CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION – MST2008-00496
MARCH 22, 2012

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code and the "Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970," as amended to date, this Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been prepared for the following project:

PROJECT LOCATION: 4151 Foothill Road, 681 Cieneguitas Road and 675 Cieneguitas Road

PROJECT PROPONENT: Steve Fort, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services, Inc.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project involves the annexation of three parcels into the city of Santa Barbara, and detachment from the Goleta Water District, the Goleta Sanitary District, the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, County Service Area 3 and County Service Area 32. A City General Plan designation of Commercial/Medium High Density Residential is proposed, with a zoning designation of Limited Commercial/Upper State Street Overlay (C-1/SD-2).

4151 Foothill Road & 681 Cieneguitas Road: These parcels would be merged and the existing abandoned gas station (1,750 net square feet) at the corner of Foothill Road and Highway 154 would be demolished. Two new two-story office buildings totaling 60,122 net square feet would be constructed on the merged parcel. The larger of the two buildings (46,600 net square feet) would be located parallel to Foothill Road, and the smaller building (13,522 net square feet) would face Cieneguitas Road. The proposed new office buildings would be occupied by Sansum Clinic and would include an outpatient surgery center, a medical clinic and administrative offices. A parking lot containing 225 parking spaces (including five on the adjacent 675 Cieneguitas Road parcel) would be located between and behind the proposed new buildings. Access would be provided via two driveways on Cieneguitas Road. A detention basin and vegetated swales would accommodate increased storm water run-off. Ground water remediation due to contamination from the previous use as a full service gas station is currently on-going and would continue.

675 Cieneguitas: The existing 2,500 square foot building, currently used as a veterinary hospital, would remain. The only change would be the addition of five parking spaces in an existing easement along the north property line for use by the occupants of the new office buildings described above.

IDENTIFIED MITIGATION: The Draft MND identifies potentially significant environmental impacts related to **hazards**. The Draft MND includes mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures to further reduce adverse but less than significant impacts related to **biological resources, geophysical conditions and noise** have also been identified in the Draft MND.

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FINDING:

Based on the findings contained in the attached Initial Study and the mitigation measures identified, it has been determined that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Prepared By:

Allison De Busk 3/22/12

Allison De Busk [DATE]
Project Planner

Approved By:

Danny Kato 3/22/12

Danny Kato [DATE]
Senior Planner / Environmental Analyst

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING DIVISION

INITIAL STUDY/ ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST MST2008-00496

PROJECT: 4151 Foothill Road

March 22, 2012

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) or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) 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/Owner: Foothill Centre, LP and Britschgi 1, LLC

Applicant Representatives: Steve Fort, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services, Inc.

PROJECT ADDRESS/LOCATION 4151 Foothill Road, 681 Cieneguitas Road and 675 Cieneguitas Road

The project site encompasses 4.31 acres and is a triangular site bounded by Foothill Road to the north, Cieneguitas Road to the east and Highway 154 to the west/southwest. It is commonly referred to as the "Foothill Triangle" due to its shape. The project site includes three parcels: 4151 Foothill Road (0.51 acre), 681 Cieneguitas Road (3.5 acres) and 675

Cieneguitas Road (0.23 acre). The project site is currently located in the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara. If annexed to the city of Santa Barbara as proposed, the site would be located in the Hope neighborhood of the city of Santa Barbara.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (See *Exhibit 1-Project Plans*)

Project Components: The project involves the annexation of three parcels into the city of Santa Barbara, and detachment from the Goleta Water District, the Goleta Sanitary District, the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, County Service Area 3 and County Service Area 32. A City General Plan designation of Commercial/Medium High Density Residential is proposed, with a zoning designation of Limited Commercial/Upper State Street Overlay (C-1/SD-2).

4151 Foothill Road & 681 Cieneguitas Road: These parcels (4.08 acres) would be merged, and the existing abandoned gas station (1,750 net square feet) at the corner of Foothill Road and Highway 154 would be demolished. Two new two-story office buildings totaling 60,122 net (61,745 gross) square feet would be constructed on the merged parcel (this development is referred to hereafter as the "Foothill Centre"). The larger of the two buildings, Building A, would contain 46,600 net square feet (sq. ft.), which is evenly divided between the first and second floors. Building A is proposed as a rectangular building and would be oriented parallel to Foothill Road, and located approximately 50 feet south of Foothill Road and 33 feet west of Cieneguitas. Primary access to Building A would be from the parking lot, with secondary access from Cieneguitas Road. The smaller building, Building B, would contain 13,522 net square feet, which is evenly divided between the first and second floors. Building B is a square building and would be located approximately 360 feet south of Foothill Road and 20 feet west of Cieneguitas Road. Access to Building B would be provided from Cieneguitas Road and the parking lot.

The Foothill Centre's 61,745 gross square feet of building area would be used as follows:

Medical Clinic	41,950 gross sq. ft.
Surgery Center	15,375 gross sq. ft.
General Office Space	4,420 gross sq. ft.
TOTAL	61,745 gross sq. ft.

A parking lot containing 225 parking spaces (including five on the adjacent 675 Cieneguitas Road parcel) would be located between and behind the proposed new buildings. Access would be provided via two driveways on Cieneguitas Road. A detention basin and vegetated swales would accommodate increased storm water run-off. Ground water remediation due to contamination from the previous use as a full service gas station is currently on-going and would continue.

675 Cieneguitas: The existing 2,500 square foot building, currently used as a veterinary hospital, would remain. The only change would be the addition of five parking spaces in an existing easement along the northern property line for use by the new Foothill Centre development (described above).

Public Improvements: The project includes curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements along Foothill and Cieneguitas Roads. The project also includes extension of the existing northbound left-turn pocket along Cieneguitas at the Foothill Road/Cieneguitas Road intersection from 50 feet to 125 feet in length, with a 60-foot bay taper. Striping changes are proposed along Foothill Road along the property frontage to create a bike lane within the existing eastbound traffic lane, and the existing westbound left turn arrows painted in the two-way left turn lane would be removed.

Project Operations: The proposed new office buildings would be occupied by Sansum Clinic. They would include an outpatient surgery center, a medical clinic and administrative offices. This new development would allow Sansum to consolidate facilities, and it is estimated that some of the operations and staff at the existing Pesetas Lane facility (215 Pesetas Lane) would be relocated to the new Foothill Centre facility. Vacancies at Pesetas Lane would be backfilled by operations and staff currently housed at leased facilities on the South Coast.

Anticipated standard hours of operation would be 8:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. On occasion, the surgery center would accommodate patients (no more than four) for up to, but not more than, 24 hours to ensure patients are stable and functioning after a surgery. When patients (up to four) are on site after normal business hours, approximately one Sansum Clinic staff per patient would also be onsite.

Demolition/Construction: The project would involve demolition of the existing gas station, and construction would require 17,327 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and fill. The majority of the earthwork would be cut located outside the building footprint (13,185 c.y.) It is estimated that there would be 16,527 c.y. of export. Construction activities are anticipated to

last for approximately 13 months.

Discretionary Actions Required:

The project would require the following discretionary actions:

1. Annexation of the three properties to the city of Santa Barbara and Detachment from Goleta Water District, Goleta Sanitary District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, County Service Area 3 and County Service Area 32;
2. A General Plan Amendment to designate the property as Commercial/Medium High Density Residential upon annexation;
3. A Zoning Map Amendment to zone the property C-1/SD-2 (Limited Commercial and Upper State Street Overlay) upon annexation;
4. A Development Plan to allow the construction of 58,372 square feet of nonresidential development on APNs 059-160-017 and -023 (SBMC §28.87.300); and
5. Final Economic Development Designation by the City Council for 13,526 square feet from the Economic Development category for a medical office/clinic (SBMC 28.87.300).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Site Characteristics

Topography: The site has a gentle slope (3.2%) from the northwest corner to the southeast.

Creeks/Drainage: The site does not contain any creeks or drainages. The closest creeks are Atascadero Creek (to the northwest) and Cieneguitas Creek (to the east); however, urban development is located between the project site and these creeks.

Hazards: In 1985, the project site was identified as having contaminated ground water and soil as a result of a leaking underground fuel tank associated with the previously operating gas station. A Cleanup and Abatement Order was issued by the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board, and a remediation program was begun in 1985. Soil and ground water remediation have occurred, and monitoring wells were installed. Two interceptor trenches are currently located in the eastern and southern portions of the property. Plans for abandonment of these trenches have been approved by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, and work has begun, but is not yet complete. The project site is currently in a monitored natural attenuation phase.

Noise: The majority of the project site is subject to noise levels of 60-65 dBA; the southern tip of the site is subject to noise levels of 65-70 dBA. Traffic noise from Highway 154 and Foothill Road are the major noise-generating sources in the area.

Existing Land Use

Existing Facilities and Uses: The project site is currently developed with an abandoned gas station and a veterinary hospital, although the majority of the site is vacant. Monitoring wells associated with the ground water contamination remediation are located throughout the site. The gas station would be demolished and the veterinary hospital would remain. Monitoring wells would be removed/relocated as needed to complete the project.

Access and Parking: The are currently four driveway curb cuts along Foothill Road and three along Cieneguitas Road; however, a perimeter fence prevents public access to the site from all curb cuts on Foothill, and the two northern curb cuts on Cieneguitas Road. The third driveway on Cieneguitas Road (the southernmost driveway) provides access to the existing veterinary hospital located at 675 Cieneguitas Road. There is no formal parking on the majority of the site (area proposed for development); however, there is a seven-space parking lot that serves the veterinary hospital.

Neighboring Land Uses and Characteristics

To the north of the site is Foothill Road (Highway 192), residential development, an electric substation and Atascadero Creek. These parcels are within the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara, and are zoned for residential and public utility use. Development includes one- and two-story residences.

To the east of the site is Cieneguitas Road and single and multi-family residential development on land zoned for duplex and single-family residential use. These parcels are primarily within the jurisdiction of the City; however, there are

parcels along La Barbara Drive that are in the County's jurisdiction. Development includes one- and two-story residences. Beyond the residential development is Cieneguitas Creek and La Colina Junior High School.

To the south of the site is residential development zoned for duplex and single-family residential use. It is within the jurisdiction of the City. Farther south is Bishop Garcia Diego High School.

To the west of the site is Highway 154 and residential development (mobile home park and single-family residential). These parcels are within the jurisdiction of the County and are residentially zoned.

PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS

Assessor's Parcel Number:	Address:	Parcel Size:	Existing Land Use	Owner:
059-160-021	675 Cieneguitas Road	10,018 sq. ft.	Veterinary Hospital	Britschgi I, LLC
059-160-023	681 Cieneguitas Road	155,384 sq. ft.	Vacant	Foothill Centre LP
059-160-017	4151 Foothill Road	22,321 sq. ft.	Former gas station	Foothill Centre LP
		187,723 sq. ft. (4.31 acres)		

Existing Zoning:	SC - Shopping Center (County)	**Existing General Plan Designation:**	Neighborhood Commercial (County)
Proposed Zoning:	C-1 - Limited Commercial (City)	**Proposed General Plan Designation:**	Commercial/Medium High Density Residential (City)
Existing Land Use:	Vacant and veterinary hospital		
Proposed Land Use:	Medical office and veterinary hospital		
Slope:	3.2% NW to SE		
SURROUNDING LAND USES:			
North:	Foothill Road and Residential	**East:**	Cieneguitas Road and Residential
South:	Residential	**West:**	Hwy 154 and Residential

PLANS AND POLICY DISCUSSION

Land Use and Zoning Designations:

The project site would be located in the Hope Neighborhood, which is described in the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan as being bounded by the City limit line to the north and west, Arroyo Burro Creek to the east, and Via Lucero to the south. The Hope Neighborhood includes single family, duplex and multi-family development, as well as senior and affordable housing complexes. The subject project would move the City's jurisdictional limits to the west at the northern edge of this neighborhood.

The project site is currently located within the jurisdiction of County of Santa Barbara, and is zoned Shopping Center (SC). The SC zone is applied to areas appropriate for clustered shopping center uses. The intent is to establish provisions for the comprehensive development of property suitable for commercial use, and to prevent piecemeal commercial development in areas that may be more appropriate for a clustered shopping center use. This zone allows either a convenience shopping center (where the everyday, frequent needs of the consumer are served) or a community shopping center (where consumer goods and services are provided and shoppers are provided the opportunity to comparison shop).

The current County General Plan Land Use Plan designation is Neighborhood Commercial. Neighborhood Commercial is located within the neighborhood and serves such day-to-day needs of residents in the immediate area as food, drugs,

gasoline, and other incidentals. These uses typically require 5,000-10,000 people, or from 1,700-3,300 dwelling units in the neighborhood for support.

As part of the project, the site would be annexed to the City and rezoned to Limited Commercial and Upper State Street Area Overlay Special District Zone (C-1/SD-2). The intent of the C-1 zone district is to provide a desirable living environment by preserving and protecting surrounding residential land uses in terms of light, air and existing visual amenities. The Upper State Street Overlay is intended to limit traffic through specific setback, parking and building size requirements. The General Plan land use designation would become Commercial/Medium High Density Residential, which is intended for commercial centers typically located in residential areas. A broad variety of retail commercial outlets, restaurants, offices, medical offices, and grocery stores are allowed uses under this designation.

The proposed development of the medical office buildings would be consistent with the proposed City land use and zoning designations.

Existing and Proposed Parking Supply and Parking Demand:

The project site is currently developed with a veterinary hospital that contains seven parking spaces. This building and associated parking would not change as a result of the proposed project.

The currently undeveloped portion of the site would be developed with a medical office building and parking. Per the City's Zoning Ordinance standards, 168 parking spaces would be required for the Foothill Centre, based on its use as an office development of 60,122 square feet. However, the proposed development is intended for use as a medical office, which has a higher parking demand than a typical office development. A Traffic, Circulation and Parking Study dated November 14, 2011 (***Exhibit 8***) and a Parking Analysis Addendum dated February 2, 2012 were prepared for the project by Associated Transportation Engineers. Based on analysis contained in those studies, the project is anticipated to demand 239 parking spaces. The Foothill Centre development is proposing 225 parking spaces, space to accommodate three cars in the passenger drop-off area, and one loading space. A Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan is proposed as part of the development to reduce the project's overall parking demand. The Parking Analysis Addendum concludes that the TDM Plan should reduce peak parking demand by approximately 15%, which results in a peak demand of 218 parking spaces (based on 138 employees). The project exceeds the Zoning Ordinance requirements as they relate to parking, and the TDM measures proposed in order to reduce the anticipated parking demand are being provided at the applicant's discretion in order to minimize on-street parking and associated impacts to the surrounding neighborhood.

Land Use Compatibility:

Certain land uses have the potential to result in incompatibility with existing surrounding land uses or activities. Typically, development applications for General Plan Amendments, Rezones, Conditional Use Permits, Performance Standard Permits, and certain modifications have the greatest potential to result in land use compatibility issues. Incompatibility can result from a proposed project's generation of noise, odor, safety hazards, traffic, visual effects, or other environmental impacts. This Initial Study provides an analysis of environmental impacts, including land use compatibility, within the primary impact sections (i.e. noise, air quality, etc.). However, in instances where an impact does not rise to a level of significance, land use compatibility concerns may still exist due to adverse (less than significant) impacts. These adverse impacts require careful evaluation by decision-makers at the time the proposed project's permit requests are considered.

The subject project has a number of environmental impacts that are either less than significant as proposed or reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation measures. For the subject project, adverse impacts associated with hazards, geophysical conditions and short-term construction impacts (biological resources and noise) were identified. However, the identified impacts do not raise any significant neighborhood compatibility issues. A full analysis of the required findings to approve the use and a discussion of neighborhood compatibility will be provided in the project's staff report.

General Plan Policies:

As discussed above, if annexed to the City, the project site would be located in the Hope neighborhood, as defined in the General Plan. This neighborhood is primarily developed with single-family residences. However, the area also includes several schools and is located in close proximity to medical and office uses in the North State neighborhood. The project would not change the site's existing commercial land use designation, but would add land that is in the City's Sphere of Influence into City limits. One City goal noted in the General Plan is to simplify the present City boundaries and provision of services by encouraging annexation of unincorporated islands and peninsulas of land contiguous to the City. The proposed annexation and land use designation could be found potentially consistent with the General Plan. Analysis of compliance with specific elements of the General Plan is identified below.

1. Land Use Element

The City's Land Use Element contains goals and policies to ensure long-term sustainability ("living within our resources"), management of non-residential growth, protection of community character, and encouragement for the construction of affordable housing. With respect to the proposed annexation and development, there are several land use policies that are particularly applicable (refer to ***Exhibit 10*** for complete text):

LG2 Limit Non-Residential Growth

LG7 Community Benefit Non-Residential Land Uses

R3 Regional Planning

R4 Future Annexations

The project site is located within the City's existing Sphere of Influence, and in an area (south of Foothill Road in the Hope neighborhood) that is identified to be annexed at the earliest opportunity (Policy R4). As identified in this Initial Study, the City has the resource capacity to serve the project site (Policy R3). As the Foothill Centre development project includes new non-residential square footage, the project is subject to the City's non-residential square footage limitations (Policy LG2) and special findings to approve this development will be required. The Foothill Centre development project is also requesting allocation of economic development square footage in order to construct the proposed buildings (Policy LG7). The proposed project could be found potentially consistent with the Land Use Element of the General Plan.

2. Housing Element

Although construction of housing, and particularly community benefit housing, is a priority of the General Plan and specifically the Housing Element, the project site has a deed restriction that prevents it from being developed with any housing. This restriction was put in place by the prior owner (Mobil) and is a result of the contamination from a previously existing underground fuel tank. The current owner has been unsuccessful in having this residential deed restriction removed from the site. As such, the Housing Element is not applicable to the project site.

3. Open Space, Parks and Recreation Element (includes prior Open Space and Parks and Recreation Elements)

The project site is neither designated open space nor contiguous with open space. It is privately held and has previously been developed. As identified in this Initial Study, impacts associated with use of City parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project could be found potentially consistent with the Open Space, Parks and Recreation Element of the General Plan.

4. Economy and Fiscal Health Element

The City's Economy and Fiscal Health Element addresses local and regional economic considerations, and includes policies to promote economic resiliency and equity. The project involves a new facility for an existing local medical clinic. It is anticipated that this new facility will assist in retention and recruitment of medical professionals for the Santa Barbara area. Therefore, the project could be found potentially consistent with the Economy and Fiscal Health Element of the General Plan.

5. Historic Resources Element

Cultural resources are not on or near the project site, as identified in this Initial Study. Therefore the Historic Resources Element is not applicable to the project site.

6. Environmental Resources Element (includes prior Conservation Element and prior Noise Element)

City Environmental Resources Element policies provide that the City's natural resources (including air quality, biology, surface and ground water resources, noise, visual resources, climate change, energy and food and agriculture) be preserved, protected and enhanced.

With respect to the subject development, there are two policies under the Environmental Resources Element that directly apply to the project site, which are listed below:

> ER11 Native and Other Trees and Landscaping. "Protect and maintain native and other urban trees, and landscaped spaces, and promote the use of native or Mediterranean drought-tolerant species in landscaping to save energy and water, incorporate habitat, and provide shade."
>
> ER24 Visual Resources Protection. "New development or redevelopment shall preserve or enhance important public views and viewpoints for public enjoyment, where such protection would not preclude reasonable development of a property."

Additionally, there are two visual resources policies and three implementation strategies in the Conservation Element that apply to the project, which are listed below"

> 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 beach and lower elevations of the City."
>
> Visual Resources Policy 4.0 – "Trees enhance the general appearance of the City's landscape and should be preserved and protected."
>
> > Implementation Strategy 4.1 – "Mature trees should be integrated into project design rather than removed…"
> >
> > Implementation Strategy 4.2 – "All feasible options should be exhausted prior to the removal of a tree."
> >
> > Implementation Strategy 4.3 – "Major trees removed as a result of development or other property improvement shall be replaced by specimen trees on a minimum one-for-one basis."

Environmental issues associated with the Environmental Resources Element are discussed in the Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Noise and Water Environment sections of this Initial Study, which found that there would be no significant impacts to these resources. Based on this analysis, the project could be found potentially consistent with the Environmental Resources Element of the General Plan.

7. Circulation Element (includes prior Circulation Element and prior Scenic Highways Element)

The Circulation Element of the General Plan 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 and sustainability goals. With respect to the proposed annexation and development, there are several land use policies that are particularly applicable (refer to ***Exhibit 10*** for complete text):

C1 Transportation Infrastructure Enhancement and Preservation

C1.1 Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure

C6 Circulation Improvements

3.2 Transit Stops, Shelters and Information Systems

6.1 and 6.1.4 Local And Regional Transportation Demand Management Programs

The project includes pedestrian, bicyclist and bus stop improvements to increase the availability and attractiveness of alternative transportation (Policies C1, C1.1 and 3.2). The project also includes a Transportation Demand Management Plan to reduce traffic and parking demands at the site (Policies C6, 6.1 and 6.1.4). As identified in this Initial Study, traffic and circulation impacts resulting from the proposed project are less than significant, and thus the project could be found potentially consistent with the Circulation Element.

