CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION – MST2005-00455

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 Final Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the following project:

PROJECT LOCATION: **1722 State Street**

PROJECT PROPONENT: **Jan R. Hochhauser, Hochhauser Blatter Architecture and Planning**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project involves the construction of a 56,615 square foot (net) three-story building that would provide both residential and commercial uses. The project would provide 12 residential condominium units (23,606 total net square feet), and 9,100 net square feet of area to be used for commercial condominiums. Parking for the residential units and commercial uses would be provided in a 23,909 net square foot below-grade parking area. The project proposes to provide 22 parking spaces for the residential uses, and 33 spaces for the commercial uses, for a total of 55 shared spaces. Access to the underground parking garage would be provided by a single driveway located along State Street.

Ten (10) of the proposed residential units would be market rate units, and two would be inclusionary middle-income affordable units. Eight (8) of the market rate units would have two-bedrooms and would range between 1,771 and 2,349 net square feet in size. Two (2) of the market rate units would have three bedrooms and would range between 1,988 and 2,680 net square feet in area. Of the two affordable units, one would have two bedrooms (976 net square feet) and the other would have three bedrooms (1,179 net square feet).

A variety of commercial uses could be located in the proposed project, including a mix of specialty retail, general office and medical-dental office space.

Required Permits: In order for the project to proceed, the following discretionary approvals are required by the Planning Commission:

1. A Zoning Map Amendment to change the zoning from R-1, One Family Residential, to R-3, Limited Multi-Family Residence Zone (SBMC §28.92.080.B);
2. A Modification to allow 55 parking spaces instead of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code required 63 spaces (SBMC §28.90.100.G & I and §28.92.110.A.1);

3. A Modification of the minimum lot area required to allow for 9 two-bedroom units and 3 three-bedroom units on a 28,875 square foot lot instead of the required 29,280 square feet of lot area in order to accommodate two inclusionary (bonus density) housing units (SBMC §28.21.080.G and §28.92.110.A.2);

4. A Development Plan to allow Minor and Small Additions for the construction of a 1,600 square foot increase of nonresidential development (SBMC §28.87.300);

5. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create twelve (12) residential condominium units and 15,576 square feet of commercial condominium space (SBMC §27.07 and 27.13); and

6. A Conditional Use Permit to allow nonresidential parking in a residential zone (SBMC §28.94.030 H).

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FINDING:

Based on the attached Initial Study prepared for the proposed project, it has been determined that, with implementation of identified required mitigation measures, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

DAGmdalena
Environmental Analyst

2-15-07
Date

1722 STATE STREET

FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

FEBRUARY 15, 2007

INTRODUCTION:

An Initial Study was prepared for the subject project because the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires environmental assessment of the proposal. The Environmental Analyst found that, although the proposed project could potentially have significant adverse impacts related to air quality (short-term), biological resources, geophysical conditions, hazards, noise (long-term), transportation/circulation (long-term) and water resources, mitigation measures described in the Initial Study and agreed to by the applicant would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. In addition, recommended mitigation measures were identified to further reduce less than significant impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality (short-term), biological resources, cultural resources, noise (short-term), public services and traffic/circulation (short-term) issues.

A Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared. A public review period was held from January 18, 2007 to February 7, 2007. Two comment letters were received during the comment period:

1. California Regional Water Quality Control Board
2. Jackie Quinn

Responses to the comments received on the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration are provided below, and the comment letters received are attached.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board (letter dated February 7, 2007)

This comment letter indicates that the proposed project should implement Low Impact Design measures to reduce runoff from the project site and to minimize potential impacts to the quality of runoff water. The existing project site consists almost entirely of impervious surface area, including a parking lot. The hydrology analysis for the proposed project concluded that the project would result in a small net reduction in runoff water volume when compared to existing conditions. The project would also eliminate the existing on-site parking lot and provide required parking beneath the proposed structure. The use of covered parking would eliminate a surface water pollution source that presently exists on the project site.

Conditions of approval for the proposed project will require that it comply with the City's Storm Water Management Program (SWMP). Compliance with the SWMP would include the implementation of runoff water control best management practices, such as the use of permeable paving materials, storm drainage interceptors or clarifiers, or other approved measures to minimize storm water pollutants from hard-surfaced areas prior to discharge into the public storm drain system. With the implementation of these requirements, the proposed project would not result in significant runoff water quality impacts.

Jackie Quinn (letter dated February 7, 2007)

The comment letter expresses concern regarding the size of the proposed project. This comment does not address the review of the environmental impacts that may result from the implementation of the project. The proposed project would rezone the project site to "R-3," similar to the existing zoning of property adjacent to the project site to the south. The proposed "R-3" zoning would also be compatible with the commercial (C-2) zoning that is provided on parcels adjacent to the project site to the north and south. The proposed project has requested a modification to allow the development of nine two-bedroom units and three three-bedroom units on a 28,875 square foot lot, rather than the required 29,280 square foot lot. The proposed adjustment of minimum lot size requirements is relatively minor and would not result in a substantial increase in residential unit density above what would be allowed by zoning requirements for the R-3 zone. The design of the proposed project would provide front yard setbacks greater than or similar to other buildings in the project area along State Street, and the height of the building is consistent with zoning requirements and is similar to several other nearby buildings along State Street. Based on these and other factors considered by the Initial Study, it was concluded that with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in significant aesthetic or other environmental impacts. Therefore, the size of the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts.

The comment letter requests that the City conduct an environmental analysis of future development projects in the State Street area in the subject project's vicinity, similar to analysis prepared for the Upper State Street area. The Upper State Street Study is a City Council directed effort in response to multiple substantial development proposals in the Upper State Street area (approximately Alamar Avenue on the east to Calle Real on the west). The USSS is focused on roadway improvements and amendments to development and design standards that could occur within the existing City policy framework. The area of State Street where the subject project is located is not experiencing the same development pressures as the Upper State Street area, and at this time there is no basis to undertake a planning study comparable to the USSS for this area. The Initial Study prepared for the subject project did, however, review the cumulative environmental effects of the subject project in light of past, present, and potential future development in the surrounding area. The conclusions of the Initial Study are that, with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, potential project-specific and cumulative environmental impacts of the proposed project would be reduced to a less than significant level. There is no basis under the requirements of CEQA to require the proposed project to conduct a planning evaluation of the State Street area in the subject project's vicinity. However, the request for such a planning evaluation will be provided to decision-makers for the proposed project for their consideration.

