CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING DIVISION

INITIAL STUDY/ ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST MST2007-00331

PROJECT: 915 E. Anapamu Street

February 18, 2010

This Initial Study has been completed for the project described below because the project is subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and was determined not to be exempt from the requirement for the preparation of an environmental document. The information, analysis and conclusions contained in this Initial Study are the basis for deciding whether a Negative Declaration (ND) is to be prepared or if preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to further analyze impacts. Additionally, if preparation of an EIR is required, the Initial Study is used to focus the EIR on the effects determined to be potentially significant.

APPLICANT/ PROPERTY OWNER

Applicant: Suzanne Elledge, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services, Inc.
800 Santa Barbara Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Owner: Riviera Partners c/o Charles Crail, 1187 Coast Village Road, Montecito, CA 93108

PROJECT ADDRESS/LOCATION

The project site is a 40,759 square foot lot located at 915 E. Anapamu Street in Santa Barbara, California, at the northeast corner of the North Milpas Street/East Anapamu Street intersection. The site is accessed from Lowena Drive. The site is located in the Lower Riviera neighborhood of the city of Santa Barbara.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (See *Exhibit A-Project Plans*)

Project Components:

The applicant proposes the demolition of the existing 2,192 square foot, two-story, single-family residence, and the construction of a residential development containing 13 units totaling 14,934 net square feet, on a 40,055 square foot lot. Nine of the units are proposed above a subterranean parking structure. The main structure includes eight (8) two bedroom apartments and one (1) three bedroom apartment (units 1-9). A separate duplex structure with two (2) one bedroom units is accessed off the driveway that leads into the subterranean parking structure (units 12 and 13). A third structure is a duplex with one three-bedroom unit and one two-bedroom unit accessed separately from Lowena Drive (Units 10 and 11) and includes covered parking spaces. The subterranean parking structure contains eight (8) private two-car garages and one (1) one-car garage to serve Units 1-9 for a total of 17 parking spaces. Four (4) covered parking spaces are proposed for units 10 and 11. Three covered spaces for units 12 and 13, three (3) guest parking spaces and one (1) shared space are located on the driveway leading to the subterranean garage. An existing sandstone wall that runs along the Milpas Street frontage and terminates where the road curves and turns into Anapamu Street is proposed to remain.

The project includes the removal of twenty (20) existing trees including two (2) Eugenias, one (1) loquat, one (1) pittosporum and one (1) unknown tree. Five (5) native coast live oaks are proposed to be removed, and the root zones of two (2) native coast live oaks will be encroached upon by 40%-50%. Three (3) palms will be relocated on site, and thirty-five (35) mitigation trees and thirty-six (36) ornamental trees will be installed with eighteen (18) trees to remain.

Approximately 11,023 square feet (27%) of the site is located in an area of 30% slope or greater. Approximately 1,236 square feet of building footprint is proposed within the area of 30% slope or greater, which represents approximately 11.2% of the total area of 30% or greater slope. The extent of grading in the area of 30% or greater slope consists of approximately 115 cubic yards of cut.

Demolition/Construction:

Grading on site will consist of 3,350 cubic yards of cut and 550 cubic yard of fill. Project construction is anticipated to take approximately 16 months to complete from the commencement of demolition, and grading activities through building construction and installation of landscaping.

Required Permit: The discretionary action required by the City is Design Review Approval by the Architectural Board of Review (ABR), of multiple-family residential development, consistent with SBMC §22.68.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Site Characteristics

Archaeological Resources. The project site is located within the Early 20th Century Period archaeological resource sensitivity area, as shown on the City's Cultural Resources Sensitivity Map. A Phase I Archaeological Report (Exhibit D) prepared by Larry Carbone, dated August 2008, is incorporated by reference and summarized herein. The Report found no evidence of archaeological resources during a literature search and site survey.

Biological Resources. The project site is located in an urban setting surrounded by a mix of single and multi-family residential development, and an outdoor amphitheater (Santa Barbara County Bowl). There is a small, unnamed drainage traversing the western portion of the property in a north-to-south direction. This drainage is ephemeral and only conveys surface water during and immediately following major rainfall events. It is not a United States Geological Survey-mapped blue-line stream, nor a tributary of any named creek or watercourse; however, it is identified by the Army Corpse of Engineers as Waters of the U.S.

A Biological Assessment prepared by Watershed Environmental, Inc. dated March 25, 2009 (Exhibit F) is incorporated by reference and summarized herein. The assessment states that vegetation on site consists of turf grass/nonnative grassland (0.32 acre), ornamental trees (0.15 acre), ornamental shrubs and ground cover (0.16 acre) and individual native Coast live oak trees. Sixteen wildlife species were observed: 14 birds, one mammal, and one reptile, and several other mammal, amphibian, and reptile species are expected to occur and/or have the potential to occur on the property given the habitat types present and property location.

Sensitive species occurring in the vicinity include: Cooper's hawk, big free-tailed bat, globose dune beetle, Coulter's saltbush, Nuttall's scrub oak, Santa Barbara honeysuckle, late-flowered mariposa lily, and Santa Barbara morning-glory. No sensitive plants or wildlife species were found during performance of the survey nor are any sensitive biological resources likely to occur on this property in the future due to the lack of suitable habitat and the property's location in an

urban area. There are no sensitive, endangered, rare or threatened species or habitat known to occur on the site or expected to occur on the site in the future due to the lack of suitable habitat and the property's location in an urban area.

Drainage: Currently there is approximately 1,700 square feet of impervious area on the property. The small drainage course mentioned above has a tributary watershed of approximately 15 acres. The drainage runs to an existing 24" diameter City storm drain.

Flooding: The property is not in the 100-year flood plain of any creek or in any City-designated flood-prone area.

Fire Hazard: The project site is located within the city's High Fire Hazard area.

Hazards. The State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker website (http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov) does not report any active leaking underground fuel tank or spill sites (Cortese List Government Code 65962.5) on or directly adjacent to the project site. The site is not on the Cortese list of contaminated sites. Therefore, according to these sources no hazardous materials are expected to occur on the site.

Historic Resources. A Historic Structures Report (HSR) was prepared by San Buenaventura Research Associates, dated July 16, 2007, (Exhibit H) and is incorporated herein by reference. The report concluded that the property does not appear to be eligible for listing on the California or National Registers. The residence does not appear to be eligible for designation as a City of Santa Barbara Landmark or Structure of Merit. The stone wall was determined to be eligible as a Structure of Merit in a study done of the adjacent property at 1130 N. Milpas Street. While the HSR did not state that the stairs are historic, they appear to be an integral part of the stone wall that is eligible for listing as a structure of merit and therefore, are also considered eligible as a Structure of Merit.

Noise. The primary contributor to the ambient noise environment at the project site is vehicle noise from N. Milpas Street. An Environmental Noise Study dated February 5, 2009, prepared by Dudek, (Exhibit J), incorporated by reference and summarized herein, states that the highest exterior noise level that would occur on the second floor of the proposed development is 53 CNEL. There is also noise generated from occasional events at the nearby County Bowl which are considered special events, permitted and regulated through the City's Noise Ordinance.

Seismic/Geologic Conditions: According to the City's Master Environmental Assessment (MEA), the project site is located in an area of low damage level to single-family and small two- to three-story structures, low to moderate level damage to large structures and moderate damage to old structures. The City's MEA indicates that the project site is located in an area of "minimal liquefaction potential" and there are "varying levels of erosion potential". According to the MEA and a Preliminary Geologic Investigation by Adam Simmons, dated March 27, 2009 (Exhibit I), summarized herein and incorporated by reference, the site contains loose earth materials. The site is not located in an area of known or mapped earthquake faults, but would be subject to ground shaking due to earthquakes on nearby faults. The subject property is underlain by Older Alluvium (Fanglomerate) Deposits. The Fanglomerate Deposits are typically composed of unconsolidated to weakly consolidated boulders, gravels, sands, silts, and clays.

Topography: The elevations of the site range from a high of 106 ft. in the northern portion of the lot to a low of 76 ft. in the southern portion of the lot. The lot slopes toward the south and has an average slope of 19 percent. There are slopes of 30% adjacent to the drainage channel.

Existing Land Use

Existing Facilities and Uses:

The subject property is 40,055 square feet (approximately 0.94) acre in area and has an irregular shape. The existing property is currently developed with a stucco, two-story single-family residence and a small metal equipment shed. A sandstone wall runs along the Milpas Street side of the property and ends where the road curves and turns into Anapamu Street. At this corner are stone steps that lead up the hill to the house. A stucco clad wall extends out from the back of the house and encloses a small backyard. A concrete sidewalk runs along the front of the house and leads to the hillside stairway on Milpas Street. Scattered oak trees and palm trees along with small shrubs form the landscaping surrounding the house. The property is bordered on the north and west by Lowena Drive, to the south by Milpas Street, and to the east by the Santa Barbara County Bowl parking lot. The hillside below the house is covered with dense shrubs and trees, primarily native Oak trees and some palm trees.

Access and Parking: There is a single unpaved driveway off of Lowena Drive to the north that leads to the uncovered and unpaved parking area that serves the existing residence on the site.

PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS

Assessor's Parcel Number:	029-201-003	**Existing General Plan Designation:**	Residential, 3 units per acre
Zoning:	R-3 33,615 sq. ft. (Majority of lot) E-1 6,440 sq. ft. (northern and eastern portion)	**Parcel Size:**	40,055 sq. ft.
Existing Land Use:	Single-Family Residence	**Proposed Land Use:**	Multi-Family Residential
Slope:	19% average slope		
SURROUNDING LAND USES:			
North:	Single-Family Residential		
South:	Commercial		
East:	Commercial (Santa Barbara Bowl)		
West:	Mix of Single and Multi-Family Residential		

PLANS AND POLICY DISCUSSION

(CEQA Guidelines 15063, Contents of Initial Study specifies inclusion of "An examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls.)

Land Use and Zoning Designations:

The project site is designated Residential – 3 units per acre by the General Plan Land Use Element and is immediately adjacent to the demarcation line for Residential – 12 units per acre. The project is located in the Lower Riviera neighborhood, as identified and described in the General Plan Land Use Element. This area is primarily given over to residential uses, with single-family home development predominating, but with substantial pockets of more intensive duplex and multiple-unit development. The General Plan designates this neighborhood primarily for a density of three dwelling units to the acre, with small portions to the west and south at higher densities of twelve dwelling units to the acre. Any growth that may occur will take place in the areas now designated for higher-density development. Lot sizes, are generally rather small, considering the steep topography of the Lower Riviera neighborhood.

The site is comprised of two different residential zoning designations. The majority of the lot is designated as R-3, Limited Multiple-Family Residence Zone; however, the eastern-most portion of the lot is designated E-1, One-Family Residence Zone. The proposed development is consistent with the two differing zoning designations because only one unit and no more than 750 square feet of garage space is proposed on the portion of the lot that is zoned E-1.

General Plan Policies:

Initial analysis of project consistency with adopted City plans and policies indicates that the project could be found consistent with the existing General Plan Land Use Element designation of Residential for the proposed multiple family development. Various sections of this Initial Study make reference to applicable General Plan policies and ordinance provisions.

1. Land Use Element:

The project site is consistent with the Lower Riviera neighborhood, as described above. Therefore, the proposed multiple-family development would be potentially consistent with the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The proposal of thirteen new residential units is not consistent with the General Plan designation of three units per acre. However, because this proposed development is not a subdivision, consistency with the General Plan designation of three dwelling units per acre is not required.

2. Open Space Element:

The Open Space Element of the General Plan is concerned primarily with conserving, providing, and improving, as appropriate, land and water areas significant in the Santa Barbara landscape. Those would be defined as the ocean, mountains, major hillsides, creeks, shoreline, major parks and the freeway. This project site is not considered to be an open space significant in the Santa Barbara landscape, according to the descriptions contained in the Open Space Element. This site is not considered a major hillside as defined in the General Plan. Therefore, the project can be found potentially consistent with the Open Space Element of the General Plan.

3. Housing Element:

The Housing Element encourages construction of a wide range of housing types to meet the needs of various household types. The proposed project would result in the provision of thirteen rental units of one, two and three bedrooms. Therefore, the proposed project is potentially consistent with this goal of the Housing Element.

Housing Element Policy 3.3 requires new development to be compatible with the prevailing character of the neighborhood. The neighborhood surrounding the project site is comprised of single-family residential development to the north and a mix of commercial and multiple-family residential development to the south, east and west. This is a transitional area between two different types of housing and is in the vicinity of an area used for commercial development and apartment development. The size and design of these units is subject to review by the City's Architectural Board of Review (ABR). Therefore, the proposed development would be potentially consistent with this policy of the Housing Element.

Housing Element Policy 4.1 encourages all opportunities to construct new housing units that are affordable to low and moderate-income owners and renters. The project will provide thirteen new rental units to be added to the City's rental housing stock and therefore, can be found potentially consistent with this policy of the Housing Element.