8. Public Services Element (includes prior Seismic Safety/Safety Element)

The City's Public Services Element requires that public infrastructure and services be planned, sited, upgraded and maintained to meet present and future service needs efficiently, economically and in a manner consistent with a sustainable community and climate change, as well as to emphasize safety and emergency preparedness as an integral part of land use and planning. The prior Seismic Safety/Safety Element addresses a number of potential hazards including, geology, seismicity, flooding, liquefaction, tsunamis, high groundwater, and erosion. Potential impacts associated with the site's prior contamination and associated public safety hazards would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of identified mitigation measures. As discussed in this Initial Study analysis, potential impacts associated with public services (water supply and wastewater, solid waste and recycling) and geophysical conditions are less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project could be found potentially consistent with the Public Services Element.

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) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista enjoyed by a large portion of the community?		Less Than Significant
b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway?		Less Than Significant
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		Less Than Significant
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare?		Less Than Significant

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 public (as opposed to private) viewpoints and larger community wide views (those things visible by a larger community, as opposed to select individuals). 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 public viewpoints, and how many people can see the views. 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 or community-wide scenic views, including extensive grading and/or removal of substantial amounts of vegetation and trees visible from public areas without adequate landscaping; or substantial loss of important public open space.
- Substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway (Highway 154) or within an eligible or potential scenic highway (Highway 101; Cabrillo Blvd between Highway 101 and Castillo Street; Sycamore Canyon Road (144)/Stanwood Drive(192)/Mission Ridge Road (192)/Mountain Drive to the Old Mission on Los Olivos Street); or a potential City scenic route (Shoreline Drive from Castillo Street to the end of Shoreline Park).
- 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, disrupts sensitive wildlife, or substantially affects day or nighttime views.

Aesthetics – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

Annexation of the property into the City would not result in visual changes; however, development of the Foothill Centre would result in a visual change at the project site. The proposed Foothill Centre development includes construction of two new two-story buildings. Both buildings are designed in an art deco style with a flat tiled sloped roof. The buildings would each have a maximum height of approximately 35 feet (Building A would be 27 feet above existing grade along Foothill Road).

The project includes the removal of approximately 17 trees, protection of 3 trees (2 oaks and a stone pine) and planting of approximately 160 trees, including approximately 25 coast live oaks, 11 street trees on Cieneguitas Road and 9 street trees on Foothill Road. Although some tree removal is proposed, existing trees do not represent skyline or specimen trees and, overall, the site would be re-landscaped with significantly more trees than currently exist.

Photo simulations of the proposed development were prepared by Interacta (December 10, 2009) and are incorporated by reference and summarized herein (***Exhibit 3 - Photo Simulations***). It should be noted that the photo simulations are for a prior iteration of the project, which included development of the site with three two-story buildings totaling 65,600 sq. ft. (Building A = 41,056 sq. ft. located in approximately the same location as the currently proposed Building A, Building B = 13,247 sq. ft. located along Cieneguitas approximately 250 feet south of Foothill Road, and Building C = 13,247 sq. ft. located in approximately the same location as the currently proposed Building B). The primary difference between this prior iteration and the current proposal is the elimination of the former Building B. Surface parking is now located where the prior Building B was. Therefore, the photo simulations represent a worst-case analysis of the Foothill Centre development, and are adequate for use in analyzing the current proposal.

1.a) Scenic Views

The City's Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) maps do not identify the subject parcels as being located in an area of visual sensitivity. However, the there are views of the mountains from Cieneguitas looking north across the project site. The City has identified mountains, open space and hillsides that provide a scenic backdrop as important natural scenic features.

The site itself is not considered to be "open space" due to its previous development, existing perimeter fencing and on-going on-site remediation. Therefore there is no visual impact related to a substantial loss of important public open space as a result of the proposed development.

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 overall height of the proposed Foothill Centre development would be 35 feet from existing grade. This is similar to the existing surrounding developments, which consist of both one- and two-story buildings.

There are views of the mountains provided as one looks north/northwest from Cieneguitas Road (refer to ***Exhibit 4 - Site Photographs***). This view is interrupted by existing development, vegetation and utility poles along Cieneguitas Road and at the Foothill/Cieneguitas Road intersection. The proposed development, including proposed landscaping, would affect this existing view. However, the existing view is not pristine, the ridgeline of the mountains would still be visible, Cieneguitas Road is not considered a high use public viewpoint, and the public views are typically not of substantial duration. Therefore, the project would result in a *less than significant* impact to scenic views because the new construction would not obstruct any important visual resources, and no designated open spaces would be impacted by the proposed project.

1.b) Scenic Highway

State Highway 154 ("San Marcos Pass Road") is an officially designated State Scenic Highway by the California Department of Transportation (Nov. 12, 1968). The project site is adjacent to Highway 154 and would be visible from it (refer to ***Exhibit 3 - Photo Simulations***). When travelling south on Highway 154, the final eight miles are downhill, and from them travelers are afforded views of the Pacific Ocean, coastal communities and the Channel Islands. Due to the topography and location of the project site as Highway 154 reaches the project site, impacts to views when travelling south on Highway 154 would be minimal, and are considered *less than significant*.

When travelling north on Highway 154, the project site and proposed development would be more prominent (refer to ***Exhibit 3 - Photo Simulations***). However; the new buildings would be located in an area that has existing development as its backdrop. Additionally, Highway 154 is elevated from the project site, so the new development does not block views as it might if the Highway were at ground level. The new buildings would change the existing views when travelling northbound on Highway 154 and would be more prominent than the existing primarily vacant site due to its proximity to Highway 154, but their environmental impact would be *less than significant*.

1.c) Visual Character and Quality

The Foothill Centre project would permanently alter the appearance of the site by constructing two, two-story buildings, approximately 35 feet in height. If the project site is annexed to the City as proposed, the size and design of the project would be subject to review and approval by the City's Architectural Board of Review (ABR). The proposed development of the Foothill Centre has been reviewed conceptually by the ABR on three occasions (refer to ***Exhibit 5 - ABR Minutes***). Overall, the ABR was satisfied with the site planning and proposed architectural style. The ABR conducted the

Compatibility Analysis and found the proposed project to be in compliance with the City Charter and applicable Municipal Code requirements, consistent with the Design Guidelines, and compatible with the architectural character of the City and the surrounding neighborhood.

Prior to building permit issuance, the Foothill Centre development, including grading and landform alteration, structural design, landscaping, and lighting, would require Project Design Approval and Final Approval by the ABR for consistency with design guidelines for views, visual aesthetics and compatibility, and lighting. Based on the generally positive conceptual comments from the ABR, the project appears to be consistent with adopted Design Guidelines for the area.

Based on the context of its surroundings, the proposed development would be visually compatible with existing development. Therefore, aesthetic impacts resulting from development of this urban in-fill parcel would be *less than significant*.

1.d) Lighting and Glare

The Foothill Centre project would result in the construction of two new, two-story medical office buildings and associated parking lot, which would require outdoor lighting typical of an office park development. Exterior lighting would be subject to compliance with the requirements of Santa Barbara Municipal Code Chapter 22.75, the City's Outdoor Lighting and Design Ordinance. The ordinance provides that exterior lighting be shielded and directed to the ground such that no undue lighting or glare would affect surrounding residents, roads, or habitat areas. Outdoor lighting would be primarily for security purposes, as the hours of operation would typically be from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Additionally, proposed building materials do not include materials with the potential for significant glare. As such, project impacts on lighting and glare would be *less than significant*.

Aesthetics - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Aesthetics - Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

2. AIR QUALITY Could the project:	NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		Less Than Significant
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		Less Than Significant
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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		Less Than Significant
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants?		Less Than Significant
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	X	
f) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		Less Than Significant
g) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?		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 [NOx] 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} and $PM_{2.5}$) include demolition, grading, road dust, agricultural tilling, mineral quarries, and vehicle exhaust.

The City of Santa Barbara is part of 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 (APCD) 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. The County is in attainment for the federal $PM_{2.5}$ standard and unclassified for the state $PM_{2.5}$ standard.

The APCD has also issued several notifications and requirements regarding toxic air emissions generated from activities such as gasoline dispensing, dry cleaning, freeways, manufacturing, etc., that may require projects with these components to mitigate or redesign features of the project to avoid excessive health risks. Additionally, APCD requires submittal of

an asbestos notification form for each regulated structure that is proposed to be demolished or renovated. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) and APCD also recommend a buffer between Highway 101 and new residential developments or other sensitive receptors in order to reduce potential health risks associated with traffic-related air pollutant emissions, particularly diesel particulates. Based on analysis in the citywide Program EIR (2010) for the Plan Santa Barbara General Plan Update, the City established an interim policy limiting the introduction of new residential construction or sensitive receptor uses within 250 feet of Highway 101 (excluding minor additions or remodels of existing homes or the construction of one new residential unit on vacant property), until CARB implements further statewide phased diesel reduction measures and/or the City otherwise determines a satisfactory reduction of diesel reduction risks citywide or on individual projects. Certain projects also have the potential to create objectionable odors that could create a substantial nuisance to neighboring residential areas or sensitive receptors and should be evaluated in CEQA documents.

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 (in terms of carbon dioxide equivalent) of all greenhouse gas emissions by the United States. Greenhouse gas emissions are typically measured in terms of mass carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e), which is the product of the mass of a particular greenhouse gas and its specific global warming potential (CO_2 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 (36.6 and 24.3 percent, respectively). 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. California State Senate Bill 97, enacted in 2007, required that the CEQA Guidelines be amended to include "guidance for the mitigation of greenhouse gas emission or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions." The California Office of Planning and Research developed amendments to the CEQA Guidelines which were adopted by the California Natural Resources Agency on December 30, 2009 and became effective March 18, 2010. These amendments established a general framework for addressing global climate change impacts in the CEQA process and require that all CEQA analysis include a significance determination for impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. A number of state and regional agencies within California are working to develop procedures to evaluate climate change impacts in CEQA documents and to determine whether those impacts are significant. While these standards are being developed for Santa Barbara County, APCD recommends that CEQA documents include: 1) a discussion of a project's impacts to and from global climate change; 2) a quantification of greenhouse gas emissions from all project sources; and 3) a discussion of how climate change impacts have been be mitigated to the extent reasonably possible for each project. In order to satisfy the State requirements and the APCD recommendations, several jurisdictions around the State, including Santa Barbara County and the City of Santa Barbara, are temporarily using greenhouse gas emissions thresholds developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Although BAAQMD formally adopted the thresholds in June 2010, the use of the thresholds by the District has been suspended while a CEQA lawsuit over the adoption process proceeds through the courts. Even though the thresholds are not currently effective for use by BAAQMD, the thresholds were developed through a scientifically valid process and serve as one of few examples of objective standards for analyzing greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, until region-specific thresholds are developed, the city of Santa Barbara has elected to use the thresholds developed by BAAQMD for use in the City's analysis of GHGs as is permitted and anticipated by CEQA Guideline section 15064.4.