The comment letter requests an explanation of the conclusion that the proposed project would result in fewer traffic trips than the traffic generated by existing and previous occupants of the building located on the project site. The table provided on page 33 of the Initial Study, and that is provided below, includes estimates of the number of average daily trips and peak hour trips that would have resulted from the former use of the project site building as a bank, and trip generation characteristics resulting from the use of the existing building as a classroom and ATM facility. Those trip generation estimates are compared to the traffic trip generation

estimates for the proposed project. All traffic generation estimates were based on published trip generation data for similar land uses. As shown on the table, the proposed mixed use project would generate fewer average daily trips and fewer peak hour trips than the former and existing uses of the building located on the project site.

Land Use	Average Daily Trips	AM Peak Hour Trips	PM Peak Hour Trips
Bank	622	31	132
Proposed Project	347	28	67
Difference	**-275**	**-3**	**-65**
Classrooms/ATMs	770	44	77
Proposed Project	347	28	67
Difference	**-423**	**-16**	**-10**

CONCLUSION

The environmental analysis demonstrates that, with the identified mitigation measures agreed to by the applicant, the project as proposed would not result in significant environmental impacts. The project therefore qualifies for a Mitigated Negative Declaration and no further analysis of alternatives is required as part of the environmental document.

Attachments: Public Comment letters received

Linda Adams
Secretary for Environmental Protection

California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Central Coast Region

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

Internet Address: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb3
895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101, San Luis Obispo, California 93401
Phone (805) 549-3147 • FAX (805) 543-0397

February 7, 2007

RECEIVED
FEB 12 2007
CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
PLANNING DIVISION

Allison De Busk
P.O. Box 1990
Santa Barbara, CA 93102

Ms. Allison De Busk:

RE: Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, 1772 State Street, Santa Barbara County SCH#

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above-referenced document. The Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) is a responsible agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Water Board staff understands that the project proposes the development of a 69,799 square foot three-story building that would provide both residential and commercial uses. We recommend you require Low Impact Development (LID) design techniques for the proposed project. LID or equivalent methods are necessary to mitigate stormwater runoff pollution and stream erosion and sedimentation impacts that result from significantly increased downstream flows due to introduced impermeable surfaces.

Your project may be subject to the NPDES Phase 2 Municipal Stormwater Permit (Permit). The Permit requires new and redevelopments to reduce control runoff volume and pollutant load to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP). In most cases, MEP standards are not met by conventional site layouts, construction methods, and storm water conveyance systems with "end of pipe" basins and treatment systems that do not address the changes in volume and rates of storm water runoff and urban pollutants (including thermal pollution). Low Impact Development practices meet the MEP standard and are more effective at reducing pollutants in storm water runoff at a practicable cost.

LID is an alternative site design strategy that uses natural and engineered infiltration and storage techniques to control stormwater runoff where it is generated. The objective is to disperse LID devices uniformly across a site to minimize runoff. LID serves to preserve the hydrologic and environmental functions altered by conventional stormwater management. LID methods provide temporary retention areas, increase infiltration, allow for pollutant removal and control the release of stormwater into adjacent waterways (Anne Guillette, Whole Building Design Guide). For further reference please see:

http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/lid/

Eight Common LID Practices Include:

1. Reduced and Disconnected Impervious Surfaces
2. Native Vegetation Preservation
3. Bioretention
4. Tree Boxes to Capture and Infiltrate Street Runoff
5. Vegetated Swales, Buffers, and Strips
6. Roof Leader Flows Directed to Planter Boxes and Other Vegetated Areas
7. Permeable Pavement
8. Soil Amendments to Increase Infiltration Rates

Water Board staff considers a project that meets the following descriptions (inclusive) to be a "Low Impact Development" project:

A. Runoff Volume Control. The pre-development stormwater runoff volume is maintained by a combination of minimizing the site disturbance, and providing distributed retention BMPs. Retention BMPs are structures that retain the excess (above pre-development project volumes) runoff resulting from the development for the design storm event (2-, 10-, and 25-year, 24-hour duration storm). Note that "retention" is required, as opposed to "detention"; retention may be achieved using infiltration methods, and capture-for-use methods.

B. Peak Runoff Rate Control. Low impact development practices maintain the pre-development peak runoff discharge rate. This is done by maintaining the pre-development time of concentration and then using retention and/or detention BMPs (e.g., rain gardens, open drainage systems, etc.) that are distributed throughout the site, to control runoff volume. If retention practices are not sufficient to control the peak runoff rate, detention practices may be added.

C. Flow Frequency Duration Control. Since low impact development emulates the pre-development hydrologic regime through both volume and peak runoff rate controls, the flow frequency and duration of post-development conditions must be identical (to the greatest extent possible) to those of pre-development conditions. Maintaining pre-development hydrologic conditions will minimize or eliminate potential impacts on downstream habitat due to erosion and sedimentation.

Please consider these comments in the approval process for this project. If you have questions, please contact Donette Dunaway at (805) 549-3698.

Sincerely,

Roger W. Briggs
Executive Officer

S:\CEQA\Comment Letters\Santa Barbara County\1772 State Street.doc

DISTRIBUTED TO: DATE: 2/8/07
PLANNING COMMISSION (7)
SR. PLANNER, ASST. CITY ATTY
CASE PLANNER APPLICANT('S)
AGENT PC SEC, ENTERED AS INT
PARTY ON DATE: 2/8/07
BY:

JACKIE QUINN
1720 Chapala Street #9
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Telephone: (805) 963-0755

February 7, 2007

Via Email

Attn: Allison De Busk
Association Planner
Planning Division
City of Santa Barbara
P.O. Box 1990
Santa Barbara, CA 93102-1990

Re: Notice of Intent to Adopt Draft Negative Declaration – MST2005-00455
1722 State Street

Dear Ms. De Busk:

I am writing to you as both a concerned neighbor and also as Secretary of the Board of Directors of Bella Villeta Condominium Association located at 1720 Chapala Street.

We are concerned with the size of the project being proposed. We would also like the City to do an environmental analysis of the impacts of future development of this area, as you are doing on upper State Street. We understand your report indicates that traffic will actually be reduced from historical averages. We do not understand how this conclusion was reached.

We are concerned about the canyonization of Santa Barbara and, in particular, of this area.

Sincerely,

Jackie Quinn

RECEIVED
FEB 0 8 2007
CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
PLANNING DIVISION

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING DIVISION

FINAL INITIAL STUDY/ ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST MST2005-00455

PROJECT: 1722 State Street

February 15, 2007

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

APPLICANT/ PROPERTY OWNER

Applicant: Jan R. Hochhauser, Hochhauser Blatter Architecture and Planning

Owner: 1722 State Street Investors, LLC

PROJECT ADDRESS/LOCATION

The 28,875 square foot (0.66 acre) project site is located on the northern side of State Street, between Valerio Street to the south and Islay Street to the north, and is commonly known as 1722 State Street. The site is in the Upper East neighborhood of the City of Santa Barbara. See **Exhibit A-Vicinity Map.**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (See Exhibit B-Project Plans)

Project Components. The applicant proposes to construct a 69,799 square feet (gross) building that would provide both residential and commercial uses. The project would provide 12 residential condominium units (29,837 total square feet), and 15,576 square feet of area to be used for commercial condominiums. Parking for the residential units and commercial uses would be provided in a 24,386 square foot below-grade parking area. The project proposes to provide 22 parking spaces for the residential uses, and 33 spaces for the commercial uses, for a total of 55 shared spaces. Access to the underground parking garage would be provided by a single driveway located along State Street.