4. Conservation Element:

City Conservation Element policies provide that significant environmental resources of the City be preserved and protected. The Conservation Element requires implementation of resource protection measures for archaeological, historic and architectural resources; protection and enhancement of visual, biological and open space resources; protection of specimen and street trees; maintenance of air and water quality; and minimization of potential drainage, erosion and flooding hazards. The Conservation Element recognizes that while full implementation of the policies would be the most desirable, there are often competing demands for preservation, enhancement, development and conservation.

With respect to the subject development, there are six (6) policies under the Conservation Element that directly apply to the project site, which are discussed below:

Cultural and Historic Resources Policy 1.0 – "Activities and development which could damage or destroy archaeological, historic, or architectural resources are to be avoided."

A Phase 1 Archaeological Report and a Historic Structures Report, described above, were prepared for this project site, and found that the property does not include any historic or archaeological resources, and no archaeological resources were found on the project site during a site specific survey. However, a previous report for the adjacent property at 1130 N. Milpas Street determined the sandstone retaining wall that runs along Milpas Street, half of which belongs to the 915 E. Anapamu Street property, to be eligible as a Structure of Merit. Therefore, the demolition of this wall would potentially result in an adverse impact. The property owner intends to retain the sandstone wall located at the base of the hill along Milpas Street. Consequently the proposed project will not have a negative impact to a historic property. Therefore, the project will not produce an adverse impact on historic or cultural resources and the project can be found potentially consistent with this policy.

Visual Resources Policy 1.0 – "Development adjacent to creeks shall not degrade the creeks or their riparian environments."

There is an existing ephemeral drainage channel bisecting the property which has been designated a Water of the United States by the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). The biology report described above found no riparian habitat to exist on the project site. Also, the site is not within the 100 year flood plain. The project includes setback from the drainage and re-vegetation of the setback area and would improve the vegetation on the site. Therefore this project can be found potentially consistent with this policy.

Visual Resources Policy 2.0 – "Development on hillsides shall not significantly modify the natural topography and vegetation."

Grading on site will consist of 3,350 cubic yards of cut and 550 cubic yard of fill. Of the entire project, approximately 11,000 square feet (27%) is located in an area 30% slope or greater. Approximately 1,236 square feet of building footprint is proposed within the area of 30% slope or greater which represents approximately 11.2% of the total 30% or greater area. The extent of grading in the area of 30% slope or greater consists of approximately 115 cubic yards of cut, a relatively small amount of grading, which does not constitute a major change in topography. Therefore this project can be found potentially consistent with this policy.

Visual Resources Policy 3.0 – "New development shall not obstruct scenic view corridors, including those of the ocean and lower elevations of the City viewed respectively from the shoreline and upper foothills, and of the upper foothills and mountains viewed respectively from the breach and lower elevations of the City."

The project is not anticipated to obstruct important public scenic views to the ocean or lower elevations of the City, and is not anticipated to substantially obstruct upper foothill or mountain views from the beach or lower elevations of the City. The project site is located in a valley on the edge of a knoll with adjacent steep hillsides that comprise the Riviera neighborhood as a backdrop, and is not visually prominent from public view points. Additionally, the site is adjacent to existing two-story multiple-family residential developments, and will not affect a prominent, public or an important visual resource. The project development will be compatible with the surrounding urban area, and will not significantly alter the topography of the site. Therefore this project can be found potentially consistent with this policy.

Visual Resources Policy 4.0 – "Trees enhance the general appearance of the City's landscape and shall be preserved and protected."

The project includes the removal of twenty (20) existing trees. Three (3) palms will be relocated on site and thirty-five (35) mitigation trees and thirty-six (36) ornamental trees will be installed with eighteen (18) trees to remain. Oak tree mitigation will consist of seven (7) trees on site and twenty eight (28) trees at an off site location. The receptor site for the offsite mitigation will occur at Skofield Park. Although there are several oaks that will be removed by the proposed development, these trees are not substantial visual resources, are not visible from off-site, and will be replaced. Therefore this project can be found potentially consistent with this policy.

Biological Resources Policy 4.0 – "Remaining Coastal Perennial Grasslands and Southern Oak Woodlands shall be preserved, where feasible."

Although the project proposes the removal of five mature oak trees, they are not considered to be a part of a Southern Oak Woodland, and the Biology Report found no Perennial Grasslands on the property. Also, the preservation of a majority of the trees on site has been proposed. Therefore, the project can be found potentially consistent with this policy.

5. Seismic Safety/Safety Element:

The City's Seismic Safety/Safety Element requires that development be sited, designed and maintained to protect life, property and public well being from seismic and other geologic hazards, and to reduce or avoid adverse economic, social, and environmental impacts caused by hazardous geologic conditions. The Seismic Safety/Safety Element addresses a number of potential hazards including, geology, seismicity, flooding, liquefaction, tsunamis, high groundwater, and erosion. The City's MEA indicates that the project site is located in an area of "minimal liquefaction potential" and there are "varying levels of erosion potential." The site is not located in an area of known or mapped earthquake faults, but would be subject to ground shaking due to earthquakes on nearby faults. These constraints can be addressed by following the engineering foundation recommendations of the Preliminary Geologic Investigation and the California Uniform Building Code. Therefore, the project is potentially consistent with the Seismic Safety/Safety Element.

6. Noise Element:

The City's Noise Element includes policies intended to achieve and maintain a noise environment that is compatible with the variety of human activities and land uses in the City. The proposed project would not generate a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the area due to the nature of the proposed use (residential). The Noise Study states that the current and future noise levels would be consistent with the City's noise level compatibility criteria. Short-term construction noise is minimized through implementation of standard mitigation measures. Therefore the proposed project could be found potentially consistent with the Noise Element.

7. Circulation Element:

The City's Circulation Element contains goals and implementing measures to reduce adverse impacts to the City's street system and parking by reducing reliance on the automobile, encouraging alternative forms of transportation, reviewing traffic impact standards, and applying land use and planning strategies that support the City's mobility goals. The project site is located within walking distance of restaurants and other commercial businesses. As discussed in the traffic section of the Initial Study, traffic and circulation impacts resulting from the proposed project are negligible, and thus the project could be found potentially consistent with the Circulation Element.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

A draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared for the project in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6. The draft MMRP is attached as ***Exhibit B***.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The following checklist contains questions concerning potential changes to the environment that may result if this project is implemented. If no impact would occur, **NO** should be checked. If the project might result in an impact, check **YES** indicating the potential level of significance as follows:

Significant: Known substantial environmental impacts. Further review needed to determine if there are feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives to reduce the impact.

Potentially Significant: Unknown, potentially significant impacts that need further review to determine significance level and whether mitigable.

Potentially Significant, Mitigable: Potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels with identified mitigation measures agreed-to by the applicant.

Less than Significant: Impacts that are not substantial or significant.

1. AESTHETICS Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** ***Level of Significance***
a)	Affect a public scenic vista or designated scenic highway or highway/roadway eligible for designation as a scenic highway?	X	
b)	Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect in that it is inconsistent with Architectural Board of Review or Historic Landmarks Guidelines or guidelines/criteria adopted as part of the Local Coastal Program?		Less Than Significant
c)	Create light or glare?		Less Than Significant

Visual Aesthetics - Discussion

Issues: Issues associated with visual aesthetics include the potential blockage of important public scenic views, project on-site visual aesthetics and compatibility with the surrounding area, and changes in exterior lighting.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Aesthetic quality, whether a project is visually pleasing or unpleasing, may be perceived and valued differently from one person to the next, and depends in part on the context of the environment in which a project is proposed. The significance of visual changes is assessed qualitatively based on consideration of the proposed physical change and project design within the context of the surrounding visual setting. First, the existing visual setting is reviewed to determine whether important existing visual aesthetics are involved, based on consideration of existing views, existing visual aesthetics on and around the site, and existing lighting conditions. Under CEQA, the evaluation of a project's potential impacts to scenic views is focused on views from prominent public (as opposed to private) viewpoints. The importance of existing views is assessed qualitatively based on whether important visual resources such as mountains, skyline trees, or the coastline, can be seen, the extent and scenic quality of the views, and whether the views are experienced from prominent public viewpoints. The visual changes associated with the project are then assessed

qualitatively to determine whether the project would result in substantial effects associated with important public scenic views, on-site visual aesthetics, and lighting.

Significant visual aesthetics impacts may potentially result from:

- Substantial obstruction or degradation of important public scenic views, including important views from scenic highways; extensive grading and/or removal of substantial amounts of vegetation and trees visible from prominent public areas without adequate landscaping; or substantial loss of important public open space.
- Substantial negative aesthetic effect or incompatibility with surrounding land uses or structures due to project size, massing, scale, density, architecture, signage, or other design features.
- Substantial light and/or glare that poses a hazard or substantial annoyance to adjacent land uses and sensitive receptors.

Visual Aesthetics – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is located within a small valley on the edge of a knoll that is not clearly visible from any important public viewing places including Milpas Street and Anapamu Street. Due to topography, existing development and vegetation, views of the site are only available from the immediate site area.

1.a) Scenic Views

The project proposes the construction of thirteen (13) new residential units on a parcel that the City's Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) maps do not identify as being located in an area of visual sensitivity. The project site is located in an urban environment. Existing development in the project vicinity is a mix of architectural styles and housing types. The project includes a mixture of two and three story structures using below grade garages and also includes extensive landscaping.

The project site is not located on, nor is it visible from, a designated scenic highway. Therefore, *no impacts* to a scenic highway will occur.

There are no prominent public view points from which the project site can be viewed nor would the new construction obstruct views or any important visual resources. The visual change resulting from the proposed project would not obstruct any prominent public views, and no designated open spaces would be impacted by the proposed project, therefore, the project would result in *no impact* to public or scenic views.

1.b) On-Site Aesthetics

The project proposes the construction of thirteen (13) new residential units in three (3) two- and three-story buildings including 3,900 cubic yards of grading, including 115 cubic yards in an area of 30% or greater slope. The construction footprint includes some areas which require grading on slopes of greater than 30 percent and the removal of five oak trees.

Size and design of these units, as well as the proposed grading and landscaping, is subject to review by the City's Architectural Board of Review (ABR). The proposed project was reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) on October 20, 2008, and April 20, 2009, for consistency with design guidelines for views, visual aesthetics and compatibility, and lighting (see Exhibit C-ABR Minutes). The Board will continue to review the project site plan and architecture subsequent to Environmental Review.

The proposed project would result in the redevelopment of a site in an urban area with development similar in height and bulk to surrounding development. Given that ABR approval is required and that the surrounding area is urban, the project's on-site aesthetics impacts would be *less than significant*.

1.c) Lighting

The project would introduce additional lighting onto the project site.

All proposed exterior lighting would be subject to compliance with the requirements of SBMC Chapter 22.75, the City's Outdoor Lighting and Design Ordinance. The ordinance provides that exterior lighting be shielded and directed to the site such that no undue lighting or glare would affect surrounding residents or roads. Compliance with this ordinance, as well as review and approval of the lighting plan by the ABR, will ensure that the proposed exterior lighting does not result in a significant impact. Therefore, project impacts from lighting and glare would be *less than significant*.

Visual Aesthetics - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Visual Aesthetics - Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

2. AIR QUALITY		NO	YES
	Could the project:		*Level of Significance*
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		Less Than Significant
b)	Exceed any air quality emission threshold?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is designated in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?		Less Than Significant
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants?		Less Than Significant
e)	Create objectionable odors?		Less Than Significant

Air Quality - Discussion

Issues. Air quality issues involve pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust stationary sources (i.e., gas stations, boilers, diesel generators, dry cleaners, oil and gas processing facilities, etc.), and minor stationary sources called "area sources" (i.e., residential heating and cooling, fireplaces, etc.) that contribute to smog, particulates and nuisance dust associated with grading and construction processes, and nuisance odors. Stationary sources of air emissions are of particular concern to sensitive receptors, as is construction dust and particulate matter. Sensitive receptors are defined as children, elderly, or ill people that can be more adversely affected by air quality emissions. Land uses typically associated with sensitive receptors include schools, parks, playgrounds, childcare centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and clinics.

Smog, or ozone, is formed in the atmosphere through a series of photochemical reactions involving interaction of oxides of nitrogen [NO_x] and reactive organic compounds [ROC] (referred to as ozone precursors) with sunlight over a period of several hours. Primary sources of ozone precursors in the South Coast area are vehicle emissions. Sources of particulate matter (PM_{10}) include demolition, grading, road dust, agricultural tilling, mineral quarries, and vehicle exhaust ($PM_{2.5}$).

The City of Santa Barbara is located within the South Coast Air Basin. The City is subject to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are more stringent than the national standards. The CAAQS apply to six pollutants: photochemical ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, and lead. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) provides oversight on compliance with air quality standards and preparation of the County Clean Air Plan.

Santa Barbara County is considered in attainment of the federal eight-hour ozone standard, and in attainment of the state one-hour ozone standard. The County does not meet the state eight-hour ozone standard or the state standard for particulate matter less than ten microns in diameter (PM_{10}); but does meet the federal PM_{10} standard. There is not yet enough data to determine the County's attainment status for either the federal standard for particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$) or the state $PM_{2.5}$ standard, although the County would likely be in attainment for the federal 2.5 standard.