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 APCD 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.

Substantial long-term project emissions could potentially stem from stationary sources which may require permits from the APCD and from motor vehicles associated with the project and from mobile sources. Examples of stationary emission sources that require permits from APCD include gas stations, auto body shops, diesel generators, boilers and large water heaters, dry cleaners, oil and gas production and processing facilities, and wastewater treatment facilities.

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 for non-stationary sources. However, APCD uses the threshold for stationary sources as a guideline for determining the impacts of construction emissions for non-stationary sources. The stationary source threshold states that a projects combined emissions from all construction equipment cannot exceed 25 tons of any pollutant except carbon monoxide within a 12-month period. Standard equipment exhaust mitigation measures are recommended by APCD for projects with either significant or less than significant effects.

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 (CAP) 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: According to recent amendments to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would have significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emission if it would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. A number of state and regional agencies within California are currently working to develop procedures to determine specifically how this significance determination should be interpreted and to develop plans and policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. In the meantime, projects should be designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to the extent reasonably possible.

As discussed above, a number of state and regional agencies within California are currently working to develop procedures to determine specifically how this significance determination should be interpreted and to develop plans and policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. In the meantime, the City is temporarily using greenhouse gas emissions thresholds developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) as guidance in evaluating greenhouse gas emissions impacts from projects. A detailed explanation from the County of Santa Barbara as to why the BAAQMD analysis and thresholds are appropriate guidance for land use project in Santa Barbara County, including the City of Santa Barbara, is provided as ***Exhibit 6***. Consistent with the BAAQMD's guidance, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to GHG emissions and climate change would likely be cumulatively considerable if the project's operations would produce in excess of 1,100 metric tons CO_2E/year. BAAQMD's Air Quality Guidelines (May 2011) presents a methodology for this analysis and uses a screening table for projects it has determined would not be likely to

exceed this threshold. If a project exceeds the 1,100 metric tons CO_2E/year threshold, it can be evaluated using an efficiency based methodology outline in BAAQMD's 2011 Air Quality Guidelines document that factors in what kind of service population (employees and residents) the project would serve. If the project would not exceed 4.6 metric tons CO_2E/service population/year, then the project would not have significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. The BAAQMD provides useful information for GHG emissions analysis; however, significance determinations are made on a case-by-case basis. The BAAQMD does not include a significant threshold for construction related greenhouse gas emissions.

Air Quality – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

An Air Quality Technical Report and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis ("Technical Report") was prepared for the Foothill Centre development project by Dudek, dated March 2012. The Technical Report is summarized below and incorporated herein by reference.

2.a) Clean Air Plan

Direct and indirect emissions associated with the project are accounted for in the 2010 Clean Air Plan emissions growth assumptions. Appropriate air quality conditions, including construction dust suppression, would be applied to the project, consistent with CAP and City policies, and are identified in ***Exhibit 2*** as standard conditions of approval. Since the proposed project would not result in a land use that would generate population or employment growth exceeding what was anticipated in the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments' Regional Growth Forecast, the project would be consistent with the adopted CAP. The project could be found consistent with the 2010 Clean Air Plan; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Because the project would not generate significant O_3 precursor emissions or localized pollutant impacts (as identified below), and as emissions have been taken into account in the most recent CAP growth projections, regional cumulative impacts would be *less than significant*.

b-d) Air Pollutant Emissions, Sensitive Receptors, and Cumulative Impacts

Long-Term Emissions:

As proposed, the project would include medical office development, with all of the uses and vehicle trips associated with this type of development. Vehicular traffic to and from the project site represents the project's primary long-term impact to air quality. Area sources associated with the project include space and water heating, landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products and architectural coatings. The only stationary emission source associated with the project is an emergency generator, which only runs during emergencies and during periodic testing. Appropriate permits from APCD will be required for this generator. Sensitive receptors are located to the north and east of the project site.

As identified in the Technical Report prepared by Dudek, utilizing the CalEEMod, Version 2011.1.1 computer model and APCD emission factor data, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate the following combined operational (vehicle) and area source emissions:

Pollutant	Vehicle (lbs/day)	Stationary/ Area Source (lbs/day)	Combined (lbs/day)	SBAPCD Threshold (lbs/day)
ROC	5.74	1.57	7.31	motor vehicle sources: 25; all sources combined: 240
NO_x	8.96	1.12	10.08	motor vehicle sources: 25; all sources combined: 240
PM_{10}	6.36	0.07	6.43	all sources combined: 80

Project-related vehicle emissions would be below the threshold of significance of 25 pounds per day for both ROC and NOx. The combined operational (vehicle), area, and stationary source emissions from all long term project sources would be below the APCD threshold of 240 pounds per day of ROC or NOx and 80 pounds per day of PM_{10}. These estimates are considered conservative, as they do not account for the fact that the Foothill Centre would be closed on weekends, and that the project includes a Transportation Demand Management program to encourage alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a *less than significant* effect on long term air quality.

Emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) would result from operation of the on-site emergency generator. The maximum anticipated cancer risk associated with the project is 0.7 in 1 million at the maximally exposed residential receptor based on a 70-year lifetime exposure. The assessment also finds that the chronic hazard index for noncancer

health impacts is well below 1.0 for the maximally exposed receptor. As such, the exposure of project-related TAC emission impacts to sensitive receptors during operation of the proposed project would be *less than significant.*

In analyzing cumulative impacts from the proposed project, the assessment must specifically evaluate a project's contribution to the cumulative increase in pollutants for which the County is designated as nonattainment. The County is currently in attainment of NAAQS and is in attainment for all CAAQS with the exception of the state 8-hour O_3 standard and the state standards for PM_{10}. Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate emissions of ROC and VOC (O_3 precursors) and PM_{10} emissions; however, the proposed project would not exceed SBCAPCD guidance for annual construction emissions or SBCAPCD thresholds for operational emissions. Since implementation of the project would result in less-than-significant short-term impacts to air quality associated with construction and less-than-significant long-term impacts associated with operation of the project, which includes project-generated vehicle traffic and energy use, the proposed project's contribution to the County's nonattainment status for state 8-hour O_3 and PM_{10} standards would be *less than cumulatively considerable.*

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions:

As identified in the Technical Report prepared by Dudek, utilizing the CalEEMod, Version 2011.1.1 computer model and APCD emission factor data, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate the following construction emissions from all sources:

Pollutant	**Proposed Construction Emissions (tons/year)**	
	2012	**2013**
ROC	0.18	0.46
NO_x	1.31	0.36
CO	0.94	0.44
SO_2	0	0
PM_{10}	0.16	0.06
$PM_{2.5}$	0.07	0.02
Total Proposed Emissions (tons/year)	**2.66**	**1.34**
APCD Total Emissions Threshold (tons/year)	**25**	**25**

Construction of the proposed project could result in emissions of pollutants due to grading, fumes, and vehicle exhaust. Sensitive receptors located primarily to the east, but also to the north and south of the project site, could be affected by dust and particulates during project site grading and vehicle exhaust from construction equipment. The project would involve grading, paving, and landscaping activities which could cause localized dust related impacts resulting in increases in increases in particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$). However, dust control measures are required for the project as standard conditions of approval (identified in ***Exhibit 2***) and therefore dust-related impacts to sensitive receptors would be *less than significant*.

Diesel and gasoline powered construction equipment also emit particulate matter, NOx, and ROC. In order for emissions from construction equipment to be considered a potentially significant environmental impact, combined emissions from all construction equipment would need to exceed 25 tons of any pollutant (except carbon monoxide) within a 12-month period. As shown in the table above, the total combined emissions over the 13-month construction period is 4.02 tons, which is significantly less than the 25 ton threshold. Therefore, with application of standard conditions of approval for dust control and compliance with APCD requirements for construction equipment engines (refer to ***Exhibit 2***), the proposed project is anticipated to have a *less than significant* effect on the environment.

The proposed project would include demolition of the former gas station building, and this building may contain lead and asbestos. Depending on the type of product that incorporates asbestos (e.g. linoleum tiles), it can be classified as friable or non-friable. Friable asbestos represents an air quality health hazard. Prior to commencement of construction, the buildings would be assessed and tested as necessary to determine the presence of lead and asbestos. Should any of the material be found, demolition of the building would follow all the necessary protocols for permitting, removal and disposal of the materials. Standard conditions of approval related to APCD Notification (***Exhibit 2***) would ensure *less than significant* impacts related to these substances.

2.e) Odors

The project is limited to medical and administrative office uses, and would not include land uses involving odors or smoke. 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, the project would have *no impact* related to odors.

2.f-g) Greenhouse Gases:

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 generations, site lighting, and potable water delivery. The City is temporarily using greenhouse gas emissions thresholds developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) as guidance in evaluating greenhouse gas emissions impacts from projects.

Long term operating emissions of greenhouse gases were calculated for the project using the methodology outlined in BAAQMD's Air Quality Guidelines (May 2011). These emissions include transit related emissions, water use, energy use, and solid waste disposal. As identified in the Technical Report prepared by Dudek, utilizing the CalEEMod, Version 2011.1.1 computer model, it has been estimated that the project would generate 946 MT of CO_2E/year. This is below the 1,100 MT of CO_2E/year threshold of significance for greenhouse gases.

Construction related emissions represent a small portion of greenhouse gas emissions. The project is estimated to emit 204 metric tons of CO_2 during construction. With the implementation of standard APCD conditions for dust and equipment exhaust control measures (refer to ***Exhibit 2***), construction-related impacts to greenhouse gases are assumed to be less than significant for most projects. Finally, the project would not exceed other air quality significance thresholds adopted by the APCD.