The height of the proposed building would vary, but the structure would have a maximum height of 43 feet above existing grade. The portion of the building adjacent to State Street and along the project site's southern property line would be three stories. Proposed commercial uses would be provided on the first and second floors of the building adjacent to State Street. Two residential units would be provided on the third floor adjacent to State Street, and the other 10 residential units would be provided on the first, second and third floors of the remaining building area. A total of 5,122 square feet of common open space area would be provided for the residential uses on the project site.

Ten (10) of the proposed residential units would be market rate units, and two would be inclusionary affordable units. Eight (8) of the market rate units would have two-bedrooms and would range between 1,771 and 2,349 net square feet in size. Two (2) of the market rate units would have three bedrooms and would range between 1,988 and 2,680 net square feet in area. Of the two affordable units, one would have two bedrooms (976 net square feet) and the other would have three bedrooms (1,179 net square feet).

A variety of commercial uses could be located in the proposed project, including a mix of specialty retail, general office and medical-dental office space. The project would provide a net total of 9,100 square feet of commercial floor space.

Construction. The applicant estimates that project construction would require approximately 18 months to complete after the commencement of demolition activities through building construction and landscaping. Project construction activities would include three major phases: Demolition, grading and construction.

Demolition. Demolition activities include the removal of the existing 7,500 square foot, two-story structure, and the removal of other on-site improvements (paving, concrete walks and curbs, etc). It is estimated that demolition activities would require approximately ten (10) working days to complete.

Grading. The project would require approximately 8,594 cubic yards of cut and approximately 255 cubic yards of fill. Approximately 8,339 cubic yards of soil would be exported from the project site. It is estimated that grading operations would require approximately 12-15 working days to complete.

Construction. Construction activities would include pouring concrete for foundations, building framing, and general construction activities. Construction activities would continue for the remainder of the project's 18-month construction duration.

Required Permits. The proposed project requires the following discretionary approvals:

1. A Zoning Map Amendment to change the zoning from R-1, One Family Residential, to R-3, Limited Multi-Family Residence Zone (SBMC §28.92.080.B);
2. A Modification to allow 55 parking spaces instead of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code required 63 spaces (SBMC §28.90.100.G & I and §28.92.110.A.1);
3. A Modification of the minimum lot area required to allow for 9 two-bedroom units and 3 three-bedroom units on a 28,875 square foot lot instead of the required 29,280 square feet of lot area (SBMC §28.21.080.G and §28.92.110.A.2);
4. A Development Plan to allow the construction of a 1,600 square foot increase of nonresidential development (SBMC §28.87.300);
5. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create twelve (12) residential condominium units and 15,576 square feet of commercial condominium space (SBMC §27.07 and 27.13); and
6. A Conditional Use Permit to allow nonresidential parking in a residential zone. (SBMC §28.94).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Site Characteristics

Existing Development. The project site is occupied by a two-story 7,500 square foot building that was originally developed as bank. The interior of the building has been converted into offices and classrooms for the Brooks Institute. Automatic teller machines are located on the western side of the building facing State Street. The remaining portions of the project site are paved and a limited amount of landscaping is provided.

Topography. The project site has an elevation of approximately 150 feet above sea level, is generally level and slopes gently to the south. The project site is approximately eight feet lower in elevation than adjoining properties to the east. A retaining wall along the eastern project site property line provides the grade separation between the project site and adjacent properties.

Seismic/Geologic Conditions. The project site is underlain by Quaternary-aged older dissected sediments. Soil borings to a maximum depth of eight feet on the project site did not encounter groundwater. In the downtown area, groundwater depths generally range between 200 and 400 feet below the ground surface, although areas with perched groundwater at shallower depths may be encountered. The inferred location of the potentially active Mesa Fault is approximately 5,000 feet south of the project site. The soils report prepared for the project determined that the potential for liquefaction to affect the project site is very low, and that project site soils have

a very low potential for expansion and are non-compressible (PML, 2005).

Flooding/Drainage. The project site is located beyond the mapped boundaries of the 500-year flood plain.

Biological Resources. The project site is located within an urban area and has been previously developed. Vegetation on the project site consists primarily of ornamental landscaping. Three large ficus trees are located in the northwest corner of the project site adjacent to the State Street sidewalk. A large oak tree is located on the parcel east of and adjacent to the project site. A portion of this tree extends across the property line onto the project site.

Archaeological Resources. The project site was the subject of a Phase I Archaeological investigation (MAC, 2006). Due to structures and paving that cover most of the project site, no archaeological or historical resources were identified by the survey. The project site is considered to have a moderate potential to contain buried prehistoric artifacts and a low potential for 20th-century historical deposits, such as historic trash pits.

Noise. Noise sources affecting the project site are primarily traffic along State Street and Islay Street. The measured noise level along Islay Street near the project site was 56 dBA Leq, and the measured noise level along State Street adjacent to the project site was 69 dBA Leq (Dudek, 2006).

Hazards. The Phase I Site Assessment prepared for the project site (Rincon, 2005) indicates that groundwater beneath the property has been impacted with gasoline constituents originating from one or more upgradient offsite sources. Based on soil samples collected from four groundwater monitoring wells located on the project site, soil beneath the site has not been impacted by gasoline constituents. Recent groundwater sampling indicates that concentrations of ethylene dichloride are above the Santa Barbara County Fire Prevention Division investigation levels for this contaminant.

PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS

Assessor's Parcel Number:	027-102-021	**General Plan Designation:**	General Commercial and Offices
Existing Land Use:	7,500 former bank building currently use for photography and videography classrooms	**Parcel Size:**	28,875 square feet (0.66 acre)
Zoning:	Approximately 24,750 sq. ft. of the project site is zoned C-2 Approximately 4,125 square feet of the site is zoned R-1	**Proposed Land Use:**	69,799 sq. ft. Mixed Use building. • 12 residential units (29,837 gross sq. ft.) • Commercial Office space (15,576 gross sq. ft.) • 55 underground parking spaces (24,386 gross sq. ft.)
Slope:	Less than 4-5% southward towards State Street		
SURROUNDING LAND USES:			
North:	Commercial and Residential (C-2 and R-1)		
South:	Commercial/Office (C-2 and R-3)		
East:	Residential (R-1 and E-1)		
West:	State Street, Commercial (C-2)		

PLANS AND POLICY DISCUSSION

Land Use and Zoning Designations

The project site is designated "General Commercial and Offices" by the General Plan Land Use Element. The site is zoned "C-2" (Commercial Zone) and "R-1" (Single-Family Residential). Residential development is permitted in the C-2 zone consistent with the requirements of the R-4 zone. A variety of commercial and office uses are permitted in the C-2 zone. The R-1 zone designation does not allow multi-family unit development as proposed by the project. Therefore, a zone change to R-3 has been requested. The proposed project would be consistent with the requirements of the R-3 zone.