Global Climate Change (GCC) is a change in the average weather of the earth that can be measured by changes in wind patterns, storms, precipitation and temperature. Although there is not unanimous agreement regarding the occurrence, causes, or effects of GCC, there is a substantial body of evidence that climate change is occurring due the introduction of gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. Common greenhouse gases (GHG) include water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxides, chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, ozone and aerosols. Natural processes emit GHG that help to regulate the earth's temperature; however, it is believed that substantial increases in emissions from human activities, such as electricity production and vehicle use, have substantially elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations. While other greenhouse gases have higher global warming potential, carbon dioxide is emitted in such vastly higher quantities that it accounts for 85 percent of the global warming potential of all greenhouse gases emitted by the United States. Greenhouse gas emissions, therefore, are typically

measured in terms of mass carbon dioxide equivalents, which is the product of the mass of a particular greenhouse gas and its specific global warming potential (CO2 has a global warming potential of 1).

California is a substantial contributor of GHG (2nd largest contributor in the U.S. and the 16th largest contributor in the world); with transportation and electricity generation representing the two largest contributing factors (41 and 22 percent, respectively). According to the US EPA greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. amounted to 7,260 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MMTCO2e) in 2005. The California Energy Commission estimates that California emissions in 2004 were approximately 482 MMTCO2e.

Assembly Bill 32 created the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 that requires the California Air Resources Board to adopt regulations to evaluate statewide greenhouse gas emissions, and then create a program and emission caps to limit statewide emissions to 1990 levels. The program is to be adopted by 2012 and implemented in a manner achieving emissions compliance by 2020. The California Air Resources Board has determined that for the purposes of implementing AB 32, that the 1990 level of greenhouse gas emissions in California was approximately 427 MMTCO2e. The California Air Resources Board also has estimated that without the implementation of additional greenhouse gas reduction strategies, the 2020 "business-as-usual" estimate for greenhouse gas emissions in California is 600 MMTCO2e. AB 32, therefore, creates an emission reduction goal for the state of 173 MMTCO2e by 2020. AB 32 does not directly amend CEQA or other environmental laws, but it does acknowledge that emissions of greenhouse gases cause significant adverse impacts to human health and the environment.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A project may create a significant air quality impact from the following:

- Exceeding an APCD pollutant threshold; inconsistency with District regulations; or exceeding population forecasts in the adopted County Clean Air Plan.
- Exposing sensitive receptors, such as children, the elderly or sick people to substantial pollutant exposure.
- Substantial unmitigated nuisance dust during earthwork or construction operations.
- Creation of nuisance odors inconsistent with APCD regulations.

Long-Term (Operational) Impact Guidelines: The City of Santa Barbara uses the SBCAPCD thresholds of significance for evaluating air quality impacts. The APCD has determined that a proposed project will not have a significant air quality impact on the environment if operation of the project will:

- Emit (from all project sources, both stationary and mobile) less than 240 pounds per day for ROC and NO_x, and 80 pounds per day for PM_{10};
- Emit less than 25 pounds per day of ROC or NO_x from motor vehicle trips only;
- Not cause a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone);
- Not exceed the APCD health risks public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board; and
- Be consistent with the adopted federal and state air quality plans for Santa Barbara.

Short-Term (Construction) Impacts Guidelines: Projects involving grading, paving, construction, and landscaping activities may cause localized nuisance dust impacts and increased particulate matter (PM_{10}). Substantial dust-related impacts may be potentially significant, but are generally considered mitigable with the application of standard dust control mitigation measures. Standard dust mitigation measures are applied to projects with either significant or less than significant effects.

Exhaust from construction equipment also contributes to air pollution. Quantitative thresholds of significance are not currently in place for short-term or construction emissions. However, SBCAPCD uses combined emissions from all construction equipment that exceed 25 tons of any pollutant except carbon monoxide within a 12-month period as a guideline threshold for determining significance of construction emission impacts.

Cumulative Impacts and Consistency with Clean Air Plan: If the project-specific impact exceeds the ozone precursor significance threshold, it is also considered to have a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts. When a project is not accounted for in the most recent Clean Air Plan growth projections, then the project's impact may also be considered to have a considerable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts. The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments and Air Resources Board on-road emissions forecasts are used as a basis for vehicle emission forecasting. If a project provides for increased population growth beyond that forecasted in the most recently adopted CAP, or if the project does not incorporate appropriate air quality mitigation and control measures, or is inconsistent with APCD rules

and regulations, then the project may be found inconsistent with the CAP and may have a significant impact on air quality.

Global Climate Change: Recent State legislation and opinions by the California Attorney General have indicated that CEQA evaluations should include an assessment of a project's potential to contribute to global climate change impacts. While methodologies for conducting such analysis are currently under consideration, no new CEQA significance thresholds or impact evaluation guidelines have been adopted at a state or local level for global climate change impacts.

Air Quality – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

2.a) Clean Air Plan

The 2007 Clean Air Plan (CAP) uses 2002 Regional Growth Forecasts from the Santa Barbara Council of Governments (SBCAG) as a basis for its emission estimates. The 2002 SBCAG Regional Growth Forecast states that the projection for residential growth in Santa Barbara in the five year period from 2005 to 2010 is 554 housing units. On an annual basis this equates to approximately 111 housing units. The City of Santa Barbara records indicate that a total of 341 new units were issued Certificates of Occupancy (C of O) from 2005 to 2009. Only in 2006 did the number of units issued a C of O in the City of Santa Barbara exceed 100 (it was 109). The project would add an additional 12 net new units to the City. For example, thirty-nine (39) net new residential units were constructed in 2009 in the City of Santa Barbara (the last year for which records are available), well below the SBCAG housing projection of 111 units. Therefore, it is anticipated that the project will be well within the growth assumptions used for the preparation of the CAP and the project is therefore consistent with the CAP on an annual basis. In a five year timeframe the project is also well within the projected growth rate used for CAP (projection of 554 units and 341 units issued C of O) and consistent with the CAP on a five year basis.

Direct and indirect emissions associated with the project are accounted for in the 2007 Clean Air Plan emissions. Appropriate air quality mitigation measures, including construction dust suppression, would be applied to the project, consistent with CAP and City policies. The project could be found consistent with the 2007 Clean Air Plan; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant.*

2.b) Air Pollutant Emissions

Long-Term (Area Source & Operational) Emissions:

Long-term project emissions are generated primarily from project-related motor vehicle use and from stationary sources that may require permits from the APCD. Examples of stationary emission sources include gas stations, auto body shops, diesel generators, dry cleaners, oil and gas production and processing facilities, and water treatment facilities. Other stationary sources such as small wineries, residential heating and cooling equipment, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, or other individual appliances do not require permits from the APCD and are known as "area sources". The proposed project does not contain any stationary sources that require permits from APCD.

Using the URBEMIS 9.2.4 computer model (Exhibit E), it is estimated that the long-term vehicle emissions resulting from the proposed project would be 1.78 pounds per day of ROC and NOx, which is substantially below significance thresholds of 25 pounds per day as adopted by the APCD and the City of Santa Barbara. Also, ROC and NOx for all sources during operations would be 2.82 pounds per day where the threshold would be 240 pounds per day. It is estimated that PM_{10} from source and operations would be 1.16 pounds per day where the threshold is 80 pounds per day. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant impact* on long-term air quality.

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions:

The grading volume for the project would total approximately 3,350 cubic yards of cut, 550 cubic yards of fill and 2,800 cubic yards of export. Grading, paving, and landscaping activities could result in localized dust related impacts resulting in increases in particulate matter (PM_{10}) emissions. Dust-related impacts are considered *less than significant*, but would be further reduced with the application of standard dust control measures that will be required as part of the City's SWMP permit that addresses construction erosion/sedimentation control when the plans are submitted for permit review.

Utilizing the URBEMIS 9.2.4 computer model and SBCAPCD emission factor data, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate combined construction emissions of ROC, NOx, SO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$ of approximately 13 tons per year, which is less than the SBCAPCD threshold of 25 tons per year. Therefore, with the recommended mitigations for dust control and compliance with APCD requirements for construction equipment engines, the impacts of the proposed project would be further reduced.

The project will involve demolition of the existing structures, which may release regulated friable asbestos. Friable asbestos crumbles into a dust of microscopic fibers that can remain in the air for long periods of time. If inhaled, asbestos fibers pose a serious health threat as they can become permanently lodged in body tissues. Since there is no known safe

level of exposure, all asbestos exposure shall be minimized. This would result in a *potentially significant, mitigable* impact. With implementation of mitigation to minimize potential exposure to asbestos, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The mitigation measure is a standard condition of approval for projects that remodel or demolish structures.

Global Climate Change:

Sources of carbon dioxide emissions that could result from the project include project-related traffic, natural gas use, landscape maintenance, consumer product use, solid waste generation, site lighting, and potable water delivery. Short-term and long-term emissions of carbon dioxide that would result from the development of the project were estimated using the URBEMIS 9.2.4 computer model and SBAPCD emission factors. The model estimates carbon dioxide emissions of 3,342 pounds per day from short-term construction and 821 pounds per day from project operation. These carbon dioxide emissions estimates are considered conservative because emissions from the current uses have not been deducted from the proposed project emissions.

The California Energy Commission (CEC) estimates that California emissions in 2004 were approximately 492 MMTCO2e. The project's long-term emissions of carbon dioxide were estimated to be approximately 150 tons per year, and would not hinder the State's attainment of greenhouse gas emission reductions under AB 32 (173 MMTCO2e by 2020). The project would be required to comply with the City's energy efficiency ordinance (Santa Barbara Municipal Code, Chapter 22.82), which requires energy efficiency measures that are greater than Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The City's energy efficiency ordinance requires 10, 15, or 20% less energy usage than Title 24 depending on if the project is a non-residential, high rise residential, or low rise residential project, respectively. Finally, the project would not exceed other air quality significance thresholds adopted by the APCD. The project would contribute a very small portion of the cumulative CO_2 emissions on a statewide basis. The project would, therefore, not result in substantial greenhouse gas emissions or impede the ability of the State to attain greenhouse gas reduction goals and would be considered *less than significant.*

2.c) Cumulative Impacts

Since project impacts do not exceed any adopted project-level significance thresholds and the project is consistent with the CAP, the project would have a *less than significant* impact related to cumulative project emissions.

2.d) Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors are defined as children, elderly, or ill people that can be more adversely affected by air quality problems. Land uses typically associated with sensitive receptors include schools, parks, playgrounds, childcare centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and clinics. Stationary sources are of particular concern to sensitive receptors, as is construction dust and particulate matter. There are no sensitive receptors located adjacent to the project site. However, the area could be affected by dust and diesel particulate matter (diesel PM) from construction equipment and vehicle exhaust temporarily during project site grading. Particulate emissions from diesel exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the State of California. Impacts associated with nuisance dust and diesel PM are considered *less than significant* because they are temporary, limited, and localized. With the recommended mitigation measures for dust control and compliance with APCD requirements for construction equipment engines, the impacts of the proposed project would be further reduced.

2.e) Odors

The proposed project would include only residential land use, which would not be a substantial source of objectionable odors. The project would not contain features with the potential to emit substantial odorous emissions, from sources such as commercial cooking equipment, combustion or evaporation of fuels, sewer systems, or solvents and surface coatings. Due to the nature of the proposed land use and limited size of the project, project impacts related to odors would be considered *less than significant.*

Air Quality – Required Mitigation

AQ-1 Asbestos Containing Material. Applicant shall submit the SBCAPCD "Asbestos/Demolition/Renovation Notification" Form to the SBCAPCD at least ten days prior to the start of any demolition work.

Air Quality – Recommended Mitigation

AQ-2 Construction Dust Control – Minimize Disturbed Area/Speed. Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce on site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.

AQ-3 Construction Dust Control - Watering. During site grading and transportation of fill materials, regular water sprinkling shall occur using reclaimed water whenever the Public Works Director determines that it is reasonably available. During clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation, sufficient quantities of water, through use of either water trucks or sprinkler systems, shall be applied to achieve minimum soil moisture of 12% to prevent dust from leaving the site. Each day, after construction activities cease, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be sufficiently moistened to create a crust.

Throughout construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall also be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust raised from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will include wetting down such areas every three hours. Increased watering frequency will be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph.

AQ-4 Construction Dust Control – Tarping. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be covered from the point of origin and maintain a freeboard height of 12 inches.

AQ-5 Construction Dust Control – Gravel Pads. Gravel pads, 3 inches deep, 25 feet long, 12 feet wide per lane and edged by rock berm or row of stakes or a pipe-grid track out control device shall be installed to reduce mud/dirt track out from unpaved truck exit routes.