The proposed project would incorporate energy efficient building design by exceeding Title 24 requirements and using water efficient landscaping. In addition, project-generated traffic would potentially be reduced by providing break areas to encourage employees to remain on site during meal breaks, and the proposed Transportation Demand Management program that is designed to reduce traffic and parking demands at the site would include incentives to encourage employees to use alternative modes of transportation, such as bus fare subsidies, ride sharing or carpooling programs, bicycle facilities, and guaranteed ride home programs. The potential reduction in vehicle trips would be consistent with the City's goal of reducing mobile-source GHG emissions.

Although the proposed project would generate GHG emissions that would contribute to the cumulative global climate change impact, the project would not cause a cumulatively considerable contribution to greenhouse gas emissions or impede the ability of the State to attain greenhouse gas reduction goals. Therefore, impacts would be considered *less than significant*.

Air Quality –Mitigation

No mitigation is required. Refer to ***Exhibit 2*** for Standard Conditions of Approval Applicable to Project.

Air Quality - Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

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

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 qualitatively 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 or sensitive biological resources exist, project effects to the resources are qualitatively 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, migration corridors, or habitats supporting sensitive species such as oak woodland, coastal strand, riparian, and wetlands.
- Substantial effect on a 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

A Biological Survey and Assessment of the project site prepared by Watershed Environmental, Inc. (October 20, 2009) is incorporated by reference and summarized herein (***Exhibit 7 – Biological Survey and Assessment***).

3.a,c) Natural Communities; Trees; Wetland and Riparian Habitats

The Foothill Centre site is primarily undeveloped; however the undeveloped portion has been heavily disturbed as a result of soil testing and remediation work resulting from a prior leaking underground fuel tank. Most of the property is covered with non-native annual grassland. The site is not designated critical habitat for any federally threatened or endangered species. There are no natural communities or wetland habitat within the project site.

The portion of the site proposed for development contains approximately 23 trees, of which 7 are Coast live oaks with trunk sizes ranging from 4.5 to 20 inches. The oaks appear to be volunteers, and are scattered in three locations. The proposed development includes the removal of 17 trees, of which 2 are Coast live oaks (with trunk sizes ranging from 4.5 to 8.7 inches) and the remainder are non-native trees that are not considered to be specimen or skyline trees. The project proposes to retain and protect two Coast live oaks and one Italian stone pine. The project includes the planting of 25 Coast live oaks, as well as approximately 135 additional trees. Although some oaks would be removed, they would be replaced at a ratio higher than 10:1, which is fully consistent with City policy. Overall, the landscape plan would result in more trees and vegetation than currently exist on site. Refer to ***Exhibit 2*** for Standard Conditions of Approval related to tree protection and replacement that would be applicable to the project.

Impacts to natural communities, trees, and wetland and riparian habitat would be *less than significant* because the site does not contain any natural communities, critical habitat, or riparian or wetland habitat, and because proposed tree planting would mitigate any potential impacts related to loss of trees.

3.b) Locally Designated Trees

There are no locally designated historic or landmark trees on the project site, thus there would be *no impact* on historic, landmark or specimen trees.

3.d) Endangered, Threatened, or Rare Species

No sensitive (State or Federally listed rare, candidates for listing, threatened or endangered) plants or wildlife were found on the project site. A White-tailed kite (special status species) was observed southeast of the project site in 2003. As discussed above, the site is not designated critical habitat for any federally threatened or endangered species. Therefore, impacts to sensitive species would be *less than significant*.

3.e) Wildlife Dispersal and Migration Corridors

The site is fully surrounded by Highway 154, Foothill Road (Highway 192) and Cieneguitas Road, and is not considered to be a wildlife dispersal or migration corridor. However, the area north/northwest of the site, near Atascadero Creek, is considered to be an important wildlife area, and Atascadero Creek is an important movement corridor and a key riparian bird habitat area. Cieneguitas Creek to the east of the project site is also considered to be a movement corridor. Given prior and current activity on the site, and the geographic and physical separation from the creeks to the north and east by roads and development, it is unlikely that the project site serves as an important site for wildlife. Impacts associated with wildlife dispersal and migration corridors are considered *less than significant*. Nevertheless, there exists the possibility that migratory birds use the site for nesting. Avoidance of vegetation removal during the bird nesting season (or surveying the site to ensure there are no nesting birds) would further minimize any potentially adverse impacts.

Biological Resources – Recommended Mitigation

BIO-1 Bird Nesting. Removal of vegetation shall be avoided during the bird nesting season (February 15 to September 15) where feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey prior to removal of any trees or vegetation scheduled to occur from February 15 through September 15. If nesting is found, the trees/vegetation shall not be removed until after the young have fledged and the biologist should establish a protective buffer around the nest as needed.

Refer to ***Exhibit 2*** for Standard Conditions of Approval Applicable to Project.

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

4.a) Archaeological Resources

The project site is not located in any known or mapped archaeological sensitivity zones. Additionally, the site has been extensively disturbed as part of the site remediation work, and no sensitive resources have been found. Therefore, the probability of encountering archeological resources is low and impacts are considered *less than significant*. 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 (refer to ***Exhibit 2***) would be added to the project to alert contractors and construction personnel to the possibility of encountering archaeological resources within the project site. If archaeological resources are encountered, work in the area of the find shall be halted and a professional archaeologist consulted.

4.b) Historic Resources

The project site contains an existing Veterinary Hospital and an abandoned gas station. The gas station, which is not a historic resource, would be removed as part of the project. No physical changes to the Veterinary Hospital would occur as part of the project. Therefore, there would be *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. Per Government Code, section 65352.3(a)(1), the City contacted local Native American tribes to invite them to discuss development of the project site; to date, no response has been received.

Cultural Resources – Mitigation

No mitigation is required. Refer to ***Exhibit 2*** for Standard Conditions of Approval Applicable to Project.

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?		Less Than Significant
b)	Seismicity: ground shaking or liquefaction?		Less Than Significant
c)	Seismicity: seiche or tsunami?	X	
d)	Landslides or mudslides?		Less Than Significant
e)	Expansive soils?		Less Than Significant
f)	Excessive grading, permanent changes in the topography or substantial soil erosion?		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 looses 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 of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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 30%, substantial topographic change, destruction of unique physical features; or substantial erosion of soils.

Geophysical Conditions – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

A Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Fugro West, Inc. (April 2003) is summarized below and incorporated herein by reference. Soil at the site generally consists of alluvium that is comprised of medium stiff to very stiff fine-grained clayey soils with interbedded layers of medium dense to dense granular soils. Artificial fill is present in the northern and western portion of the site.

5.a-c) Seismic Hazards

The city of Santa Barbara is not considered an Earthquake Fault Zone as prescribed under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. Additionally, current building codes require that any development be constructed to address all geologic conditions of the site.

Fault Rupture:

The closest fault to the site is the San Jose (Foothill) fault, located approximately 1,000 feet south-southwest of the site. The More Ranch/Mission Ridge/Arroyo Parida fault is estimated to be 4,000-5,000 feet south of the project site. The North Channel Slope Fault is also considered a significant local fault and is mapped as a blind fault extending from the Santa Barbara Channel north beneath the Santa Barbara/Goleta coastal plain at depth. Given the information on mapped faults and the large distance to the nearest mapped fault (1,000 feet), the potential for ground rupture at the site is low, and impacts related to fault rupture would be *less than significant*.

Ground Shaking and Liquefaction:

The project site is located in a seismically active area of southern California. Significant ground shaking as a result of a local or regional earthquake is likely to occur during the life of the project. The soil testing encountered groundwater at a depth of 30-1/2 feet below existing ground surface.

The soils analysis determined that granular soils susceptible to liquefaction are present at the site. The consequences of liquefaction of the saturated course-grained soil materials under the present groundwater conditions at the site are generally anticipated to involve ground surface settlement. However, some localized movement from liquefaction could occur (estimated at ½ to ¾ inches). By following the recommendations of the Geotechnical Engineering Report for site preparation and foundation design (as required prior to issuance of building permits), impacts related to ground shaking and liquefaction would be *less than significant*. This has been identified as a recommended mitigation measure.

Seiche or Tsunami:

The project site is not located adjacent to any lakes or other enclosed bodies of water, and is located several miles from the coast and outside the City's tsunami run up area. Therefore, because of the project location, there would be *no impacts* from a seiche or tsunami.

5.d-e) Geologic or Soil Instability

Landslides/Mudslides:

The site is located on relatively flat terrain and slope stability and landsliding are not anticipated to represent geologic hazards to the project. Therefore impacts would be *less than significant*.

Expansive Soils:

Site soils are considered to have a medium potential for expansion (moderately expansive soils). The Geotechnical Engineering Report included recommendations for grading and construction to minimize potential impacts. As part of the typical plan check process, prior to issuing a building permit for development of the site, the City's Building Division would require the project to comply with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Engineering Report. By following the recommendations of the Geotechnical Engineering Report for site preparation and foundation design (as required prior to issuance of building permits), impacts would be *less than significant*. This has been identified as a recommended mitigation measure.

5.g) Topography; Grading/Erosion

Topographic Changes:

The project site is relatively flat. Proposed construction of the Foothill Centre would essentially follow the existing contours of the site, although Building A would be slightly depressed from the existing grade along Foothill Road. The primary topographic changes would be for the creation of a detention basin, vegetated swales and bio-retention designs. Impacts associated with topographic changes would be *less than significant*.

Grading

Grading for the proposed Foothill Centre development includes 3,742 c.y. of cut and 19 c.y. of fill within the building footprints, and 13,185 c.y. of cut and 381 c.y. of fill outside the building footprints for a total of 17,327 c.y. of cut and fill. A majority of the cut is needed to create the proposed detention basin. It is anticipated that grading activities will result in

the export of 16,527 c.y. of soil. The proposed grading would not alter the natural topography of the site (other than to provide for storm water treatment opportunities), destroy unique physical features, or cause substantial erosion of soils. Therefore, long-term impacts resulting from grading would be *less than significant*.

Short term impacts from erosion due to wind and storm water runoff that could occur during grading would be *less than significant*. Standard construction Building Division requirements for an erosion control plan would apply to the project. Standard conditions of approval related to dust control are discussed in the Air Quality section and identified in ***Exhibit 2,*** and would address potential wind erosion impacts. With implementation of these standard requirements and conditions of approval, any potential adverse impacts would be further reduced.