General Plan Policies

Land Use Element. The project site has a General Plan designation of "General Commerce and Offices." The residential portion of the proposed mixed-use development would be subject to the density requirements of the R-3/R-4 Multiple Family Residential Zones, which allows 12 dwelling units to the acre. The General Plan Land Use and Housing Elements recognize, however, that in zones where variable density standards apply, development may exceed the limit of twelve units per acre without causing an inappropriate increase in the intensity of activities. The proposed project would result in a density of approximately 18 units per acre and is potentially consistent with the Land Use and Housing Elements of the General Plan.

Housing Element. The Housing Element encourages construction of a wide range of housing types to meet the needs of various household types. The proposed project would provide two and three bedroom units, including market-rate and affordable units. Therefore, the proposed project is potentially consistent with this goal of the Housing Element.

Neighborhood Compatibility. Housing Element Policy 3.3 requires new development to be compatible with the prevailing character of the neighborhood. The neighborhood surrounding the proposed project site is comprised of a mix of one- and two-story office, residential and commercial structures. The land uses along State Street consist of a mixture of offices and commercial businesses. The three-story portion of the proposed building that would be located along the project site's State Street frontage would provide office and commercial uses on the first and second floors. Residential uses would be provided on the third floor of the building adjacent to State Street. The rear (eastern) portion of the proposed building would be two stories in height, which would be consistent with the adjacent residential neighborhood. Additionally, as viewed from the adjacent residential areas to the east, the height of the rear (eastern) portion of the proposed building would appear to be reduced due to the existing topography of the project site, which is approximately eight feet lower than the adjacent residential properties.

A goal of the Urban Design Guidelines is compatibility of new development with the character of the City, the surrounding neighborhood, and adjacent properties. The Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) considers the Urban Design Guidelines in reviewing development proposals. The HLC reviewed the proposed project on December 14, 2005, and indicated that there was general support for the project. The three story portion of the building along State Street was considered acceptable due to the proposed building design and the appropriate stepping back of the upper portions of the structure. Therefore, the proposed building is potentially consistent with the scale, size and design with the surrounding neighborhood.

Circulation Element. The Circulation Element contains goals and policies that promote housing in and adjacent to the downtown to facilitate the use of alternative modes of transportation and to reduce the use of the automobile. For example, Circulation Element Implementation Strategy 13.1.1 encourages "the development of projects that combine and locate residential uses near areas of employment and services." The proposed project provides housing as well as commercial space in the downtown area, and transit stops are located within walking

distance of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project is potentially consistent with the requirements of the Circulation Element.

Noise Element. The City's Noise Element includes policies intended to achieve and maintain a noise environment that is compatible with the variety of human activities and land uses in the City. The proposed project would not cause a substantial long-term increase in existing noise levels at the project site or in adjacent neighborhoods, and traffic generated by the project would not result in a substantial increase in noise along adjacent streets. Short-term construction noise would be minimized through implementation of standard mitigation measures. As such, the proposed project is potentially consistent with the applicable guidelines of the Noise Element.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be prepared for the subject project in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6. Monitoring and reporting requirements are adopted as conditions of project approval.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

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

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

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

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

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

Visual Aesthetics - Discussion

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

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

Significant visual aesthetics impacts may potentially result from:

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

Visual Aesthetics – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

1.a) Scenic Views

The project site is located in an urban environment in the Upper East neighborhood of the City of Santa Barbara. The site is occupied by an existing two-story structure that is located adjacent to State Street. Paved parking areas and a limited amount of landscaping occupy the remainder of the project site. Existing development in the project vicinity includes a mix of office, commercial and residential uses. Most of the structures near the project

site are one and two stories in height, although three-story structures are located in the project site vicinity. Much of the existing development along State Street does not provide a front yard setback area.

Views of the project site are provided primarily from the adjacent street and sidewalks. Views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from view points along State Street adjacent to the project site are very limited due to intervening structures and vegetation.

The proposed project would result in the demolition of the existing on-site structure and the development of a new two- and three-story building. The height of the proposed structure would vary, but the building would have a maximum height of 43 feet above existing grade. The project would not substantially change existing skyline views as seen from State Street, nor would it significantly obstruct or change scenic views of the mountains and hillside areas of the City. The project would increase building mass adjacent to State Street, but the size, height and location of the proposed structure would be consistent with other development located in the vicinity. Therefore, potential impacts to scenic views would be less than significant.

1.b) On-Site Aesthetics

The proposed project would result in the demolition of the existing building on the project site, which has a monolithic appearance and provides little in the way of architectural detailing. The proposed project design incorporates Mediterranean style architecture, including a plaster exterior wall finish and a red tile roof. The proposed building would provide varied roof lines, a variety of window styles, arches, balcony openings, and separations between major portions of the structure.

Front yard setbacks along State Street for the first and second floors of the proposed building would vary from zero to four feet, consistent with other buildings in the project area. The third floor of the building along State Street would be stepped back from the street by approximately 15 feet. Therefore, the architectural design of the proposed building helps to reduce its overall mass and appearance as it would be viewed from State Street. Parking for the proposed project would be located below grade beneath the proposed building. Therefore, parking areas would not be visible from State Street or surrounding properties.

Landscaping on the project site is presently very limited and generally consists of small ornamental plants, although three large ficus trees are located in the front of the project site adjacent to State Street. Two of the three ficus trees would be removed by the proposed project. Removal of the two trees would result in an adverse, but less than significant aesthetic impact. Adverse visual impacts resulting from the removal of the ficus trees would also be reduced by the proposed project's design, which would provide a landscape planter in northwest corner of the project site, as well as new street tree wells along State Street, that could be used to provide replacement trees. Proposed mitigation measure B-1 (Tree Replacement) requires that the project provide at least four replacement trees that upon maturity would provide a large canopy area, similar to the existing ficus trees.

The architectural plans for the proposed project were reviewed by the HLC, and it was concluded that there was general support for the project's design. The project would be required to receive final review and approval by the HLC for consistency with design guidelines, views, visual aesthetics and compatibility, and lighting. Therefore, based on the current project design, as well as required review by HLC, the proposed project's onsite aesthetics impacts are considered less than significant.