AQ-6 Construction Dust Control – Disturbed Area Treatment. After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated to prevent wind erosion. This may be accomplished by:

- Seeding and watering until grass cover is grown;
- Spreading soil binders;
- Sufficiently wetting the area down to form a crust on the surface with repeated soakings as necessary to maintain the crust and prevent dust pickup by the wind;
- Other methods approved in advance by the Air Pollution Control District.

AQ-7 Construction Dust Control – Paving. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., shall be paved as soon as possible. Additionally, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

AQ-8 Stockpiling. If importation, exportation and stockpiling of fill material are involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist by applying water at a rate of 1.4 gallons per hour per square yard, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Apply cover when wind events are declared.

AQ-9 Construction Dust Control – Project Environmental Coordinator (PEC). 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 offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when construction work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to land use clearance for map recordation and land use clearance for finish grading for the structure.

AQ10 Exhaust Emissions – Engines. Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated "clean" diesel engines) shall be used.

AQ-11 Engine Size. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.

AQ-12 Equipment Numbers. The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.

AQ-13 Equipment Maintenance. Construction equipment shall be maintained to meet the manufacturer's specifications.

AQ-14 Engine Timing. Construction equipment operating onsite shall be equipped with two to four degree engine timing retard or pre-combustion chamber engines.

AQ-15 Catalytic Converters. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.

AQ-16 Diesel Catalytic Converters. Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California shall be installed, if available.

AQ-17 Diesel Replacements. Diesel powered equipment shall be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.

AQ-18 Idling Limitation. Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes; auxiliary power units shall be used whenever possible.

AQ-19 Worker Trips. Construction worker trips shall be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

AQ-20 Biodiesel. Biodiesel shall be used to the maximum extent feasible.

AQ-21 Energy Use. Minimize the use of energy by designing and constructing structures using sustainable development principles including green building designs and materials.

AQ-22 Carpool Parking. Provide preferential parking for carpools and vanpools.

AQ-23 Demolition and Debris Removal. Apply water every 4 hours to the area within 100 feet of a structure being demolished, to reduce vehicle trackout. Apply water to disturbed soils after demolition is completed or at the end of each day of cleanup.

AQ-24 Post Demolition. Apply dust suppressants (e.g., polymer emulsion) to disturbed areas upon completion of demolition.

AQ-25 Demolition Activities. Prohibit demolition activities when wind speeds exceed 25 mph.

Air Quality - Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

3. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Could the project result in impacts to:		**NO**	**YES** *Level of Significance*
a)	Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
b)	Locally designated historic, Landmark or specimen trees?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
c)	Natural communities (e.g. oak woodland, coastal habitat, etc.).	X	
d)	Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
e)	Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable

Biological Resources - Discussion

Issues: Biological resources issues involve the potential for a project to substantially affect biologically-important natural vegetation and wildlife, particularly species that are protected as rare, threatened, or endangered by federal or state wildlife agencies and their habitat, native specimen trees, and designated landmark or historic trees.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Existing native wildlife and vegetation on a project site are assessed to identify whether they constitute important biological resources, based on the types, amounts, and quality of the resources within the context of the larger ecological community. If important biological resources exist, project effects to the resources are evaluated to determine whether the project would substantially affect these important biological resources. Significant biological resource impacts may potentially result from substantial disturbance to important wildlife and vegetation in the following ways:

- Elimination or substantial reduction or disruption of important natural vegetative communities and wildlife habitat or migration corridors, such as oak woodland, coastal strand, riparian, and wetlands.
- Substantial effect on protected plant or animal species listed or otherwise identified or protected as endangered, threatened or rare.
- Substantial loss or damage to important native specimen trees or designated landmark or historic trees.

Biological Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is currently developed with a single family residence and is located in an urban setting surrounded by a mix of single family residential and multiple family residential developments and commercial uses. As recognized by the

City of Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment, this portion of the City is almost entirely urbanized, and biological resources are limited.

The project site is located in an urban setting surrounded by a mix of single and multi-family residential development. There is a small, unnamed drainage traversing the western portion of the property in a north-to-south direction. This drainage is ephemeral and only conveys surface water during and immediately following major rainfall events. It is not a US Geological Survey-mapped blue-line stream, nor a tributary of any named creek or watercourse; however, it is identified by the Army Corpse of Engineers as Waters of the U.S.

Vegetation on the project site, proposed to be removed, consists of twenty (20) existing trees including two (2) Eugenias, one (1) loquat, one (1) pittosporum and one (1) unknown tree. Five (5) native coast live oaks are proposed to be removed, and the root zones of two (2) native coast live oaks will be significantly encroached upon by 40%-50%. Three (3) palms will be relocated on site, and thirty-five (35) mitigation trees and thirty-six (36) ornamental trees will be installed, with eighteen (18) trees to remain.

A Biological Assessment prepared by Watershed Environmental, Inc. dated March 25, 2009 is incorporated by reference and summarized herein (Exhibit F). The assessment states that vegetation on site consists of turf grass/nonnative grassland (0.32 acre), ornamental trees (0.15 acre), ornamental shrubs and ground cover (0.16 acre) and individual native Coast live oak trees (*Quercus agrifolia*) (0.19 acre) ranging in size from 6-10 inches in diameter measured at breast height. There were 57 plant species observed on site, of which 14 % are native and 86% are introduced. The native plant species include umbrella sedge (Cyperus eragrostis), telegraph weed (Heterotheca grandiflora), laurel sumac (Malosma laurina), purple needlegrass (Nassella pulchra), coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia), lemonadeberry (Rhus integrifolia, wild blackberry (Rubus ursinus) and poison oak (Toxicodendron diversilobum). Sixteen wildlife species were observed: 14 birds, one mammal, and one reptile. Several other mammal, amphibian, and reptile species are expected to occur and/or have the potential to occur on the property given the habitat types present and property location.

Sensitive species occurring in the vicinity include: Cooper's hawk, big free-tailed bat, globose dune beetle, Coulter's saltbush, Nuttall's scrub oak, Santa Barbara honeysuckle, late-flowered mariposa lily, and Santa Barbara morning-glory. No sensitive, endangered, rare or threatened plants, wildlife species were found during performance of the survey and sensitive biological resources are not likely to occur on this property in the future due to the lack of suitable habitat and the property's location in an urban area.

3.a) Rare/Endangered species or their habitats

The project would result in grading and construction of 13 residential units that would remove most of the vegetation on site excluding within the area of the existing ephemeral drainage channel.

The biological survey prepared for this project found no endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds) on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore the project will have *no impacts* on sensitive species found on the site during the survey.

All migratory non-game native bird species are protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. There is the potential for bird species protected by this act to occur on this site during nesting season. Taking of birds and their active nests are prohibited. Migratory birds or raptors may nest in trees on the site, and removal of these trees before the birds have fledged could result in take of those nesting birds. The applicant shall not allow any tree removal within the site from February 1 to August 15, the recognized breeding, nesting and fledging season for most bird species. If vegetation has to be removed within these dates, a qualified biologist shall conduct bird surveys for nesting birds. If a listed species is found, the tree will not be removed until the biologist certifies that the nesting birds have fledged. With the possible exception of nesting birds, there are no endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats currently listed nor are there candidates for State or Federal protection present at this site. Project impacts to endangered, threatened or rare species would be *potentially significant, mitigable*, and reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the required mitigation measure related to nest protection.

3.b) Specimen Trees

The Biological Assessment (Exhibit F) states that there are no City-designated historic, landmark, or specimen trees within the project area to be removed. There are however, seven (7) smaller (between 4" and 10" in diameter, several of which are multi-trunk) mature native oak trees on the project site that would be removed (5) or potentially damaged (2). Mature native and non-native specimen trees provide numerous benefits to the environment, including shade, soil stability, air quality, and localized habitat for urban-adapted wildlife species, such as birds. City policies address the protection and replacement of mature trees. With implementation of the identified tree protection measures and the replacement of the five (5) oak trees to be removed with 35 fifteen gallon native oak trees in various locations, impacts to

Coast live oak tree would be would be *potentially significant, mitigable*, and reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the required mitigation measures.

3.c) Natural Communities

The project site does not contain any substantial, sensitive natural communities (e.g. oak woodland, coastal habitat, etc.) as the site is mostly covered with non-native species. Development of the proposed project will require the removal of 20 trees, including 5 native coast live oaks. The five native coast live oak trees that will be removed are individual trees and are not considered to be part of a larger oak grove or oak woodland habitat. Therefore, there would be *no impact* to sensitive natural communities.

3.d) Wetland Habitat

The proposed project includes grading of approximately 3,350 cubic yards of cut and 550 cubic yards of fill from within the area identified on the preliminary grading and drainage plans. This earthwork will occur in areas adjacent to, but not in, the unnamed drainage channel in the eastern portion of the property, but not within the approximately 200-ft. –long by 3-ft. –wide area identified by the Army Corps of Engineers as Waters of the United States (U.S.).

The project as currently configured will not have a direct impact on this federal-or state-regulated Waters of the U.S. However, given the close proximity of grading to this drainage, it has the potential to cause construction-related indirect effects to federal-and state-regulated Waters of U.S. should the project accidentally cause a direct effect to the 3-ft. –wide bed of this drainage. The property owners would need to obtain a 404 permit from the ACOE, a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game, and a 401 Water Quality Certification from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board it this were to occur. Mitigation includes fencing the area adjacent to the drainage to preclude access, and construction related water quality measures to control spills. Therefore, the proposed project would be considered *potentially significant, mitigable*.

3.e) Wildlife Dispersal

Other than the potential for migratory bird species, as discussed above, no other species are expected on the site and no non-urbanized wildlife would be displaced as a result of the project. The project site is a small isolated island of mostly undeveloped land. The drainage above and below the site is culverted, therefore, according to the biological assessment the project site does not currently serve as a wildlife corridor for any species. The project would restore the drainage area so that it would remain available for wildlife to traverse the site. Since the site would maintain a wildlife corridor but currently does not serve as one, project impacts on wildlife corridors would be less than significant. Project impacts to migratory birds would be *potentially significant, mitigable*, and reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the required mitigation measure that requires a survey to preclude presence during nesting season or construction outside the nesting season.

Biological Resources – Required Mitigation

BIO -1 Tree Protection Measures. The landscape plan and grading plan shall include the following tree protection measures:

a. Tree protection measures contained in the preliminary landscape plans shall be implemented prior to any demolition, clearing, or grading occurring on the property and will be maintained throughout the duration of construction activities as mitigation for short-term impacts to native trees.

b. A pre-construction meeting shall be held with contractors, prior to commencement of work, to discuss tree protection measures.

c. Install fencing as designated on the site plan to establish tree protection zones (TPZs). These TPZs shall be at the outside edge of work areas, around trees. Fences must be maintained in upright positions throughout the duration of the project. Fences shall be chain-link and staked with 6' of space between posts.

d. The TPZs shall be void of all activities, including parking vehicles, operation of equipment, storage of materials and dumping (including temporary spoils from excavation).

e. All excavation and grading near trees shall be monitors by the project arborist.

f. Any roots encountered during grading that are ½" and greater shall be cleanly cut.

g. Any pruning shall be performed or supervised by a qualified Certified Arborist. The project arborist shall review the goals with workers prior to commencement of any tree pruning. Tree workers shall be

knowledgeable of *American National Standards Institute (ANSI) A-300 Pruning Standards and ISA Best Management Practices for Tree Pruning.*

h. Oak trees that are impacted from root damage even minimally shall be sprayed in the early spring and late summer with permethrin (*Astro*) to help resist attack of oak bark beetles. The application of the chemical shall be applied to the lower 6' of trunk. The arborist recommends that treatments be repeated for at least two years after completion of the project or if drought prevails for longer periods.

i. It shall be determined by the project arborist when supplemental irrigation is necessary to aid trees that incur root loss or during hot and dry periods.

j. The project arborist shall monitor activities on the site throughout the duration of the project. Monitoring would be more frequent during fencing installation, excavation and grading, and less frequent as the project progresses, provided fences remain upright and TPZs are not violated.

BIO-2 Replacement Trees. The landscape plans shall include on-site and off-site replacement of coast live oak trees. The minimum tree replacement shall be 5:1 mitigation ratio using 15-gallon size trees, with 1:1 mitigation to be performed on-site (i.e., plant seven (7) oak tree saplings onsite) and 4:1 mitigation off-site (i.e., plant twenty-eight (28) oak tree saplings offsite). The receptor site for the offsite mitigation will occur at Skofield Parks outside of any high fire defensible spaces and outside of any archaeologically sensitive zones. Additionally, some offsite mitigation may occur within the City parkway in previously disturbed areas or outside of any archaeologically sensitive zones.

BIO-3 Impacts to Waters of the U.S. In order to prevent any accidental or inadvertent impacts during grading and construction, a 6-ft. –tall chain-link fence shall be installed between the drainage channel and the edge of the disturbance area and silt fencing shall be attached to the chain link fence and keyed into the ground per the manufacturer's recommendations. The purpose of the fencing is to provide a visual and physical barrier to equipment, vehicles, and slough from grading operations and construction traffic. Upon completion of construction, the chain link fencing and silt fencing may be removed. (Additional water quality mitigation measures are contained in Water Quality Section of the Initial Study and these would reduce the potential for accidental spills during construction.)

