserve the character and quality of neighborhoods, and provide adequate site capacity to meet the City's housing needs as defined in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation.
- The Housing Element Technical Appendix identifies sites for 3,681 potential residential units, exceeding the Regional Housing Needs Assessment requirement.
- Overall, the project reflects the community's goals and aspirations for Goleta by striving to create a coherent vision for the city's future, building upon the individual and sometimes conflicting visions of a diverse population.
- Overall, the project guides future physical changes and public decision making in a lawful manner that is comprehensive, long range, and internally consistent.
- Planning has always been at its best when it shows people the choices they have in shaping their future. As such, the project serves as the primary means for guiding future change in Goleta as it faces difficult choices on a daily basis about growth, housing, environmental protection, neighborhood compatibility, preservation and transportation. The project meets four core goals/objectives:
    1. It provides a unified and coherent framework and vision for the future of Goleta.
    2. It provides a basis for future decisions by the City on implementing ordinances such as zoning and subdivision codes, individual development project applications, and public investments in infrastructure and services.
    3. It informs the public of the City's policies and provides a means to invite public participation in the decision-making processes.
    4. It guides private landowners, developers, and other public agencies in formulating projects and designs that are consistent with City policies.