1.c) Lighting

Lighting on the project site is provided around the existing building and in the parking areas. The proposed project would provide outdoor lighting typical for commercial and residential areas, although placing the required parking area below the proposed building would limit the need for on-site safety/security lighting. Interior lighting provided within the building would not be a substantial source of new light in the project area. A lighting plan has not been provided for the proposed project, however, all proposed exterior lighting would be required to comply with the requirements of the City's Outdoor Lighting and Design Ordinance (SBMC §22.75), which limits exterior lighting placement, height, and requires that lighting be hooded and directed so that it is not

directed offsite. Compliance with this ordinance, as enforced by HLC review of the lighting plan, would ensure that impacts from exterior lighting are less than significant.

Visual Aesthetics – Recommended Mitigation

A-1 **Design Review.** Prior to building permit issuance, proposed project grading and landform alteration, structural design, landscaping, and lighting plans shall receive preliminary and final review and approval by the Historic Landmarks Commission. The required review and approval will ensure project consistency with design guidelines related to views, visual aesthetics and compatibility, and lighting.

A-2 **Lighting.** Lighting design shall conform with City Lighting Ordinance requirements, including shielding and direction to the ground to avoid off-site lighting and glare effects. The proposed lighting plan shall be approved by the Historic Landmarks Commission.

Visual Aesthetics - Residual Impacts

Project-related impacts to visual resources and aesthetics would be less than significant and would be further reduced with implementation of the measures identified above.

2. AIR QUALITY Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** *Level of Significance*
a)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?		Less than Significant
b)	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
c)	Create objectionable odors?	X	
Is the project consistent with the County of Santa Barbara Air Quality Attainment Plan? Yes			

Air Quality - Discussion

Issues. Air quality issues involve pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and industrial or other stationary sources that contribute to smog, particulates and nuisance dust associated with grading and construction processes, and nuisance odors.

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

The City of Santa Barbara is part of the South Coast Air Basin. The City is subject to the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are more stringent than the national standards, for six pollutants: photochemical ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, and lead. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) provides oversight on compliance with air quality standards and preparation of the County Clean Air Plan. Presently, the County of Santa Barbara is in non-attainment with the CAAQS for ozone (O_3) and particulate matter (PM_{10}). An area is in nonattainment for a pollutant if the applicable CAAQS for that pollutant has been exceeded more than once in three years. There are also heavily congested intersections within the City that may approach the California 1-hour standard of 20 parts per million for carbon monoxide (CO) during peak traffic hours.

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

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

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

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

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

Exhaust from construction equipment also contributes to air pollution. As a guideline, SBCAPCD Rule 202.F.3 identifies a substantial effect associated with projects having combined emissions from all construction equipment that exceed 25 tons of any pollutant (except carbon monoxide) within a 12-month period.

Cumulative Impacts and Consistency with Clean Air Plan: If the project-specific impact exceeds the 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.

Air Quality – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

2.a-b) Air Pollutant Emissions

Long-Term (Operational) Emissions. Long-term project-related air pollutant emissions would result primarily from vehicle trips generated by the project and from stationary sources required for the operation of the project (space heating, cooling, water heaters, etc). Depending on their size and air emission characteristics, stationary sources may require permits from the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD).

The proposed project would generate approximately 347 average daily vehicle trips. It is estimated that project-generated vehicle trips would result in NOx emissions of approximately 4.40 pounds per day, and approximately 3.46 pounds of ROC per day (URBEMIS 8.7). Therefore, project-related mobile emission would be below the

threshold of significance of 25 pounds per day. Long-term operation of emissions sources such as heaters and consumer products would result in approximately 0.16 pounds of NOx per day, and approximately 0.60 pounds of ROC per day. Therefore, the proposed project's long term combined mobile and stationary emissions would be substantially below the significance threshold of 240 pounds per day.

Long-term emissions resulting from the proposed project would be substantially below significance thresholds adopted by the SBAPCD and City of Santa Barbara. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant long-term air quality impact.

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions. Development of the proposed project would require the use of construction equipment for demolition, grading, excavation, transport of soils from the site, paving, and landscaping activities. The use of this equipment would have the potential to cause localized nuisance dust impacts and contribute to particulate matter (PM10) emissions in the air basin. Standard mitigation measures, including site watering, covering of transported soil and stockpiles, and planting, paving, or other treatment of graded areas are considered adequate to reduce project-related dust generation impacts to a less than significant level.

The existing building located on the project site that would be demolished has the potential to contain materials that contain asbestos. SBAPCD regulations require that prior to obtaining a demolition permit, the building must be surveyed to identify the presence of regulated asbestos containing material (any material containing greater than one percent friable asbestos). If regulated asbestos containing material is identified, that material must be removed by a licensed asbestos contractor in accordance with applicable APCD, state and federal regulations before the building is demolished. Compliance with these regulations would reduce the potential for the uncontrolled release of asbestos fibers to the environment to a less than significant level. Asbestos containing waste that is removed from the project site buildings must be placed in a package or container that prevents spilling or breaking during transport, and that is appropriately labeled as containing asbestos material. If more than 50 pounds of asbestos containing waste is to be transported from the project site, it must be hauled to a permitted treatment, storage or disposal site by a registered waste hauler. The removal of asbestos containing materials prior to building demolition as required by federal, state and local regulations would be adequate to reduce potential asbestos-related hazards to the environment, public and workers to a less than significant level.

Project-related construction equipment would also emit NOx and ROC emissions. Based on the small size of the project site, the limited amount of equipment that could be operated on the site, and the limited duration for proposed construction activities (particularly demolition and grading operations), emissions of NOx and ROC would be less than significant. Recommended mitigation measures related to the use of ultra low sulphur diesel fuel, bio-diesel, and diesel particulate filters on construction equipment would further minimize construction related emissions.

Sensitive Receptors. Sensitive receptors are defined as children, elderly, or ill people that can be more adversely affected by air pollutants. Land uses typically associated with sensitive receptors include schools, parks, playgrounds, childcare centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and clinics. Stationary sources are of particular concern for potential impacts to sensitive receptors, as is construction dust and particulate matter. The proposed project would not result in significant stationary source emissions; however, construction dust and particulates could affect sensitive receptors that may exist in the project vicinity. A survey of parcels adjacent to the project site did not; however, identify sensitive receptors such as those identified above. Nuisance dust and particulate emissions would be reduced to a less than significant level through application of dust control, and NOx and ROC emission reduction mitigation measures. The less than significant amounts of these pollutants would not result in significant short-term air quality impacts to sensitive receptors that may be located in the vicinity of the project site.