BIO-4 Nest Protection. Proposed project activities including tree and vegetation removal shall occur outside the breeding bird season (February 1 – August 15). If project activities cannot be feasibly avoided during the bird nesting season, the project proponent shall conduct a survey prior to construction, using a qualified biologist approved by the City Environmental Analyst, to detect protected nesting native birds in the vegetation and trees being trimmed and within 300 feet of the construction work area. The survey shall be conducted no more than three days before construction is initiated. If an active nest is located, construction within 500 feet of a raptor nest and 300 feet of any other nesting bird, vegetation trimming shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and this has been confirmed by the qualified biologist.

Biological Resources - Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

4. CULTURAL RESOURCES Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** *Level of Significance*
a)	Disturb archaeological resources?		Less Than Significant
b)	Affect a historic structure or site designated or eligible for designation as a National, State or City landmark?	X	
c)	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect ethnic cultural values or restrict religious uses in the project area?	X	

Cultural Resources - Discussion

Issues: Archaeological resources are subsurface deposits dating from Prehistoric or Historical time periods. Native American culture appeared along the channel coast over 10,000 years ago, and numerous villages of the Barbareno Chumash flourished in coastal plains now encompassed by the City. Spanish explorers and eventual settlements in Santa Barbara occurred in the 1500's through 1700's. In the mid-1800's, the City began its transition from Mexican village to

American city, and in the late 1800's through early 1900's experienced intensive urbanization. Historic resources are above-ground structures and sites from historical time periods with historic, architectural, or other cultural importance. The City's built environment has a rich cultural heritage with a variety of architectural styles, including the Spanish Colonial Revival style emphasized in the rebuilding of Santa Barbara's downtown following a destructive 1925 earthquake.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Archaeological and historical impacts are evaluated qualitatively by archeologists and historians. First, existing conditions on a site are assessed to identify whether important or unique archaeological or historical resources exist, based on criteria specified in the State CEQA *Guidelines* and City Master Environmental Assessment *Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historical Structures and Sites*, summarized as follows:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there exists a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with an important prehistoric or historic event or person.

If important archaeological or historic resources exist on the site, project changes are evaluated to determine whether they would substantially affect these important resources.

Cultural Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

As described above, the subject property is 40,055 square feet (approximately 0.94) acre in area and has an irregular shape. The existing property is currently developed with a stucco, two-story residence and a small metal equipment shed. A sandstone wall runs along the Milpas Street side of the property and ends where the road curves and turns into Anapamu Street. At this corner are stone steps that lead up the hill to the house. A stucco clad wall extends out from the back of the house and encloses a small backyard. A concrete sidewalk runs along the front of the house and leads to the hillside stairway on Milpas Street. Scattered oak trees and palm trees along with small shrubs form the landscaping surrounding the house. The property is bordered on the north and west by Lowena Drive, to the south by Milpas Street, and to the east by the Santa Barbara County Bowl parking lot. The hillside below the house is covered with dense shrubs and trees, primarily native Oak trees and some palm trees.

4.a) Archaeological Resources

The project will disturb the ground, during the grading phase, and the ground disturbance could affect archaeological resources. A Phase 1 Archeological Survey (Exhibit D) was prepared for the project site and determined that there are no archaeological resources on the project site. However, as with any ground disturbing activity, there is the remote possibility of encountering unknown buried deposits. For this reason, a standard condition of approval is recommended to alert contractors and construction personnel to the possibility of encountering archaeological resources within the project parcel. If archaeological resources are encountered, work in the area of the find shall be halted and a professional archaeologist consulted. Project impacts to archaeological resources are considered *less than significant*

4.b) Historic Resources

The project will demolish the existing house, and therefore could affect historic resources. A Historic Structures Report (Exhibit H),prepared for the project site determined that the existing house has no historic value. There is an existing stone wall that runs along the front property line, which was determined to be eligible for listing as a Structure of Merit. The proposed demolition of the house would not result in any significant historic impacts because it is not historically significant. The project proposes to retain the stone wall and therefore would not impact its historic significance. Therefore, the project would have *no impact* to historic resources.

4.c) Ethnic/Religious Resources

There is no evidence that the site involves any ethnic or religious use or importance. The project would have *no impact* on historic, ethnic or religious resources.

Cultural Resources – Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Cultural Resources - Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

5. GEOPHYSICAL CONDITIONS Could the project result in or expose people to:		NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a)	Seismicity: fault rupture?	X	
b)	Seismicity: ground shaking or liquefaction?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
c)	Seismicity: seiche or tsunami?	X	
d)	Landslides or mudslides?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
e)	Subsidence of the land?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
f)	Expansive soils?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
g)	Excessive grading or permanent changes in the topography?		Less Than Significant

Geophysical Conditions - Discussion

Issues: Geophysical impacts involve geologic and soil conditions and their potential to create physical hazards affecting persons or property; or substantial changes to the physical condition of the site. Included are earthquake-related conditions such as fault rupture, groundshaking, liquefaction (a condition in which saturated soil loses shear strength during earthquake shaking); or seismic sea waves; unstable soil or slope conditions, such as landslides, subsidence, expansive or compressible/collapsible soils; or erosion; and extensive grading or topographic changes.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Potentially significant geophysical impacts may result from:

- Exposure to or creation of unstable earth conditions due to seismic conditions, such as earthquake faulting, groundshaking, liquefaction, or seismic waves.
- Exposure to or creation of unstable earth conditions due to geologic or soil conditions, such as landslides, settlement, or expansive, collapsible/compressible, or expansive soils.
- Extensive grading on slopes exceeding 20%, substantial topographic change, destruction of unique physical features; substantial erosion of soils, overburden, or sedimentation of a water course.

Geophysical Conditions – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

Overall the project site has an average slope of 19% and includes some slopes in excess of 30%. The site is located on the edge of a knoll, on a slope of an adjacent hillside, and is divided by an ephemeral drainage channel.

5.a) Fault Rupture

Development is proposed on the project site. The City Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) and the Preliminary Geologic Investigation state that there are no known earthquake faults on the project site. Because no known active or potentially active faults are located within or immediately adjacent to the subject site, there are *no impacts* associated with fault rupture on the project site.

5.b) Ground Shaking or Liquefaction

The project would locate new construction in a potentially active seismic area. The Preliminary Geological Investigation by Adam Simons dated March 27, 2002 (Exhibit I), states that the closest significant earthquake fault is the Arroyo Parida/Mission Ridge Fault system that is identified as "potentially active" but also states that it may be "active." Substantial ground shaking as a result of a local or regional earthquake activity is likely to occur during the life of the project. Ground shaking is considered a *potentially significant, mitigable* impact. Future development would be required to comply with the California Building Code, Preliminary Geological Investigation, and Preliminary Foundation Investigation (Exhibit K), requirements that would minimize potential hazards associated with ground shaking. Compliance with these requirements would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

The Preliminary Geologic Investigation states that liquefaction is unlikely because of the type of soils and depth to groundwater on the project site. The City's MEA maps indicate that the project site is in an area that has minimal liquefaction potential. Earth materials consist of firm fanglomerate and the ground water table is inferred to be greater than 50 feet below the surface. Since granular soils and ground water are absent and are required to facilitate liquefaction, there would be *no impact* due to liquefaction

5.c) Seiche or Tsunami

The project would locate new construction on the site. No enclosed water bodies are located in proximity to the project area. The City MEA maps identify the project site as being located outside the tsunami run-up zone. Therefore, *no impacts* related to seiche or tsunamis are anticipated.

5.d) Landslides or Mudslides

The project would locate new construction on the site. According to the City's MEA maps, the project site is not located in an area subject to landslides. The Preliminary Geologic Investigation states that there is no overt evidence of past slope instability or evidence of landslide activity on or immediately adjacent to the proposed building sites because the steep sloping hillsides are underlain by fanglomerate deposits generally considered to have low potential for deep seated slope instability. However, the Preliminary Geologic Investigation states that steep slopes are vulnerable to minor erosion and shallow debris flows can occur, particularly if the slopes are poorly vegetated such as when construction is in process or vegetation cover is light on the project site and surrounding slopes. The debris flows above or on the project site have the potential to block the 30" drainage pipe below Lowena Drive causing mud and debris to wash over Lowena Drive, and fill in portions of the drainage channel on the project site. This debris flow is not expected to impact proposed structures because their elevations are well above any future debris flow. Therefore, *potentially significant mitigable* impacts related to mudslides are anticipated. Required mitigation would be to ensure that site soils are stabilized during construction that after construction landscaping includes deep rooted plants on the site to stabilize steep slopes and site drainage is designed to minimize uncontrolled flows on site slopes. Also, the applicant would periodically clean out the drainage culvert, especially after periods of heavy rainfall, and would require a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers.

5.e) Subsidence of Land

The project would locate new construction on the site. According to the Preliminary Foundation Investigation, prepared by Pacific Materials Laboratories, March 19, 2009, incorporated by reference and summarized herein, (Exhibit K), site soils vary from high to low in their sensitivity to collapse or settlement. There is also the potential for undocumented fills to occur on the site that would result in different soil subsidence rates. Project soil subsidence impacts would be *potentially significant, mitigable* because proposed structures would be subject to damage (cracking). The Preliminary Foundation Investigation recommends that the footing of proposed structures either be supported completely by a uniform thickness of compacted soil, or the foundations be designed to penetrate the compressible top soil so that the structure is supported completely on firm original ground. Also the report recommends that the site drainage be designed to avoid concentrating flows on site slopes. Following the recommendations of the Preliminary Foundation Investigation and the California Building Code would ensure that project soil subsidence impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

5.f) Expansive Soils

The project would locate 13 apartments on the site. According to the Preliminary Foundation Investigation, soils on the site have both a low and a high potential for expansion. The Preliminary Foundation Investigation states that the topsoil layer of sandy clays and clayey sands was found to have a low potential for expansion but the underlying brown silty clay was found to have a high potential for expansion. There is also the potential for undocumented fills to occur on the site that would result in different soil expansion rates. The project would result in a *potentially significant, mitigable impact.* The soil preparation and foundation design recommendations of the Preliminary Foundation Investigation would need to be implemented to address expansiveness of soils. Following the recommendations of the Preliminary Foundation Investigation and the CBC would ensure that project expansive soils impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

5.g) Excessive Grading or Topography Changes

Grading for the proposed development is estimated to total 3,350 cubic yards (cy) of cut, 550 cy of fill, and 2,800 cy of export. Impacts associated with landform changes and grading on the project site are considered *less than significant.* Although the project requires excavation, excavation is relatively moderate in scale. Approximately 11,000 square feet of the site (27%) contains areas of 30% slope or greater. The amount of excavation that would alter the terrain in areas of 30% slopes is approximately 1,250 square feet in area which is approximately 11% of the area with a slope of greater than 30%. The amount of grading in the area of 30% or greater slope consists of approximately 150 cy of cut and 35 cy of fill. The development would not create any unstable slopes. Therefore, the proposed grading would not result in a significant alteration of the natural landform or substantially change the appearance of the existing topography of the site.

Geophysical Conditions – Required Mitigation

G-1 Building Code and Engineering Report Compliance. Prior to issuance of building permits for all proposed structures, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the currently adopted California Building Code's seismic reinforcement requirements for structures. In addition, the plans shall demonstrate compliance with the provisions of the Geologic Investigation and the Foundation Investigation. Compliance shall be demonstrated on plans submitted for building permits and subject to City Building and Safety Division review and approval. These requirements shall include, but are not limited to requirements for inspections of areas to be excavated during vegetation clearing, grubbing prior to grading, grading, removal of undocumented fill, scarification, recompaction of areas to receive fill, and engineering review of the design of all foundations and retaining walls.

G-2 Erosion Control Plan. At application for a grading and/or any building permits, a construction erosion control plan in conformance with the City's Storm Water Management Plan shall be submitted. The erosion control plan shall at a minimum be designed to ensure that during construction no runoff containing sediment is allowed to leave the project site. Erosion controls are to be inspected and maintained daily during construction.

G-3 Drainage Control. The drainage plan for the site shall include provisions to accept flows from roofs, patios, French drains and directing these flows from onto site slopes in a controlled manner that would not saturate soils or cause excessive erosion. Concentrated flows shall not be released onto site slopes in an uncontrolled manner.

G-4 Landscape Materials. The project site shall be planted with deep rooted, drought tolerant plants, on steep and moderate slopes on the property to improve slope stability and reduce oversaturated soils.

G-5 Drainage Channel Maintenance. The owner shall keep the on-site drainage channel free from debris that has the potential to obstruct water flow and if required, shall obtain the necessary permits from the Army Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish & Game.

Also refer to the Biological Resources and Water Resources Sections for additional erosion control measures.