Geophysical Conditions – Recommended Mitigation

G-1 **Geotechnical Studies.** All recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Fugro West, Inc. (April 2003) shall be implemented. These recommendations shall include, but are not limited to requirements for grading and site development, foundation design, slabs on grade, pavement sections, corrosion and surface drainage consideration shall be followed. A Final Geotechnical Report shall be prepared and submitted to the City's Building Division as part of the City Building and Safety Division review and approval of the construction plans. Grading and foundation plans shall be reviewed by a Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist to ensure compliance with the recommendations in the Final Report. Compliance shall be demonstrated on plans submitted for grading and building permits and subject to City Building and Safety Division review and approval.

Geophysical Conditions – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

6. HAZARDS Could the project:		NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a)	Involve a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?		Less Than Significant
b)	Involve the creation of any health hazard or potential health hazards?		Less Than Significant
c)	Involve exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
d)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		Less Than Significant
e)	Involve increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?		Less Than Significant

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.

Emergency evacuation is discussed in the Transportation Section below.

Hazards – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

6.a-c) Public Health and Safety

The Foothill Centre development site has undergone remediation as a result of a leaking underground fuel tank associated with the prior use as a gas station. The site is currently in a monitored natural attenuation phase under the purview of the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division, Leaking Underground Fuel Tank Program. The project site has an approved Work Plan dated May 13, 2011. The site also has an approved Work Plan for Trench Abandonment in order to abandon two existing interceptor trenches (by backfilling to 20 feet below ground surface with bentonite grout and cement, and replacing the top five feet with clean fill soil) and five associated extraction wells. Abandonment of the trenches has begun but is not yet complete. It is anticipated that the trenches will be fully abandoned prior to the start of construction for the Foothill Centre, and they are not part of the project description.

A Site Assessment Report prepared by Cardno ERI (December 6, 2011) is summarized below and incorporated herein by reference. This Report documented assessment activities at the site, verified the effectiveness of the vapor extraction system in remediating residual adsorbed phase hydrocarbons, evaluated the current distribution of adsorbed phase hydrocarbons in two wells, and also updated a vapor study and health risk assessment conducted by Komex (another consulting firm) in 2005. A letter prepared by Geosyntec (December 15, 2011) to clarify the results of the Cardno ERI Report is also summarized below and incorporated herein by reference. Analysis of the Foothill Centre project site concludes that petroleum hydrocarbons underlying the site are not expected to result in adverse impacts to human health

associated with indoor air exposure for the building occupants and visitors. Natural attenuation has generally occurred and continues to reduce residual benzene concentrations in the vadose zone (top of the ground surface to the water table) and capillary fringe (subsurface layer in which groundwater seeps up from water table by capillary action).

The Foothill Centre development is planned to move forward prior to the completion of the required site monitoring. In order to accomplish the proposed development without compromising the continued monitoring and potential additional clean up of the site, and to avoid health risks to construction workers, the County Fire Department has required that several conditions be met prior to project construction: monitoring well relocation, trench abandonment and soils management plan . With incorporation of the required conditions, impacts associated with soil and groundwater contamination and monitoring are considered *potentially significant, mitigable.*

The proposed use of the Foothill Centre as a medical office would require the use and storage of medical gas (nitrous oxide, oxygen and nitrogen). This gas would be housed in a medical gas storage room designed as an S-1 occupancy (moderate hazard storage) with a 1-hour fire separation from other uses. A compressed medical air system would be used. The amount of medical gas stored would be below the maximum allowable per the California Building Code (CBC), and the medical gas storage room would be vented and signed in compliance with the CBC and National Fire Protection Association requirements. Therefore, the project's impacts related to exposure of persons or the environment to hazardous substances due to improper use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials would be *less than significant*. A condition of approval to require a Hazardous Materials Business Plan should certain quantities of hazardous materials be stored on site would be applied to the project to ensure safe storage of materials.

6.d) Hazards Near Schools

The project site is located approximately ⅛-mile from La Colina Junior High and approximately ¼-mile from Bishop Diego High School. As a medical office, the Foothill Centre development project would require the use and storage of medical gas (nitrous oxide, oxygen and nitrogen). As identified above, these gases would be stored in a special room and would comply with all applicable building and fire safety standards. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous emissions and hazardous materials near a school would be *less than significant*.

6.e) Fire Hazard

The project site is not located in a designated High Fire Hazard Area, although the County High Fire Hazard Area begins on the north side of Foothill Road, near the project site. The new development on the site would not create a new fire hazard because it is not located in a High Fire Hazard Area, it is located in an area where adequate emergency response times can be accomplished and has adequate water pressure and access to fire hydrants. The project would have a *less than significant* impact associated with increased fire hazard.

Hazards – Required Mitigation

H-1 **Monitoring Wells.** Any monitoring well that is in conflict with a building or the detention basin shall be properly abandoned and replaced as required by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department Fire Prevention Division, prior to construction. A well abandonment workplan shall be submitted to the Fire Prevention Division and must be approved prior to issuance of a building permit for construction. All site wells that are not to be abandoned shall be protected during construction activities. This may involve cutting the wells down and capping them during site grading activities and then extending them back up to an appropriate monitoring well cover at the completion of the paving or landscaping activities.

H-2 **Soils Management Plan.** A soils management plan shall be submitted to the County Fire Prevention Division for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit. The soils management plan shall describe the procedures to properly handle and dispose of hydrocarbon impacted soils that may be encountered during site grading activities.

H-3 **Interceptor Trenches.** Prior to the start of construction, both interceptor trenches shall be properly abandoned.

Hazards – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

7. NOISE Could the project result in:	NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a) Substantial permanent increases in existing ambient noise levels?		Less Than Significant
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels or excessive ground borne vibration?		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:
  - Commercial (retail, restaurant, etc.) / Office: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 75 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 50 dB(A).
- Substantial noise or groundbourne vibration from grading and construction activity in close proximity to noise-sensitive receptors for an extensive duration.

Noise – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

7.a-b) Increased Noise Level; Exposure to High Noise Levels

Long-Term Operational Noise:

The majority of the project site is located in an area where noise levels do not exceed 65 dB(A); however the southern tip of the site (approximately 675 Cieneguitas Road) is located in an area subject to noise levels of 65-70 dB(A).

Normally acceptable exterior noise levels for commercial or office uses are 65-75 dB(A), as identified in the City's Noise Element. The maximum interior exposure is 50 dB(A). The Foothill Centre development would occur where noise levels are less than 65 dB(A). Therefore, exterior noise levels would be acceptable and common construction practices would make the interior environment acceptable from a noise exposure perspective. Additionally, the proposed uses would not include activities that would generate significant noise such that it would impact surrounding residential development. Therefore, impacts associated with long-term noise are considered *less than significant.*

Temporary Construction Noise:

The project would result in temporary construction noise due to grading and construction activities. Noise from grading and construction equipment, truck traffic and vibration would affect surrounding areas during the construction period. The total construction period is anticipated to last approximately 13 months. Construction noise would be short term and generally intermittent and sporadic. Therefore, noise impacts would be *less than significant*. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures identified below would further reduce any adverse impacts associated with construction noise.

Noise – Recommended Mitigation

N-1 **Neighborhood Notification Prior to Construction.** At least twenty (20) days prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall provide written notice to all property owners, businesses, and residents within 300 feet of the project area. The notice shall contain a description of the project, the construction schedule, including days and hours of construction, the name and phone number of the (Project Environmental Coordinator (PEC) and) Contractor(s), site rules and Conditions of Approval pertaining to construction activities, and any additional information that will assist the Building Inspectors, Police Officers and the public in addressing problems that may arise during construction.

N-2: **Construction Hours.** Construction (including preparation for construction work) shall only be permitted Monday through Friday between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., excluding the following holidays: New Year's Day (January 1st); Martin Luther King Jr. Day (3rd Monday in January); President's Day (3rd Monday in February); Memorial Day (Last Monday in May); Independence Day (July 4th); Labor Day (1st Monday in September); Thanksgiving Day (4th Thursday in November); Day Following Thanksgiving Day (Friday following Thanksgiving); Christmas Day (December 25th). *When a holiday falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the preceding Friday or following Monday respectively shall be observed as a legal holiday.

When, based on required construction type or other appropriate reasons, it is necessary to do work outside the allowed construction hours, contractor shall contact the City to request a waiver from the above construction hours, using the procedure outlined in Santa Barbara Municipal Code §9.16.015 Construction Work at Night. Contractor shall notify all residents within 300 feet of the parcel of intent to carry out said construction a minimum of 48 hours prior to said construction. Said notification shall include what the work includes, the reason for the work, the duration of the proposed work and a contact number.

N-3: **Construction Equipment Sound Control.** All construction equipment, including trucks, shall be professionally maintained and fitted with standard manufacturers' muffler and silencing devices.

N-4 **Sound Barriers.** The project shall employ sound control devices and techniques such as noise shields and blankets during the initial grading and construction period to reduce the level of noise to surrounding residents. Proposed measures shall be submitted to the Planning Division for approval and shall result in noise attenuation of 5-10 dB at the north, east and south property lines. Noise levels shall be monitored for compliance.

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

8.a) Growth-Inducing Impacts

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 is anticipated to result in minor growth to the extent that new employment created by the project results in new residents to the area. It is estimated by Sansum that this new development would generate approximately 25-30 new employees on the South Coast, which could potentially increase population and housing demand in the South Coast. Growth-inducing impacts would be *less than significant* because the project site is in an urbanized area that is currently served by all required infrastructure and the increase in area employees is small.

8.b) Housing Displacement

The project would not involve any housing displacement. *No impact* would result from the project.

Population and Housing - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Population and Housing – Residual Impact

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?		Less Than Significant
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.

Facilities and Services: The project site is located in an urban area where all public services are available. In 2010, the City certified a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) on the Plan Santa Barbara General Plan Update. The FEIR concluded that under the projected planned development and all studied alternatives, all public services could accommodate additional growth.

Water: The City of Santa Barbara's water supply comes primarily 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, Devils Canyon and Mission Tunnel; groundwater; State Water Project Table A allotment; desalination; and recycled water. Conservation and efficiency improvements are projected to contribute to the supply by offsetting demand that would otherwise have to be supplied by additional sources. On June 14, 2011, based on the comprehensive review of the City's water supply, the City Council approved the Long Term Water Supply Program (LTWSP) for the planning period 2011-2030. The LTWSP outlines a strategy to use the above sources to meet the City's estimated system demand (potable plus recycled water) of 14,000 AFY, plus a 10% safety margin equal to 1,400 AFY, for a total water supply target of 15,400 AFY. The LTWSP concludes that the City's water supply is adequate to serve the anticipated demand plus safety margin during the planning period.