2.c) Odors

The proposed project would include residential, retail and office uses. These types of uses would not be a substantial source of objectionable odors. Therefore, potential odor-related impacts would be less than

significant.

Consistency with the Clean Air Plan

The proposed project includes a zone change that would change the existing "R-1" zoning designation of a 4,125 square foot portion of the 28,875 square foot project site to "R-3." The requested zone change would increase the project's residential unit density consistent with adopted variable density zoning requirements. In this case, two units would be provided on the rezoned portion of the site, which is a net increase of one unit above that allowed by the existing zoning. Therefore, the direct and indirect emissions resulting from the proposed project are minimal and are accounted for in the CAP emission growth assumptions. Additionally, the project would be consistent with projected residential growth rates for the South Coast, which anticipates the development of approximately 1,000 units per year. The proposed project would also be consistent with CAP policies that promote higher residential densities in urban areas to support regional transit systems, as the project's location on State Street provides opportunities for project residents to use existing transit systems. Appropriate air quality mitigation measures, including construction dust suppression, would be applied to the project, consistent with CAP and City policies. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the CAP.

Air Quality – Required Mitigation

AQ-1 **Construction Dust Control - Watering.** During site grading and transportation of fill materials, regular water sprinkling shall occur using reclaimed water whenever the Public Works Director determines that it is reasonably available. During clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation, sufficient quantities of water, through use of either water trucks or sprinkler systems, shall be applied to prevent dust from leaving the site. Each day, after construction activities cease, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be sufficiently moistened to create a crust.

Throughout construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall also be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust raised from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency will be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph.

AQ-2 **Construction Dust Control – Tarping.** Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be covered from the point of origin.

AQ-3 **Construction Dust Control – Gravel Pads.** Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads.

AQ-4 **Construction Dust Control – Disturbed Area Treatment.** After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is complete, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated to prevent wind pickup of soil. This may be accomplished by:

A. Seeding and watering until grass cover is grown.

B. Spreading soil binders.

C. Sufficiently wetting the area down to form a crust on the surface with repeated soakings as necessary to maintain the crust and prevent dust pickup by the wind.

D. Other methods approved in advance by the Air Pollution Control District.

AQ-5 **Construction Dust Control – Paving.** All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., should be paved as soon as possible. Additionally, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

Air Quality – Recommended Mitigation

AQ-6 **Construction Ozone Precursors.** The following shall be adhered to during project grading and construction to reduce NOx and PM 2.5 emissions from construction equipment:

A. **Diesel Engines.** Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated "clean" diesel engines) should be utilized wherever feasible.

B. **Engine Size.** The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.

C. **Equipment Use Management.** The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.

D. **Equipment Maintenance.** Construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.

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

F. **Catalytic Converters.** Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.

G. **Low Sulfur Fuel.** All diesel-powered equipment shall use ultra low sulfur diesel fuel.

H. **Diesel Emission Reduction.** Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California shall be installed, if available.

I. **Diesel Equipment Reduction.** Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.

J. **Engine Idling Limitations.** Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading should be limited to five minutes; auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible.

K. **Minimize Employee Trips.** Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

L. **Bio-diesel.** To the extent feasible, diesel-powered construction equipment and vehicles used on site shall be fueled using bio-diesel fuels.

Air Quality - Residual Impacts

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-5 would reduce the significant effects of dust generation during construction to a less than significant level. Less than significant construction-related NOx and ROC emissions would be further reduced by implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-6. Project-related operational impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

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 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 or migration corridors, such as oak woodland, coastal strand, riparian, and wetlands.
- Substantial effect on protected plant or animal species listed or otherwise identified or protected as endangered, threatened or rare.
- Substantial loss or damage to important native specimen trees or designated landmark or historic trees.

Biological Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

3.a,c,d,e) Native Plants, Wildlife and Habitat

The project site is located in a portion of the City that is almost entirely urbanized and biological resources are limited. Vegetation on the project site consists primarily of ornamental landscaping. No endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats currently listed nor candidates for State or Federal protection are present at this site. The project site does not support any contiguous natural communities, nor does it function as an important wildlife movement or dispersal area. The proposed project would not result in impacts to native plants, animals, their habitats or wildlife movement opportunities.

3.b) Specimen Trees

On-Site Trees. Mature native and non-native specimen trees provide numerous benefits to the environment, including visual beauty, shade, soil stability, air quality, and localized habitat for urban-adapted wildlife species,

such as birds. City policies address the protection and replacement of mature trees. Three mature ficus trees are located in the northwest corner of the project site. Two of the three trees would be removed by the proposed project. The removal of the two trees would result in a significant impact, and construction operations have the potential to damage the tree that is to remain.

The project site plan indicates that a landscape planter would be provided in the northwest corner of the project site, and that five new street tree wells would be provided. Other planters located on the project site could also facilitate planting of replacement trees. The type of replacement trees that would be provided by the project has not been specified; however, impacts resulting from the removal of two specimen trees can be reduced to a less than significant level by providing replacement trees at a ratio of at least 2:1. The replacement trees should be species that, when mature, will provide a large canopy similar to the existing ficus trees. Potential impacts from construction activities to the ficus tree that is to be retained can also be reduced to a less than significant level by providing adequate protection during the proposed project's construction period.

Off-Site Tree. A large oak tree is located adjacent to the eastern perimeter of the project site, and a portion of the tree's canopy overhangs onto the project property. Proposed excavations and new residential units would be located beneath the tree's dripline, and the location of the proposed building would require that several of the tree's lower limbs be removed. An evaluation of potential project-related impacts to the oak tree determined that, due to the existing retaining wall and elevation difference between the project site and the adjacent property (the adjacent property is approximately eight feet higher than the project site), it is unlikely that the tree's roots are located on the proposed project site. Therefore, proposed excavations and paving material placed on the project site would not adversely affect the tree (Spiewak, 2006). The evaluation also concluded that the removal of several tree branches (branches with a diameter of 5-inches and 8-inches, and several smaller branches) by a qualified tree worker would not result in significant impacts to the health of the tree. Impacts to this off-site tree resulting from the project are considered less than significant, and would be further reduced by the recommended mitigation measure that requires that proposed tree work be done by a qualified tree worker, and also that the appropriate measures be implemented to protect the tree from other construction-related impacts.

Biological Resources – Required Mitigation

B-1 **Tree Replacement.** The project's landscape plan shall include the use of trees that when mature, will provide a large tree canopy similar to the ficus trees removed from the project site. At least four such replacement trees shall be provided by the project. The proposed landscape plan shall be submitted to the ~~ABR~~ HLC for review and approval.