Geophysical Conditions – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

6. HAZARDS Could the project involve:		**NO**	**YES** *Level of Significance*
a)	A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?		Less Than Significant
b)	The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazards?		Less Than Significant
c)	Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
d)	Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable

Hazards - Discussion

Issues: Hazardous materials issues involve the potential for public health or safety impacts from exposure of persons or the environment to hazardous materials or risk of accidents involving combustible or toxic substances.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Significant impacts may result from the following:

- Siting of incompatible projects in close proximity to existing sources of safety risk, such as pipelines, industrial processes, railroads, airports, etc.
- Exposure of project occupants or construction workers to unremediated soil or groundwater contamination.
- Exposure of persons or the environment to hazardous substances due to improper use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials.

- Siting of development in a high fire hazard areas or beyond adequate emergency response time, with inadequate access or water pressure, or otherwise in a manner that creates a fire hazard

Hazards – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

6.a) Hazardous Substances

Construction on the project site would result in the use of equipment that involves fuel, and oil use. There is a potential for this oil and fuel to be released on the site. (This issue is further discussed in Water Quality Section of the Initial Study.) In the unlikely event of a spill recommended mitigations would involve proper maintenance, monitoring and spill clean up.

Residential uses involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials such as cleaning supplies, pesticides, paints and automotive fluids. There are several existing programs designed to inform the public of this issue and provide opportunities to dispose of household hazardous waste. A *less than significant* impact from the release of hazardous substances is anticipated.

6.b) Creation of Health Hazards

The proposed residential use is not anticipated to create any new hazards. Hazardous materials usage on the site would likely be limited to the storage and use of relatively small quantities of materials such as paint, oils, cleaners, and landscape maintenance materials. Any usage of hazardous materials would be subject to all applicable State and local requirements for management and disposals of such materials. A *less than significant* impact from the creation of hazardous materials is anticipated.

6.c) Exposure to Health Hazards

The project site is not near any pipelines or other potential sources of safety hazards. Limited quantities of chemicals may be used during construction and operations. It is possible that the existing buildings contain lead-based paint and asbestos. Health hazards associated with exposure to lead-based paint and asbestos are considered *potentially significant, mitigable*. Compliance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations would reduce impacts related to exposure to lead to a less than significant level. Compliance with Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce potentially significant health impacts related to asbestos exposure to less than significant levels.

6.d) Fire Hazard

The project site is located in a High Fire Hazard Area, and is surrounded on the south, east, and west by urban development. The north portion of the property is adjacent to a canyon with heavy chaparral vegetation that is highly flammable. The proposed structure would be equipped with an automatic fire sprinkler. The project would be subject to Fire Department and California Building and Fire Code requirements for adequate access, defensible space, structural design and materials. The City's Wildland Fire Specialist has reviewed the project plans and approved the fuel modification proposal. The proposed project includes a green roof on units 12 and 13. This does not comply with the High Fire Hazard mitigation requirements and this would cause a *potentially significant, mitigable* impact. With roof design and materials that comply with the High Fire Standards, including the installation of a Class A roof, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Hazards – Required Mitigation

H-1 Lead Disposal. During demolition activities, workers shall follow OSHA regulations regarding potential exposure to lead. In addition, representative samples of any construction waste shall be tested by the Toxic Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) to determine if the waste is hazardous. Hazardous wastes must be disposed of according to Federal, State and local regulations.

H-2 High Fire Vegetation Management. Developments located in the High Fire Hazard area are required to maintain vegetation to create an effective fuel break by thinning dense vegetation (mosaic style) and removing dry brush, flammable vegetation and combustible growth from areas within 100 feet of all buildings or structures. The owner shall perform the following maintenance annually for the life of the project.

- Cut and remove hazardous brush, shrubs, and flammable vegetation such as dry grass and weeds within 100 feet of any structure and within 2 inches of the ground.
- Thin brush from streets and driveways both horizontally and vertically along the property. Flammable vegetation must be cleared on each side of the street or driveway for a distance of 10 feet and a vertical distance of 13 feet, 6

inches. Vegetation must be cut to within 2 inches of the ground. This applies to the public or private driveway and any public or private streets that border the property.

- Remove dead wood, trim the lower branches, and limb all live trees to 6 feet above the ground (or as much as possible with younger, smaller trees), especially trees adjacent to buildings.
- Trim tree limbs back a minimum distance of 10 feet from any chimney opening.
- Remove all dead trees from the property.
- Maintain the roof of all structures free of leaves, needles or other vegetative debris.
- Legally dispose of all cut vegetation, including any debris left from previous tree trimming and brush removal. Cut vegetation may be chipped and spread throughout the property as a ground cover, up to 12 inches in depth, and at least 30 feet from any structure.

H-3 Landscape Plan. The final landscape plan shall adhere to the Fire Department Landscape Guidelines for properties that are in the high fire hazard area. These plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Architectural Board of Review and the Fire Department.

See Water Quality and Air Quality sections of the Initial Study for additional mitigation.

Hazards – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

7. NOISE Could the project result in:	**NO**	**YES** *Level of Significance*
a) Increases in existing noise levels?		Less Than significant
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?		Less Than significant

Noise - Discussion

Issues: Noise issues are associated with siting of a new noise-sensitive land use in an area subject to high ambient background noise levels, siting of a noise-generating land use next to existing noise-sensitive land uses, and/or short-term construction-related noise.

The primary source of ambient noise in the City is vehicle traffic noise. The City Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) *Noise Contour Map* identifies average ambient noise levels within the City.

Ambient noise levels are determined as averaged 24-hour weighted levels, using the Day-Night Noise Level (L_{dn}) or Community Noise Equivalence Level (CNEL) measurement scales. The L_{dn} averages the varying sound levels occurring over the 24-hour day and gives a 10 decibel penalty to noises occurring between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. to take into account the greater annoyance of intrusive noise levels during nighttime hours. Since L_{dn} is a 24-hour average noise level, an area could have sporadic loud noise levels above 60 dB(A) which average out over the 24-hour period. CNEL is similar to L_{dn} but includes a separate 5 dB(A) penalty for noise occurring between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. CNEL and L_{dn} values usually agree with one another within 1 dB(A). The Equivalent Noise Level (L_{eq}) is a single noise level, which, if held constant during the measurement time period, would represent the same total energy as a fluctuating noise. L_{eq} values are commonly expressed for periods of one hour, but longer or shorter time periods may be specified. In general, a change in noise level of less than three decibels is not audible. A doubling of the distance from a noise source will generally equate to a change in decibel level of six decibels.

Guidance for appropriate long-term background noise levels for various land uses are established in the City General Plan Noise Element Land Use Compatibility Guidelines. Building codes also establish maximum average ambient noise levels for the interiors of structures.

High construction noise levels occur with the use of heavy equipment such as scrapers, rollers, graders, trenchers and large trucks for demolition, grading, and construction. Equipment noise levels can vary substantially through a construction period, and depend on the type of equipment, number of pieces operating, and equipment maintenance. Construction equipment generates noise levels of more than 80 or 90 dB(A) at a distance of 50 feet, and the shorter

impulsive noises from other construction equipment (such as pile drivers and drills) can be even higher, up to and exceeding 100 dB(A). Noise during construction is generally intermittent and sporadic, and after completion of the initial demolition, grading and site preparation activities, tends to be quieter.

The Noise Ordinance (Chapter 9.16 of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code) governs short-term or periodic noise, such as construction noise, operation of motorized equipment or amplified sound, or other sources of nuisance noise. The ordinance establishes limitations on hours of construction and motorized equipment operations, and provides criteria for defining nuisance noise in general.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A significant noise impact may result from:

- Siting of a project such that persons would be subject to long-term ambient noise levels in excess of Noise Element land use compatibility guidelines as follows:
  - Residential: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 70 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 45 dB(A).
- Substantial noise from grading and construction activity in close proximity to noise-sensitive receptors for an extensive duration.

Noise – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

7.a) Increased Noise Level

Long-Term Operational Noise:

The project site is located in an area subject to average ambient noise levels of 62 dB(A) daytime LEQ according the to Environmental Noise Study Report.. Noise at the project site is primarily due to traffic noise from Milpas Street and occasional events at the adjacent Santa Barbara Bowl. The year 2025 exterior noise analysis indicates the highest noise levels on the second floor, in the private outdoor living areas facing Milpas Street to be 53 dBA CNEL. These worst case analyses indicate that the project would meet the private exterior noise level compatibility criteria of 60 dBA CNEL used by the City. Therefore this impact would *be less than significant* and no additional mitigation measures are required.

The Noise Study (Exhibit J) states that the existing noise levels are approximately 53 dBA CNEL. By employing standard construction materials and techniques, the interior noise levels will be reduced by 12 dBA and the interior of the building will not exceed the City's threshold of 45 dBA for interior living spaces. Therefore this impact would *be less than significant* and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Temporary Construction Noise:

Uses in the vicinity of the project site are primarily residential. Noise from grading and construction equipment, truck traffic and vibration would affect surrounding residential uses during the approximately 16-month construction period.

Noise during construction is generally intermittent and sporadic. Noise generated during project grading activities would result in a short-term *less than significant* impact to sensitive receptors in the vicinity. The level of the adverse effect from the temporary construction activities would be further reduced through implementation of the City's Noise Ordinance requirements that limit hours of construction activities and mitigation using mufflers and other equipment noise mitigation features listed below. Additionally, neighbors shall be notified at least 20 days prior to commencement of construction and contact shall be supplied.

7.b) Exposure to High Noise Levels

The proposed project consists of residential uses that result in intermittent and minor noise generation due to typical use and maintenance. There is also noise generated from occasional events at the nearby Santa Barbara County Bowl which are considered special events, permitted and regulated through the City's noise ordinance. These noise levels are minor and intermittent and controlled by the Ordinance and therefore would not expose people to high noise levels. Therefore the impact would be *less than significant*.

Noise – Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Noise – Residual Impact

Less than significant.

8. POPULATION AND HOUSING Could the project:	NO	YES Level of Significance
a) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?		Less Than Significant
b) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	X	

Population and Housing - Discussion

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Issues of potentially significant population and housing impacts may involve:

- Growth inducement, such as provision of substantial population or employment growth or creation of substantial housing demand; development in an undeveloped area, or extension/ expansion of major infrastructure that could support additional future growth.
- Loss of a substantial number of housing units, especially loss of more affordable housing.

Population and Housing – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is located within an urban area developed with single family homes to the north and multiple-family residential to the south, east and west. All utility services are available at the project site.

8.a) Growth-Inducing Impacts

The project site is in an urbanized area that is currently served by all required infrastructure. The project would not involve a substantial increase in major public facilities such as extension of water or sewer lines or roads that would facilitate other growth in the area. The project would not involve substantial employment growth that would increase population and housing demand. Based upon the 2000 United Census data there is an estimate of 2.47 residents per household in the City of Santa Barbara. Using that figure, the 13 new residential units could generate approximately 32 new residents. This would amount to less than 1% of the City's 2006 population of 85,681. Infrastructure at the site already serves the existing uses and is adequate to serve the proposed project. Growth-inducing impacts would be *less than significant*. The project would not require extension of major infrastructure and would result in a small increase in population and housing that would be insufficient to substantially increase demand for goods and services.

8.b) Housing Displacement

The project would involve demolition of one residential unit and construction of 13 residential units, therefore no housing displacement would occur. *No impact* would result from the project.

Population and Housing - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Population and Housing – Residual Impact

Residual impacts associated with population and growth would be considered less than significant.

9. PUBLIC SERVICES Could the project have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered services in any of the following areas:	NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a) Fire protection?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
b) Police protection?		Less Than Significant
c) Schools?		Less Than Significant
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?		Less Than Significant
e) Other governmental services?		Less Than Significant
f) Electrical power or natural gas?		Less Than Significant
g) Water treatment or distribution facilities?		Less Than Significant
h) Sewer or septic tanks?		Less Than Significant
i) Water distribution/demand?		Less Than Significant
j) Solid waste disposal?		Less Than Significant

Public Services - Discussion

Issues: This section evaluates project effects on fire and police protection services, schools, road maintenance and other governmental services, utilities, including electric and natural gas, water and sewer service, and solid waste disposal.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: The following may be identified as significant public services and facilities impacts:

- Creation of a substantial need for increased police department, fire department, road maintenance, or government services staff or equipment.
- Generation of substantial numbers of students exceeding public school capacity where schools have been designated as overcrowded.
- Inadequate water, sewage disposal, or utility facilities.
- Substantial increase in solid waste disposal to area sanitary landfills.

Public Services – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is located in an urban area where all public services are available. The project would result in a small increment in growth with an associated small increase in demand for public services and utilities. In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Conditions, Trends, and Issues Report (CTI Report, September 2005) that examined existing conditions associated with fire protection, police protection, library services, public facilities, governmental facilities, electrical power, and natural gas. The CTI Report specifically analyzed whether there were deficiencies existing or anticipated for each of the public services. The CTI report determined that police, fire protection services, and library services are being provided at acceptable levels to the City. In addition, the CTI Report determined that electricity, natural gas, telephone, and cable telecommunication services are being provided at acceptable service levels and utility companies did not identify any deficiencies in providing service in the future. Finally, the CTI Report determined that demand for City buildings and facilities will continue to be affected by growth, although no appropriate/acceptable levels of service have been established.