Solid Waste: 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) in solid waste generation over the 15-year period. The County's threshold for project specific operational 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 tons/year]) for project operations. 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 tons/year 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 tons/year], which equates to 40 tons per year, is considered an adverse cumulative impact.

The County of Santa Barbara adopted revised solid waste generation thresholds and guidelines in October 2008. 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. The County's 350 ton threshold has not been formally adopted by the City; however, it provides a useful method for calculating and analyzing construction waste generated by a project.

Public Services – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

9a-b and d-f. Facilities and Services

The project is not anticipated to create a substantially different demand on fire or police protection services, library services, or City buildings and facilities than that anticipated in the 2010 Plan Santa Barbara FEIR. The project site is within the City's sphere of influence and was included in the FEIR analysis for determining services for future growth. The project would be served with connections to existing public services for gas, electricity, cable, and telephone traversing the site, as well as access to existing roads, which can accommodate the minor increase in demand generated by the project. Therefore, impacts to fire protection, police protection, library services, City buildings and facilities, electrical power, natural gas, telephone, and cable telecommunication services are anticipated to be *less than significant*.

9.c) Schools

The project site is within the Hope Elementary School District for elementary school and within the Santa Barbara Unified School District for high school.

The project would result in a minor increase in area employees to the extent that new employment created by the project results in new residents to the area. 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. Unlike a residential development that falls into a defined school attendance area, students generated by the proposed project could live and attend a school in any area of the South Coast. Some students generated by the project could also live outside the boundaries of the Santa Barbara Unified School District or attend private 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 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.g-i) Water and Sewer

Water

The Goleta Water District currently serves both the north and south sides of Foothill Road at the project site, as well as customers on both sides of Cieneguitas Road south of Foothill Road. The project includes detachment from the Goleta Water District and proposed service from the city of Santa Barbara. The project site (existing veterinary hospital and proposed Foothill Centre development) is estimated to demand 5.72 AFY of water (based on the City's Water Demand Factor and Conservation Study "User's Guide" Document No. 2). This increase in demand would not significantly impact the City's water supply.

Therefore, the City's long-term water supply and existing water treatment and distribution facilities would adequately serve the proposed project. 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.

Sewer

The Foothill Centre site is currently served by the Goleta Sanitary District. The veterinary hospital is currently served by City sewer. Residential properties east of the site are within the city of Santa Barbara city limits, and are currently served by the City's El Estero Treatment Plant. The maximum capacity of the El Estero Treatment Plant is 11 million gallons per day (MGD), with current average daily flow of approximately 8 MGD. The proposed project's estimated net new sewer demand (existing veterinary hospital and proposed Foothill Centre development) is 4,242 gallons per day or 4.75 AFY. Increased sewage treatment associated with the project site's existing and proposed development can be accommodated by the existing City sewer system and sewage treatment plant, and would represent a *less than significant* impact.

9.j) Solid Waste Generation/ Disposal

Long-Term (Operational). The proposed Foothill Centre development is estimated to generate 78 tons per year (TPY) of solid waste as follows: 60,122 s.f. x .0013 tons per s.f. = 78 TPY. With application of source reduction, reuse, and recycling, landfill disposal of solid waste would be reduced to 39 TPY. This represents a *less than significant* impact because it is under the 196 TPY project-specific threshold, and is below the 40 TPY cumulative threshold.

Short-Term (Demolition and Construction). Construction-related waste generation is estimated to be 839 tons prior to any recycling or diversion. Total short-term solid waste after implementation of the City's Construction and Demolition Ordinance (SBMC Ch. 7.18) requirement to divert 75% of total construction waste would be approximately 210 TPY. Because the project would generate less than 350 tons of construction and demolition debris, the project would have a *less than significant* impact related to short-term solid waste.

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?	X	

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

10.a) Recreational Demand

The project would result in the construction of 58,637 net new square feet of medical office development. This new development would create some additional demand for parks and recreational facilities, but it would be less than that demanded by a residential development. Recreational demand from this additional commercial square footage would result in a *less than significant* impact to park or recreational facility demand. Within a one-mile radius are two local parks; within a two mile radius are seven parks that provide both passive and active recreational opportunities. Also within this radius is access to the front country trail system of the Los Padres National Forest, and the Municipal Golf Course. Therefore, there are a number of facilities within a short distance to provide a number of recreational opportunities for the new development.

10.b) Existing Recreational Facilities

The project site is not adjacent to existing park facilities. The closest park is located more than 1/4-mile away. The proposed project would not impact or interfere with parks or public trails. Therefore, there would be *no impact* to existing 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)	Decreased performance or safety of pedestrian, bicycle, or public transit facilities?		Less Than Significant
e)	Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, programs, or ordinances regarding congestion management and the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation.		Less Than Significant

Transportation - Discussion

Issues: Transportation issues include traffic, access, circulation and safety. 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 and traffic in the City.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A proposed project may have a significant impact on traffic and circulation 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 the 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 effectiveness, adequacy, or safety of pedestrian, bicycle, or public transit circulation.
- Result in inadequate emergency access on-site or to nearby uses.
- Conflict with regional and local plans, policies, or ordinances regarding the circulation system, including all modes of transportation (vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation).

Vehicle 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

A Traffic, Circulation and Parking Study was prepared for the Foothill Centre development project by Associated Transportation Engineers, dated November 14, 2011 (***Exhibit 8 – Traffic, Circulation and Parking Study***). The report is summarized below and incorporated herein by reference. All of the intersections located in the vicinity of the project site currently operate at a Level of Service (LOS) A or B. The Traffic Study concludes that the Foothill Centre development project would generate a net traffic increase of 1,208 average daily trips (ADT), 242 A.M. peak hour trips (PHT), and 189 P.M. PHT. When distributed to the surrounding street system, the Foothill Centre development project would result in a *less than significant* project-specific and cumulative impact because intersection LOS would not be significantly impacted.

The Traffic Study acknowledges that there is a spike in traffic within the Foothill Road corridor related to the beginning of classes at La Colina Jr. High School. This traffic peak occurs for a 15-20 minute period and then returns to more evenly distributed traffic flows. Therefore, this traffic peak does not cause area intersections to operate at unacceptable levels per LOS calculations.

Short-Term Construction Traffic

The overall project construction process is estimated to last approximately 13 months. This would include grading for site preparation over approximately 4 months, and construction duration of approximately 9 months. Grading processes would involve up to 33 workers per day, and construction could require up to a maximum of 117 workers on site on occasion. Working hours during the construction process are proposed to be 7 a.m. – 5 p.m. weekdays excluding holidays. Staging, equipment, materials storage, and temporary construction worker parking would occur on-site.

The project would generate construction-related traffic that would occur over the ten-month 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. Standard conditions of approval would be applied, including restrictions on the hours permitted for construction trips outside of peak traffic hours, approval of routes for construction traffic, and designation of specific construction staging and parking areas (refer to ***Exhibit 2***).

11.b and c) Access/ Circulation/ Safety Hazards

Cieneguitas Road is a two-lane street that is not fully improved along the project frontage. The property frontage currently has three curb cuts along Cieneguitas Road, one located approximately 35 feet north of the southern property boundary, one located approximately 100 feet from the northern property boundary at Foothill Road, and a third curb cut located approximately 20 feet from the intersection of Foothill and Cieneguitas Roads. The southernmost driveway would remain to serve the Veterinary Hospital. The other two curb cuts would be removed and two new curb cuts and associated driveways would be located approximately 180 and 580 feet south of the northern property boundary at Foothill Road. These two new/replacement driveways would provide all vehicular access to the Foothill Centre development. The new driveways have been designed to provide adequate sight distance to and from the intersection of the driveway with Cieneguitas Road.

The project includes construction of formal curb, gutter, sidewalk and parkway within the Cieneguitas right-of-way, including widening the existing roadway and providing formalized on-street parking on the western side of the road. The project also includes extension of the existing northbound left-turn pocket at the Foothill Road/Cieneguitas Road intersection from 50 feet to 125 feet in length. This re-striping is intended to accommodate the increased northbound left-turn volumes associated with the Foothill Centre development in order to prevent congestion along Cieneguitas Road. The 125-foot left turn lane, with a 60-foot bay taper, would allow the left turn lane to transition back to the centerline of

Cieneguitas without conflicting with the project site's northerly driveway. The new sidewalk would be six feet wide behind a six-foot wide parkway, consistent with the City's Pedestrian Master Plan.

Foothill Road (SR 192) is a two-lane State highway that is fully improved (curb, gutter, sidewalk) along the project frontage. The project includes re-construction of formal curb, gutter, sidewalk and parkway within the Foothill Road right-of-way. These improvements would not change the existing roadway alignment or lane configuration. However, striping changes are proposed to create a bike lane within the existing eastbound traffic lane. The property frontage on Foothill Road currently has four curb cuts. These four curb cuts would be removed and no vehicular access would be provided from Foothill Road. Accordingly, the existing westbound left turn arrows painted in the two-way left turn lane would be removed. The sidewalk along Foothill Road would be widened to twelve feet and would include tree wells with grates and new street trees, consistent with the City's Pedestrian Master Plan.

The project site is located in an urbanized area and there are no incompatible uses that would result in a vehicle mix that could increase traffic hazards. The City Fire Department has determined that adequate emergency and fire access is provided for the project. Therefore, proposed project impacts associated with vehicular access, circulation and evacuation related to the new driveway location and access to and from the new development would be *less than significant* because it has been reviewed and found adequate by the City's Public Works, Engineering and Transportation Divisions, and Fire Department.

11.d) Bicycle/Pedestrian/Public Transit

A transit stop exists along the site's Foothill Road frontage. This transit stop is anticipated to provide adequate transit resources for the project demands. A new bus shelter would be provided as part of the Foothill Centre development to improve the usability of this transit stop. MTD's Line 10 (La Cumbre/State to Camino Real Marketplace) serves the area with hourly buses. There is also a school booster transit stop on the Cieneguitas frontage, which would be relocated approximately 240 feet to the south to better accommodate vehicles entering and exiting the project site. On-street bike lanes (Class II) in the area exist on Cathedral Oaks Road, State Street, La Cumbre Road and Hope Avenue, and a Class III bike lane is provided on Cieneguitas Road. There is also an existing off-street multi-purpose path that runs from Cieneguitas and Primavera Roads to Calle Real. The project would install a Class II bike lane (8 feet in width) along the eastbound side of Foothill Road from the Hwy 154 NB offramp to the intersection of Foothill and Cieneguitas Roads.