B-2 **On-Site Tree Protection.** A temporary construction fence shall be provided around the ficus tree that is to be retained on the project site. To the extent possible, the construction fence shall be installed outside the dripline of the tree.

Biological Resources – Recommended Mitigation

B-3 **Off-Site Tree Protection.** The following tree protection measures shall be implemented during the construction of the proposed project.

a. A qualified tree worker who practices proper pruning standards in accordance with the International Society of Arboriculture, Best Management Practices (ISA Certified Tree Worker or Certified Arborist) shall be used to raise the crown on the west side of the oak tree adjacent to the project site by removing the lowest 8-inch and 5-inch diameter limbs and several smaller branches.

b. Construction equipment and materials shall not be parked or stored beneath the dripline of the off-site oak tree located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the project site. The canopy of the oak tree shall be protected from paint overspray, plaster and other construction-related materials.

Biological Resources - Residual Impacts

Implementation of the identified required mitigation measures would reduce impacts to on-site trees to a less than significant level. Implementation of the identified recommended mitigation measure would further reduce less than significant impacts to the off-site tree.

4. CULTURAL RESOURCES Could the project:		NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a)	Disturb archaeological resources?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
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 located adjacent to a relic creek and is considered to have a moderate potential to contain buried archaeological resources. A Phase I archaeological survey of the site has been prepared (MAC, 2006); however, due to existing structures and paving that cover almost the entire project site, a systematic survey for existing archaeological resources was not possible. Although previous surveys in the project area have not documented prehistoric resources within a ¼-mile radius of the project site, the parcel is considered sensitive for the potential presence of buried prehistoric artifacts. Potentially significant impacts to previously undetected archaeological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing proposed mitigation measures, which require on-site monitoring of initial site demolition and grading and additional measures should archaeological resources be discovered, which ensure appropriate protection of said resources.

The project site also has low potential to contain early 20th century trash pits associated with the circa 1920 occupation of former residences in the project area. While residential trash deposits dating from the early 20th century may contain information relating to the residential development of Santa Barbra, they are generally not considered to be significant unless they have some unique content or integrity of deposit, or can be shown to be associated with a specific important person or event in Santa Barbara history. Proposed mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to trash deposits to a less than significant level in the unlikely event of discovery on the project site.

4.b) Historic Resources

The existing structure on project the site does not have historic merit. No impacts to historic structures would occur as a result of the proposed project.

4.c) Ethnic/Religious Resources

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

Cultural Resources – Recommended Mitigation

CR-1 Archaeological Monitoring Contract. Submit to the Planning Division a contract with an archaeologist from the most current City Qualified Archaeologists List for monitoring during all ground disturbing activities associated with the project, including, but not limited to, grading, excavation, trenching vegetation or paving removal and ground clearance in the areas identified in the Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Report prepared for this site by MacFarlane Archaeological Consultants, dated March 9, 2006. The contract shall be subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division and shall require submittal of a final report to the City.

CR-2 Discovery Procedures and Mitigation. Standard discovery measures shall be implemented per the City Master Environmental Assessment throughout grading and construction:

If archaeological resources are encountered or suspected, work shall be halted or redirected by the archaeologist immediately, and the Planning Division shall be notified. The archaeologist shall assess the nature, extent and significance of any discoveries and develop appropriate management recommendations for archaeological resource treatment, which may include, but are not limited to, redirection of grading and/or excavation activities, consultation and/or monitoring with a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List, preparation of further site studies and/or mitigation.

If the discovery consists of possible human remains, the Owner shall contact the Santa Barbara County Coroner immediately. If the Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner

shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission. The Owner shall retain a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List shall be retained to monitor all further subsurface disturbance in the area of the find. Work in the area may only proceed after the Planning Division grants authorization.

If the discovery consists of possible prehistoric or Native American artifacts or materials, the Owner shall retain a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List shall be retained to monitor all further subsurface disturbance in the area of the find. Work in the area may only proceed after the Planning Division grants authorization.

CR-3 Final Report. A final report on the results of the archaeological monitoring shall be submitted by the City-approved archaeologist to the Planning Division within 180 days of completion of the monitoring or prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, whichever is earlier.

Cultural Resources – Residual Impacts

The above measures would ensure consistency with policies requiring protection of archaeological resources and reduce the potential for impacts to archaeological and historical resources to a less than significant level.

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

Geophysical Conditions - Discussion

Issues: Geophysical impacts involve geologic and soil conditions and their potential to create physical hazards affecting persons or property; or substantial changes to the physical condition of the site. Included are earthquake-related conditions such as fault rupture, ground-shaking, 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 to or creation of unstable earth conditions due to seismic conditions, such as earthquake faulting, groundshaking, liquefaction, or seismic waves.
- Exposure to or creation of unstable earth conditions due to geologic or soil conditions, such as landslides, settlement, or expansive, collapsible/compressible, or expansive soils.

- Extensive grading on slopes exceeding 20%, substantial topographic change, destruction of unique physical features; substantial erosion of soils, overburden, or sedimentation of a water course.

Geophysical Conditions – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

5.a-c) Seismic Hazards

Fault Rupture: The nearest mapped fault is located approximately one mile from the project site. Fault rupture as a result of a seismic event is not anticipated, and therefore, potential impacts associated with fault rupture from the proposed development would not be 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. Compliance with existing building regulations would reduce any ground shaking impacts to structures built on the project site to a less than significant level and no mitigation measures are required. The project site is considered to have a low potential for liquefaction (PML, 2005). Implementation of building foundation preparation recommendations provided by the soil report prepared for the proposed project, and compliance with existing building construction regulations would reduce any liquefaction impacts to a less than significant level and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Seiche or Tsunami. The project site is located at an elevation of approximately 150 feet above sea level and not within a tsunami run-up zone as identified by the City's Seismic Safety-Safety Element. There are not open water bodies near the project site that could result in potential seiche-related impacts. Therefore, no impacts involving tsunami and seiche would affect the project site.

5.d-f) Geologic or Soil Instability

Landslides. The project site is flat and would not be subject to landslide hazards. The project would not alter the existing retaining wall located along the eastern perimeter of the project site and would not affect the stability of the grade separation change between the project site and properties to the east. No impacts associated with landslides are anticipated.

Subsidence. The potential for subsidence on the site is low. Settlement of soils on the project site is considered a potentially significant impact but would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing recommendations provided by the project site soil report. No additional mitigation measures are required.

Expansive Soils. Soils on the project are not considered to be expansive and foundation recommendations provided by the project site soil report would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation measures are required.