The City of Santa Barbara's water supply comes from the following sources, with the actual share of each determined by availability and level of customer demand: Lake Cachuma and Tecolote Tunnel, Gibraltar Reservoir and Mission Tunnel, 300 Acre Feet per Year (AFY) of contractual transfer from Montecito Water district, groundwater, State Water Project, recycled water, and, under extreme conditions, desalination. Conservation and efficiency improvements are projected to contribute to the supply by displacing demand that would otherwise have to be supplied by additional sources. In 1994, based on the comprehensive review of the City's water supply in the Long Term Water Supply Alternatives Analysis (LTWSAA), the City Council approved the Long Term Water Supply Program (LTWSP). The LTWSP outlines a strategy to use the above sources to meet the projected demand of 17,900 AFY (including 1,500 AFY of demand projected to be met with conservation) plus a 10 percent safety margin for a total of 19,700 AFY. Therefore, deducting

the projected demand met by conservation, the target for the amount of water the system will actually have to supply, including the safety margin, is 18,200 AFY. With conservative assumptions reflecting current uncertainty about some supplies, this value may be closer to 17,000 AFY, however demand is considerably lower than projected at this point than what was projected in the LTWSP. The draft 2009 Water Supply Management Report documents an actual system demand of 13,791 AFY compared to projected demand of 16,400 AFY in the LTWSP.

Most of the waste generated in the City is transported on a daily basis to seven landfills located around the County. The County of Santa Barbara, which operates the landfills, has developed impact significance thresholds related to the impacts of development on remaining landfill capacity. The County thresholds are based on the projected average solid waste generation for Santa Barbara County from 1990-2005. The County assumes a 1.2% annual increase (approximately 4000 tons per year (TPY)) in solid waste generation over the 15-year period.

The County's threshold for project specific impacts to the solid waste system is 196 tons per year (this figure represents 5% of the expected average annual increase in solid waste generation [4000 TPY]). Source reduction, recycling, and composting can reduce a project's waste stream by as much as 50%. If a proposed project generates 196 or more tons per year after reduction and recycling efforts, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Proposed projects with a project specific impact as identified above (196 TPY or more) would also be considered cumulatively significant, as the project specific threshold of significance is based on a cumulative growth scenario. However, as landfill space is already extremely limited, any increase in solid waste of 1% or more of the expected average annual increase in solid waste generation [4000 TPY], which equates to 40 TPY, is considered an adverse cumulative impact.

Existing land use on the site generates an estimated 3 TPY of solid waste and the site is currently served by recycling pick up.

9.a) Fire

The project site is located within, and on the edge, of the high fire hazard zone. Proposed construction would be exposed to a wildland fire hazard. This would result in a *potentially significant, mitigable impact.* The project includes construction and landscape design, defensible space, and materials that would be required to comply with the California Fire Code and the vegetation fuels management portions of the Wildland Fire Plan. All buildings on site will be required to have fire sprinklers per the City's Fire Sprinkler Ordinance. These measures are required by the Fire Code, and would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

9.b) Police

The project is not anticipated to create a substantial increase in demand on police protection services because it only proposed thirteen new residential units in a residential area. Police services are adequate to serve the increase development in the City, therefore, the impact would be *less than significant.*

9.c) Schools

The project site is served by the Santa Barbara Elementary and High School Districts for elementary and high school. The project would provide an increase of thirteen residential units, which could generate additional students depending on unit affordability for buyers with school age children. The project would also result in a minor increase in area employees. It would be expected that some of the added employees would already reside in the area. Some portion of new employees may in-migrate or utilize local schools.

None of the school districts in the South Coast have been designated "overcrowded" as defined by California State law. School impact fees would be applied to the project in accordance with State law. The project would not generate sufficient students to substantially impact school enrollment. School District Fees are also already required for new residential development to offset the cost to the school district of providing additional infrastructure to accommodate new students generated by the development. Therefore, project impacts to schools would be *less than significant.*

9.d &e) Public Facilities, Roads and Other Governmental Services

The project would be served by existing roads, public facilities and governmental services. The project is not anticipated to create a substantial increase in demand for roads, public facilities or governmental services. Therefore, impacts are expected to be *less than significant.*

9.f) Electric Power or Natural Gas

The project is located in an area already being served by Southern California Edison and Southern California Gas Company. Supplies of electricity and natural gas are adequate and services are available at the property line. The City's

Municipal Code requires residential development to be consistent with Title 22 in an effort to conserve energy. Therefore, project impacts to electric power and natural gas would be *less than significant*.

9.g) Water treatment or distribution facilities

The City water treatment and distribution facilities are adequate to meet the demand of this project because there is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment facility to treat the additional increment in domestic water demand necessary to supply the proposed development and there are adequate water supply lines at the property line that can be extended onto the property to serve the proposed uses. As a normal course of project review the applicant will be required to demonstrate adequate capacity at the project site by providing engineering calculations. Therefore the impact on water treatment and distribution facilities will be *less than significant*.

9.h) Sewer

The project's estimated net new sewer demand is 2.51 AFY. The maximum capacity of the El Estero Treatment Plant is 11 million gallons per day, with current average daily flow 8.0 MGD. The Treatment Plant is designed to treat the wastewater from a population of 104,000, a higher population than is now served. The proposed project's estimated new sewer discharge is approximately 0.55 AFY (0.0005 MGD).

Increased sewage treatment associated by the project can be accommodated by the existing City sewer system and sewage treatment plant, and would represent a *less than significant* impact.

9.i) Water Demand

The existing development on the site demands approximately 0.88 AFY of water. The proposed project's estimated water demand is 3.12 AFY (net increase of 2.24 AFY) based on the aggregate multi-family demand factor in the City's 2009 Water Demand Factor Update Report. The proposed project receives water service from the City of Santa Barbara. The proposed project is well within the estimates of the projected available supplies of the LTWSP. Therefore, the potential increase in demand from the proposed project would constitute a *less than significant* impact to the City water supply, treatment, and distribution facilities

9.j) Solid Waste Generation/ Disposal

Long-Term (Operational). The project use is estimated to generate a net increase of approximately 30 TPY of net new solid waste, a *less than significant* impact because less waste would be generated than the threshold. With application of source reduction, reuse, and recycling, landfill disposal of solid waste could be further reduced to approximately 15 TPY.

Short-Term (Demolition and Construction). The solid waste generation/disposal thresholds adopted by the City do not apply to short-term construction projects. However, new construction, especially remodeling and demolition, represents the greatest challenge to maintaining existing diversion rates.

Revised solid waste generation thresholds and guidelines were adopted by the County of Santa Barbara in October 2008. Based on the County's revised guidelines, it is anticipated that the project would generate 177 tons of waste for demolition and construction. According to the County's thresholds of significance, any construction, demolition or remodeling project of a commercial, industrial or residential development that is projected to create more than 350 tons of construction and demolition debris is considered to have a significant impact on solid waste generation. Although the 350 ton threshold has not been formally adopted by the City, and the amount of construction waste anticipated by the project is less than the 350 ton threshold, the amount of construction waste anticipated to be generated by the project warrants mitigation. The proposed project would be considered to have a *less than significant* impact based on its construction-related solid waste generation.

Public Services - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Public Services – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

10. RECREATION Could the project:	NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?		Less Than Significant
b) Affect existing parks or other public recreational facilities?		Less Than Significant

Recreation - Discussion

Issues: Recreational issues are associated with increased demand for recreational facilities, or loss or impacts to existing recreational facilities.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Recreation impacts may be significant if they result in:

- Substantial increase in demand for park and recreation facilities in an area under-served by existing public park and recreation facilities.
- Substantial loss or interference with existing park space or other public recreational facilities such as hiking, cycling, or horse trails.

Recreation – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

Currently within the City there are more than 1,800 acres of natural open space, park land and other recreational facilities. In addition, there are 28 tennis courts, 2 public outdoor swimming pools, beach volleyball courts, sport fields, lawn bowling greens, a golf course, 13 community buildings and a major skateboard facility. The City also offers a wide variety of recreational programs for people of all ages and abilities in sports, various classes, tennis, aquatics and cultural arts.

The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) established park service area standards for various types of parks. The NRPA standards have not been adopted by the City; however, the standards do provide a useful tool for assessing park space needs. The CTI Report determined that, based on NRPA standards, there is an uneven distribution of parkland in the City, such that some areas of the City may currently be underserved with neighborhood and community parks, but overall the City has adequate passive, community, beach, regional, open space, and sports facility parks.

10.a & b) Recreational Demand and Existing Recreational Facilities

The development of the proposed project with thirteen (13) new residential units would create a small increase in the demand for park and recreational opportunities in the general area. As indicated above, the City of Santa Barbara has ample parkland and recreational facilities, albeit unevenly distributed throughout the City.

The proposed project would introduce additional residents into the Lower Riviera neighborhood of the city of Santa Barbara where existing nearby neighborhood parks and recreational facilities (those intended to serve nearby residents) include Alice Keck Park, Ortega Park, Hale Park, Franklin Community Center, the Eastside Neighborhood Park, Yanonali Community Garden and the Santa Barbara High School tennis courts. These parks are within walking distance from the project site. In addition, residents would have access to other community, beach, regional, open space and sports facility parks, and all City recreation programs.

The increase in park and recreational demands associated with the twelve additional residential units is considered a *less than significant* impact.

Short-term construction and long-term operation of the project would not result in impacts that have the potential to interfere with the use or enjoyment of existing parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact on recreational facilities.

Recreation - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Recreation – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

11. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Could the project result in:	NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a) Increased vehicle trips?		Less Than Significant
b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves, inadequate sight distance or dangerous intersections)?		Less Than Significant
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?		Less Than Significant
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?		Less Than Significant
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?		Less Than Significant

Transportation - Discussion

Issues: Transportation issues include traffic, access, circulation, safety, and parking. Vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian, and transit modes of transportation are all considered, as well as emergency vehicle access. The City General Plan Circulation Element contains policies addressing circulation, traffic, and parking in the City.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A proposed project may have a significant impact on traffic/ circulation/ parking if it would:

Vehicle Traffic

- Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and street system capacity (see traffic thresholds below).
- Cause insufficiency in transit system.
- Conflict with the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) or Circulation Element or other adopted plan or policy pertaining to vehicle or transit systems.

Circulation and Traffic Safety

- Create potential hazards due to addition of traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g., narrow width, roadside ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or that supports uses that would be incompatible with substantial increases in traffic.
- Diminish or reduce safe pedestrian and/or bicycle circulation.
- Result in inadequate emergency access on-site or to nearby uses.

Parking

- Result in insufficient parking capacity for the projected amount of automobiles and bicycles.

Traffic Thresholds of Significance: The City uses Levels of Service (LOS) "A" through "F" to describe operating conditions at signalized intersections in terms of volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios, with LOS A (0.50-0.60 V/C) representing free flowing conditions and LOS F (0.90+ V/C) describing conditions of substantial delay. The City General Plan Circulation Element establishes the goal for City intersections to not exceed LOS C (0.70-0.80 V/C).

For purposes of environmental assessment, LOS C at 0.77 V/C is the threshold Level of Service against which impacts are measured. An intersection is considered "impacted" if the volume to capacity ratio is .77 V/C or greater.

Project-Specific Significant Impact: A project-specific significant impact results when:

(a) Project peak-hour traffic would cause a signalized intersection to exceed 0.77 V/C, or

(b) The V/C of an intersection already exceeding 0.77 V/C would be increased by 0.01 (1%) or more as a result of project peak-hour traffic.

For non-signalized intersections, delay-time methodology is utilized in evaluating impacts.

Significant Cumulative Contribution: A project would result in a significant contribution to cumulative traffic impacts when:

(a) Project peak-hour traffic together with other cumulative traffic from existing and reasonably foreseeable pending projects would cause an intersection to exceed 0.77 V/C, or

(b) Project would contribute traffic to an intersection already exceeding 0.77 V/C.

Transportation – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

11.a) Traffic

Long-Term Traffic

The project would generate a net traffic increase of 76 average daily trips, six (6) additional A.M. peak-hour trips and seven (7) P.M. peak-hour trips. The distribution and impact analysis is based on the City's practice of following five peak hour vehicle trips or more through project study area intersections. This provides a statistical certainty for project generated traffic additions at critical intersections on a day-to-day basis. Once the peak hour trips are distributed from the project site onto the City street network, the project is not expected to add five or more trips to the closest impacted intersections on the Mission Street and Carrillo Street Corridors. This is due to the distance between the project site and closest impacted intersections, the several options for travel routes, and the minimal amount of trips generated by the project. City intersection Levels of Service would not be impacted by development of this project; therefore, the project impacts relative to long term traffic impacts would be *less than significant.*

Short-Term Construction Traffic

The overall project construction process is estimated to last approximately 16 months. This would include grading for site preparation, construction and landscape installation. The project would generate construction-related traffic that would occur over the construction period and would vary depending on the stage of construction. Temporary construction traffic is generally considered an adverse but not significant impact. In this case, given traffic levels in the area and the duration of the construction process, short-term construction-related traffic would be a *less than significant* impact. Restrictions on the hours permitted for construction trips and approval of routes for construction traffic would further reduce the levels of *less than significant* impacts. These are standard conditions of approval.