There is existing sidewalk with tree wells along the project's Foothill Road frontage that would be improved and widened to provide a twelve-foot wide sidewalk with tree wells to serve the area's pedestrian needs. A new six-foot wide sidewalk and six-foot wide parkway would be installed along Cieneguitas Road to serve the area's pedestrian needs. Pedestrians and bicyclists would continue to share the existing right-of-way, and these facilities would be improved as a result of the project. Project impacts associated with pedestrian, bicycle or public transit facilities would be *less than significant* because the new medical office development would not result in a substantial increase in the need for new transit facilities, bike lanes or sidewalks in the area, and the project is providing new and/or improved pedestrian and bike facilities on Foothill and Cieneguitas Roads.

11.e) Congestion Management

The Foothill Centre development project would also comply with the Santa Barbara County Association of Government's Congestion Management Program for the region, as analyzed in the Traffic Study. The project involves construction of a medical office development in an area surrounded by residential uses. The project site would have direct access from a public street and would not conflict with or impede implementation of any policies, plans, programs, or ordinances regarding congestion management and the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation. Therefore, there would be a *less than significant* impact to congestion management and the circulation system.

Transportation –Mitigation

No mitigation is required. Refer to ***Exhibit 2*** for Standard Conditions of Approval Applicable to Project.

Transportation – Residual Impact

Less than significant.

12. WATER ENVIRONMENT Could the project:	NO	YES Level of Significance
a) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?		Less Than Significant
b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		Less Than Significant
c) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		Less Than Significant
d) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		Less Than Significant
e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		Less Than Significant
f) Substantially alter the existing drainage patterns of the site or area, including through the alternation of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		Less Than Significant
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	X	
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	X	
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of failure of a levee or dam?	X	

Water – Discussion

Issues: Water resources 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.
- Altering drainage patterns or affecting creeks in a way that would cause substantial erosion, siltation, or on- or off-site flooding.

Water Quality

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

The City of Santa Barbara began implementing the Storm Water Management Program (SWMP) in January of 2009. The purpose of the SWMP is to implement and enforce a program designed to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the "maximum extent practicable" (MEP) to protect water quality. The SWMP addresses discharge of pollutants both during construction and after construction. The water quality treatment requirement is to retain and treat the 1-inch, 24-hr. storm event. The peak runoff discharge rate requirement is that the peak runoff discharge rate shall not exceed the pre-development rate up to the 25 year storm. The volume reduction requirement is to retain on site the volume difference between pre and post conditions for the 25-yr, 24-hr storm or the 1-inch storm (whichever is larger).

Flooding and Hazards

- 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 Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The majority of the site is undeveloped and is mostly grass/dirt with some small brush and trees. Drainage currently flows in a southerly direction and water naturally infiltrates into the exposed soil.

12.a-c) Groundwater Quantity and Quality

Refer to Hazards Section for a discussion of existing groundwater contamination. Ground water was encountered (March 2003) at approximately 30-1/2 feet blow existing ground surface (approx. elevation of 185 feet above mean sea level). Runoff of pollutants from parking areas or other hardscape could degrade ground water quality. Compliance with standard City Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) requirements would 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 in the parking areas and the project's proposed storm water management plan, as discussed below. Additionally, the proposed bio-retention basin would be lined to eliminate potential impacts to groundwater associated with that storm water management and treatment area.

12.d-f) Drainage, Stormwater; Surface Water Quality; and Alteration of Creeks

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 SWMP and the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges, the City requires that any increase in storm water 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 a detention basin, vegetated swales, planter boxes and bio-retention designs to capture and treat runoff prior to discharging into the public drainage system. A Preliminary Drainage Report, prepared by Penfield & Smith, summarized herein and incorporated by reference (***Exhibit 9***), indicates that the peak runoff flow rate and total volume difference for the pre- and post-project conditions for the 25 year storm event would be 10,236 cubic feet, with a peak runoff of 0.67 cubic feet per second (cfs). Pre-project runoff (25-year storm event) is 10.11 cfs, and post-project runoff (25-year storm event) would be 9.56 cfs, which represents a 0.55 cfs reduction in runoff for the 25-year storm event. The proposed storm water Best Management Practices have been designed to capture, retain or detain as appropriate and treat the post-construction storm water runoff. Therefore, the proposed storm water management plan complies with the City's SWMP requirements. Long-term water quality impacts are addressed by the Foothill Centre's proposed storm water management design as identified above, and impacts associated with drainage, storm water, and surface water quality would be *less than significant*.

Project grading activities create the potential for temporary, incremental and localized erosion and sedimentation affecting water quality. Numerous federal state and local regulatory programs have been established to minimize impacts to water quality resulting from construction operations. Surface water quality impacts are therefore considered *less than significant* through implementation of standard erosion control measures.

Due to the distance from surrounding creeks, and with implementation of the storm water management design identified above, the project's impacts to creeks would be *less than significant*.

12.g-i) Flooding

The project site is not located in a flood hazard zone or in an area prone to regular flooding. The flooding potential would not change following project occupancy, nor would the project substantially alter the course or flow of flood waters. Therefore, the project would have *no impact* related to flooding.

Water Resources - Mitigation

No mitigation required.

Water Resources – Residual Impact

Less than significant.

13. LAND USE AND PLANNING		YES	NO
	Would the project:		
a)	Physically divide an established community?		X
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?		X

Land Use and Planning – Discussion

13.a.) Physically Divide Community

The project does not involve a cross-town freeway, storm channel, utility transmission lines or any other improvements that have the potential to physically divide the community. The project would not close any existing bridges or roadways. The project would connect, via a new driveway, to the existing street system and would not create any physical barriers that would divide the community.

13.b.) Conflicts with Plans for Avoiding Environmental Effect

While completing each section of this Initial Study, an analysis was undertaken within each resource section and the Plans and Policy Section of the potential conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Required mitigation measures related to hazards would ensure that the project is consistent with applicable plans and policies for those resource areas. Mitigation Measures H-1 through H-3 are required to ensure that impacts associated with contaminated soil and/or groundwater are minimized and that the project is consistent with applicable policies of the City's General Plan Environmental Resources Element. Additional mitigation measures related to biological resources, geophysical conditions and short-term noise are recommended to further reduce any adverse but less than significant impacts and to ensure consistency with applicable policies of the general Plan.

Therefore, with mitigation, the project is not in conflict with any adopted land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Land Use and Planning – Required Mitigation

See H-1 through H-3.

Land Use and Planning – Recommended Mitigation

See BIO-1, G-1 and N-1 through N-4.

Land Use and Planning – Residual Impacts

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) **Biological and Cultural Resources**

As discussed in Section 3 (Biological Resources), 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) **Short-Term vs. Long-Term Environmental Goals**

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) **Cumulative Impacts**

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 because the project contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considerable.

d) **Other Environmental Effects**

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 hazards 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 biological resources, geophysical conditions and noise.

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.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the project in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6. The draft MMRP is attached here as ***Exhibit 11.***

Alli DeBusk — 3-22-12

Initial Study Preparer — Date

Amy Fado — 3/22/12

Environmental Analyst — Date

EXHIBITS:

1. **Project Plans**
2. **Standard Conditions of Approval Applicable to Project**
3. **Photo Simulations prepared by Interacta and dated December 10, 2009**
4. **Site Photographs taken December 2011**
5. **ABR Minutes dated June 1, 2009, January 25, 2010 and December 13, 2010**
6. **Support for Use of Bay Area Air Quality Management District Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards**
7. **Biological Survey and Assessment prepared by Watershed Environmental, Inc. and dated October 20, 2009**
8. **Traffic, Circulation and Parking Study prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers and dated November 14, 2011 (Technical Appendix available upon request)**
9. **Preliminary Drainage Report prepared by Penfield & Smith and dated November 14, 2011**
10. **Applicable General Plan Policies**
11. **Draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

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.

Project Specific Sources

Air Quality Technical Report and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis, prepared by Dudek and dated March 2012

Clarification of Cardno ERI Report (December 6, 2011), prepared by Geosyntec and dated December 15, 2011

Construction Schedule – Preliminary Plan dated November 14, 2011

Foothill Convenience Center Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, prepared by Santa Barbara County Resource Management Department and dated February 1992

Geotechnical Engineering Report, prepared by Fugro West, Inc. and dated April 2003

Geotechnical Response to September 28, 2011 DART Letter Comments, Review of Project Site Plan and Preliminary

Drainage Report, prepared by Fugro Consultants and dated October 11, 2011

Groundwater Modeling Study to Evaluate Potential Mounding due to trench Abandonment, prepared by Entrix and dated October 4, 2010

Opinions Regarding Infiltration Potential of On-Site Soils, prepared by Fugro West, Inc. and dated February 8, 2010

Parking Analysis Addendum, prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers and dated February 2, 2012

Response to City of Santa Barbara Development Application Review Team (DART) Comments dated December 17, 2009, prepared by Fugro West, Inc. and dated January 14, 2010

Response to Item A8, City of Santa Barbara Development Application Review Team Comments dated December 17, 2009, prepared by Fugro West, Inc. and dated May 3, 2010

Site Assessment Report, prepared by Cardno ERI and dated December 6, 2011

Soil Gas Survey and Vapor Migration Health Risk Assessment, prepared by Komex and dated April 11, 2005

Solid Waste Calculations Worksheet

Supplemental Review of Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan and Response to DART Comment Regarding Construction Dewatering, prepared by Fugro Consultants and dated November 11, 2011

Traffic, Circulation and Parking Study Technical Appendix prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers and dated November 14, 2011

Water/Sewer Calculation Worksheet

Work Plan for Site Assessment Activities, prepared by Cardno ERI and dated May 13, 2011

Work Plan for Trench Abandonment, prepared by Environmental Resolutions, Inc. and dated July 1, 2010

General Sources

Bay Area Air Quality Management District Air Quality Guidelines (May 2011)

California Building Code as adopted by City

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) & CEQA Guidelines

General Plan (December 2011)

- Land Use Element
- Housing Element
- Open Space, Parks and Recreation Element
- Economy and Fiscal Health Element
- Environmental Resources Element
- Circulation Element
- Safety and Public Services Element

General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report

Geology Assessment for the City of Santa Barbara

Institute of Traffic Engineers Parking Generation Manual

Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual

Long Term Water Supply Plan (2011)

Master Environmental Assessment

Master Environmental Assessment Maps (2008)

Parking Design Standards

Regional Growth Impacts Study (1980)

Santa Barbara County APCD Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents (December 2011)

Santa Barbara Municipal Code & City Charter

Special District Map

Zoning Ordinance & Zoning Map