11.b,c,e) Access/ Circulation/ Safety

Vehicular access to the single-family residence on-site is currently provided by an unpaved driveway from Lowena Drive, which will be removed. Access to the proposed development would also be from Lowena Drive, provided by two individual driveways serving two of the units and a main driveway serving the other 11 units. The driveways have been designed to provide adequate sight distance along Lowena Drive. The traffic volumes on Lowena Drive would continue to be very low, due to the short length of the road and minimal development, and the majority of vehicles enter and exit Lowena Drive from Anapamu Street and not Milpas Street. The driveway designs and locations have been reviewed and found acceptable by the City's Public Works and Fire Works Departments. The proposed development would not significantly impact the nearest transit stops at Alta Vista and Anapamu Streets, and Milpas and De la Guerra Streets. Therefore impacts associated with vehicular access, circulation or safety would be *less than significant.*

11.d) Parking

The proposed 13 condominiums are required to have a total of 28 parking spaces, including three guest parking spaces. The project provides all the required parking on-site with 24 covered spaces and four uncovered spaces. The project impacts related to parking supply and demand are considered *less than significant.*

11.e) Pedestrians/Bicyclists

No dedicated bike lanes exist at the property frontages on Lowena Drive and Milpas Street and bicyclists would continue to share the existing right of way. A six foot wide sidewalk and four foot wide parkway exist on the Milpas Street frontage. Lowena Drive is paved approximately 23 – 25 feet in width and has a four foot wide sidewalk on the southern side of the road that terminates at the beginning of the project site. The applicant is proposing to improve this frontage by installing a 5' wide sidewalk, curb and gutter, and access ramps at driveways, for the majority of the project's frontage on Lowena Drive. A small portion of the frontage, which is located in the E-1 zone will not have new sidewalk. Impacts associated with pedestrian and bicycle circulation would be *less than significant.*

Transportation - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Transportation – Residual Impact

Less than significant.

12. WATER ENVIRONMENT Could the project result in:	NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?		Less Than Significant
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?		Less Than Significant
c) Discharge into surface waters?		Less Than Significant
d) Change in the quantity, quality, direction or rate of flow of ground waters?		Less Than Significant
e) Increased storm water drainage?		Less Than Significant

Water – Discussion

Issues: Water resource issues include changes in offsite drainage and infiltration/groundwater recharge; storm water runoff and flooding; and water quality.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A significant impact would result from:

Water Resources and Drainage

- Substantially changing the amount of surface water in any water body or the quantity of groundwater recharge.
- Substantially changing the drainage pattern or creating a substantially increased amount or rate of surface water runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage and storm water systems.

Flooding

- Locating development within 100-year flood hazard areas; substantially altering the course or flow of flood waters or otherwise exposing people or property to substantial flood hazard

Water Quality

- Substantial discharge of sediment or pollutants into surface water or groundwater, or otherwise degrading water quality, including temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity.

Water Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

12.a & e) Permeability and Drainage

Currently there is approximately 1,700 square feet of impervious area on the property and post-development runoff calculations, will assume the proposed project will result in approximately 19,500 square of impervious area. The City and State require that onsite capture, retention, and treatment of storm water be incorporated into the design of the project. Pursuant to the City's Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) and the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges, the City requires that any increase in stormwater runoff (based on a 25-year storm event) be retained onsite and that projects be designed to capture and treat the calculated amount of runoff from the project site for a one-inch storm event, over a 24-hour period. The project includes bio-swales, rain gardens, permeable pavements, garaged parking and a Stormtech subsurface system. A Preliminary Drainage Report, prepared by MAC Design Associates, summarized below and incorporated by reference (Exhibit L), indicates that the peak runoff flow rate and total runoff volume for the 25 and 100 year storm event would be lower for the proposed development than the pre-project conditions. With no net increase in runoff, impacts would be *less than significant*.

12.b) Flooding

The project site is not located in a flood hazard zone or in an area prone to flooding. There is a small drainage course passing through the site with a tributary watershed of approximately 15 acres, which drains to an existing 24" diameter City storm drain, however, no construction is proposed in this area of the site. The flooding potential would not change following project occupancy, nor would the project substantially alter the course or flow of flood waters. Therefore, project impacts related to flooding are considered *less than significant*.

12.c) Surface Water Quality

Construction Project grading activities create the potential for temporary, incremental and localized erosion, sedimentation, and fuel and oils released from construction equipment that could affect water quality. Numerous federal, state and local regulatory programs have been established to minimize impacts to water quality resulting from construction operations. The project site is less than one acre in size, and the drainage course rarely conveys water. The potential for contamination is limited. Therefore, surface water quality impacts resulting from construction are *less than significant*. All construction equipment shall be maintained, inspected and leaks repaired, refueling would occur no less than 25' from the drainage, and spill clean-up equipment would be available on the site during construction to ensure that hazardous materials are not permitted to impact surface waters. Compliance with applicable regulations and the mitigation identified below will further reduce the potential for the proposed project to result in short-term construction-related water quality impacts.

Operations The post construction project will consist of thirteen residential units including parking and open space. Runoff from the project site during operations could include urban contaminants such as, pesticides, cleaning supplies, automobile fluids, fuels and fertilizers typical of all residential projects. The project includes restoration of the existing drainage, bioswales, rain gardens and a Stormtech subsurface system. These facilities are designed to retain flows on the project site during the 25 year storm and the first inch of rain and provide an opportunity for vegetation, sunlight and filtering to treat these contaminants before they leave the site. These facilities are required to be maintained throughout the life of the project, and therefore, the project impacts on surface water quality during long term operations will be *less than significant*. In order to ensure that the facilities are maintained, it is recommended that a condition of approval be placed on the project that surface water facilities on the site be maintained in perpetuity.

12.d) Ground Water Quality

Runoff of pollutants from parking areas or other hardscape could degrade ground water quality. Compliance with standard City requirements will ensure the project's long-term ground water quality impacts are *less than significant*. These requirements include the preparation of an operation and maintenance plan for the use of storm drain surface water pollutant interceptors as stated in 12.c above, to improve water quality, and implement water quality protection best management practices (BMPs).

Water Resources – Recommended Mitigation

W-1 **Maintenance of Drainage Facilities.** Project drainage shall be designed, installed, and maintained such that stormwater runoff from the first inch of rain from any storm event shall be retained and treated onsite in accordance with the City's NPDES Storm Water Management Permit. Sufficient engineered design and adequate measures shall be employed to ensure that no significant construction-related or long-term effects from increased runoff, erosion and sedimentation, urban water pollutants or groundwater pollutants would result from the project. The drainage system including the Stormtech subsurface system and all facilities designed to protect surface water quality shall be maintained in a functioning state for the life of the project. .

W-2 **Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs).** Construction activities shall address water quality through the use of BMPs that include, equipment to be maintained, inspected and leaks repaired, refueling would occur no less than 25' from the drainage, and spill clean-up equipment would be available on the site during construction to ensure that hazardous materials are not permitted to impact surface waters.

W-3 **Drainage and Water Quality.** Any increase in runoff above existing conditions shall be retained on site, consistent with the City's NPDES Guidelines. Project plans for grading, drainage, stormwater facilities, and project development, shall be subject to review and approval by City Building Division and Public Works Department per City regulations. Sufficient engineered design and adequate measures shall be employed to ensure that no significant construction-related or long-term effects from increased runoff, erosion and sedimentation, urban water quality pollutants, or groundwater pollutants would result from the project. The Owner shall maintain the storm drain and retention areas consistent with an approved maintenance plan. This

plan shall be provided with the building plan submittal for review and approval by Community Development prior to approval of building permits.

W-4 **Construction Erosion/Sedimentation Control Plan**. Appropriate erosion/sediment control devices between the construction zone and adjacent areas shall be installed prior to initiation of grading or construction activities and shall be maintained throughout the duration all construction phases on the site as mitigation for short-term impacts to water quality from erosion and sedimentation. The applicant shall submit and obtain Building Division or Public Works Department approval of a detailed erosion control plan for the project prepared by a licensed or certified professional soil erosion and sediment control specialist, a California licensed civil engineer, landscape architect, registered geologist, or a licensed architect. The plan shall include Best Management Practices approved by the City and Regional Water Quality Control Board, and shall include, at a minimum, the following:

1. Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
2. Install silt fence, sand bag, hay bale or silt devices where necessary around the project site to prevent offsite transport of sediment.
3. Bare soils shall be protected from erosion by applying heavy seeding, within five days of clearing or inactivity in construction.
4. Construction entrances should be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and control dust.
5. During construction of the home, the contractor and/or property owner shall protect the storm drain inlets from sediment-laden runoff.
6. Erosion control materials (i.e. sandbags, strawbales, and silt fencing) shall be used to trap and filter sediment before entering the storm drain.
7. Establish fuel and vehicle maintenance staging areas located away from all drainage courses, and design these areas to control runoff.
8. Maintain and wash equipment and machinery in confined areas specifically designed to control runoff. Thinners or solvents should not be discharged into sanitary or storm sewer systems. Washout from concrete trucks should be disposed of at a location not subject to runoff and more than 50 feet away from a storm drain, open ditch or surface water.
9. Construction site operators shall be responsible for implementation of sedimentation control and good housekeeping measures in accordance with the approved erosion control plan and the Public Works Department Procedures for the Control of Runoff into Storm Drains and Watercourses. City (Building Division or Public Works Department) staff will site inspect to ensure proper installation, ongoing implementation, and effectiveness of approved BMPs, and may adjust requirements in the field if necessary to protect water quality.

Water Resources – Residual Impact

Less than significant.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.		YES	NO
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildfire population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
b)	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?		X
c)	Does the project have potential impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		X
d)	Does the project have potential environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

a. As discussed in Section 3 (Biological Resources), with the implementation of required mitigation measures, the project would not reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildfire population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. As discussed in Section 4 (Cultural Resources), the project would not eliminate or impact important prehistoric or historic resources.

b. As discussed in Sections 1 through 12 of this Initial Study, the project, as mitigated, would not result in significant short- or long-term environmental impacts.

c. Sections 1 through 12 of this Initial Study consider potential cumulative impacts to environmental resources. As discussed in these sections, the project, as mitigated, would not result in any significant, cumulative impacts on the environment.

d. As discussed in Sections 1 through 12 of this Initial Study, no significant effects on humans (direct or indirect) would occur as a result of this project as mitigated. All potentially significant impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, geological conditions, hazards, and noise can be mitigated to a less than significant level. In addition, mitigation measures are recommended to further reduce adverse but less than significant impacts associated with air quality, cultural resources, noise, and transportation.

INITIAL STUDY CONCLUSION

On the basis of this initial evaluation it has been determined that with identified mitigation measures agreed-to by the applicant, potentially significant impacts would be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared.

Initial Study Preparer: _____

Danny Kato, Senior Planner — Date: 2/17/10

EXHIBITS:

A. Project Plans

B. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

C. **Architectural Board of Review Meeting Minutes, October 20, 2008 and April 20, 2009**

D. **Phase I Archaeological Survey and Resources Assessment prepared by Western Points Archaeology, dated August 2008**

E. **Air Emission Calculations**

F. **Biological Assessment prepared by Watershed Environmental, Inc. dated March 25, 2009**

G. **Tree Assessment and Protection Plan prepared by Bill Spiewak Consulting Arborist dated July 31, 2009**

H. **A Historic Structures Report (HSR) was prepared by San Buenaventura Research Associates, dated July 16, 2007**

I. **Preliminary Geologic Investigation by Adam Simmons, dated March 27, 2009**

J. **Environmental Noise Study dated February 5, 2009, prepared by Dudek**

K. **Preliminary Foundation Excavation prepared by Pacific Materials Laboratories, dated March 19, 2009**

L. **Preliminary Drainage Report prepared by MAC Design Associates dated July 29, 2009**

LIST OF SOURCES USED IN PREPARATION OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

The following sources used in the preparation of this Initial Study are located at the Community Development Department, Planning Division, 630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara and are available for review upon request.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) & CEQA Guidelines

General Plan Circulation Element

General Plan Conservation Element

General Plan Housing Element

General Plan Land Use Element

General Plan Noise Element w/appendices

General Plan Map

General Plan Seismic Safety/Safety Element

General Plan Update: 2030 Conditions, Trends, and Issues Report

Geology Assessment for the City of Santa Barbara

Institute of Traffic Engineers Parking Generation Manual

Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual

Master Environmental Assessment

Parking Design Standards

Santa Barbara Municipal Code & City Charter

Special District Map

Uniform Building Code as adopted by City

Zoning Ordinance & Zoning Map

Project-Specific Sources/Documents

URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4, Results for 1820–1826 De la Vina Street Condominium Project

Water, Wastewater and Solid Waste Generation Calculations, City of Santa Barbara, September 1, 2009