5.g) Topography; Grading

Grading. The proposed project would result in approximatley 8,594 cubic yards of cut and 255 cubic yards of fill. The majority of the site grading is required to excavate the proposed underground parking garage. Proposed grading operations would not result in long-term slope stability impacts. Compliance with existing grading regulations provided by the City's Grading Ordinance would result in potential grading-related impacts being less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Geophysical Conditions – Required Mitigation

G-1 Geotechnical Recommendations. Site preparation and project construction related to soil conditions shall be in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Preliminary Foundation Investigation prepared by Pacific Materials Laboratory, dated July 27, 2005. Compliance shall be demonstrated on plans submitted for grading and building permits.

Geophysical Conditions – Residual Impacts

Implementation of the required site preparation and structural design measures would mitigate potential geologic hazards to a less than significant level.

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

Hazards - Discussion

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

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

- Siting of incompatible projects in close proximity to existing sources of safety risk, such as pipelines, industrial processes, railroads, airports, etc.
- Exposure of project occupants or construction workers to unremediated soil or groundwater contamination.
- Exposure of persons or the environment to hazardous substances due to improper use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- Siting of development in a high fire hazard areas or beyond adequate emergency response time, with inadequate access or water pressure, or otherwise in a manner that creates a fire hazard

Hazards – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

6.a,b,c) Public Health and Safety

Hazardous Materials and Safety Risks.

Contaminated Groundwater. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the project site to identify the possible presence of recognized environmental conditions associated with possible soil and ground water contamination at the project site (Rincon, 2005). The assessment determined that there are five sites located within ¼-mile of the project site that have environmental listings. One of the listed sites is 1727 State Street, which generates and stores small quantities of hazardous waste. The other four sites are existing or former gasoline stations at 1800, 1853, 1936 and 1935 State Street.

The site at 1727 State Street is listed as a non-release site and only generates/stores small quantities of hazardous wastes. Therefore, the Environmental Site Assessment concluded that the listed site "would not be expected to be affecting the subject property."

All four of the gasoline stations in the project vicinity are listed as release sites. Based on the review of existing documentation, it has been determined that groundwater beneath the proposed project site has been impacted with gasoline constituents originating from an upgradient source. Recent monitoring at the 1800 State Street site (former Chevron/existing Exxon Service Station) indicates that ethylene dichloride (EDC) is in the groundwater beneath the project site at levels exceeding the Santa Barbra County Fire Prevention Division (SBC FPD) Investigation Level for EDC of 0.5 micrograms per liter (µg/l). In addition, low levels of di-isopropyl ether (DIPE) just slightly exceeding the SBC FPD Investigation Level for DIPE (3.0 µg/l) have been detected. Monitoring wells upgradient of the 1800 State Street site for the 1853 State Street site (former Shell station) have also detected the presence of EDC in groundwater. Based on monitoring well reports, the EDC and DIPE in the groundwater beneath the project site appears to be originating from either one or both of the nearby upgradient (1800 and 1853 State Street) sites. Soil samples collected during the installation of the monitoring wells at the 1800 State Street site did not detect the presence of gasoline constituents. Therefore, it does not appear that soils at the proposed project site have been impacted.

The groundwater beneath the project site that has been impacted by gasoline constituents is approximately 80-90 feet below the ground surface. Due to this depth, it is unlikely that the impacted water would result in a potential health risk to future occupants of the proposed project. However, the SBC FPD will require Chevron to conduct soil gas sampling at the project site to determine if EDC is volatilizing, and if there would be a potential for EDC vapors to collect in the underground parking area or proposed residences and commercial areas. If there is a potential for the project to be affected by EDC vapor, the project would have the potential to result in a significant health-related impact. To evaluate the potential for project-related health impacts, a health risk assessment will be required to quantitatively evaluate the potential for significant health risk effects to project occupants. If the health risk analysis concludes that potential EDC exposure would have the potential to result in a potential cancer risk greater than one in one million, measures to reduce health risks resulting from EDC vapor exposure would be required. The most likely mitigation measure would be the installation of a vapor barrier beneath the proposed structure, which is a very effective method for controlling vapor migration. If mitigation measure is required, the installation of an approved vapor barrier must be indicated on building plans for the proposed project (Rezjek, 2006).

Implementation of the proposed project would require the relocation of the four monitoring wells (MW-10, 12, 14 and 15) located on the project site. Each monitoring well would be relocated during the demolition and rough grading stage of the proposed project. Installation of the relocated monitoring wells in accordance with the requirements of the SBC FPD would result in the potential for conflicts between the proposed project and relocated wells to be less than significant. The relocated monitoring wells would be maintained on the project site until EDC concentrations in groundwater beneath the project site are below the California Maximum Contaminant Level for EDC (0.5 µg/l). When no longer needed, the wells would be removed and abandoned in accordance with applicable regulations.

On-Site Hazardous Material Use. Residential uses proposed for the project site would not be a substantial source of hazardous materials or waste that would have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. Proposed commercial uses may include medical/dental offices, which would have the potential to result in the generation of medical waste. The storage, handling and disposal of medical waste is regulated by the California Medical Waste Act, which is enforced by the County of Santa Barbara Public Health Department. Should commercial area provided on the project site be used for medical offices, the implementation of existing regulations would be adequate to ensure that potential medical waste impacts to on-site occupants and uses adjacent to the project site are at a less than significant level. No additional mitigation measures are required.

6.d) Fire Hazard

The project site is not located in a City designated high fire hazard area and vegetation on or near the project site does not result in significant fire risk. The project would be subject to Fire Department and City Ordinance requirements for adequate access, structural design and materials and adequate water for fire protection. Adherence to the standard requirements of the Fire Department and Uniform Fire Code with respect to building

design would ensure that fire hazard impacts for the proposed project would be less than significant.

Hazards – Required Mitigation

H-1. Groundwater Contamination. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit for the proposed project, the applicant shall provide evidence to the City that the SBC FPD has reviewed required soil vapor testing results, and if necessary, a health risk evaluation prepared for the proposed project. If required, proposed building plans shall include measures approved by the SBC FPD to reduce potential health risk impacts to occupants of the proposed building to a less than significant level. All approved vapor control mitigation measures shall be depicted on proposed building plans prior to the approval of a building permit.

H-2 Monitoring Well Relocation. The location of proposed replacement monitoring wells, as approved by the SBC FPD, shall be depicted on a final site plan. The final site plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of a demolition permit for the proposed project.

Hazards – Residual Impacts

Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts associated with impacted ground water beneath the project site to a less than significant level. Compliance with State and local requirements for the management and disposal of medical waste that may be generated by occupants of commercial space provided by the proposed project would ensure that potential waste generation/disposal impacts are at a less than significant level. No mitigation measures are required.

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

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 sound level of six decibels.

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

High construction noise levels occur with the use of heavy equipment such as scrapers, rollers, graders, trenchers and large trucks for demolition, grading, and construction. Equipment noise levels can vary substantially through a construction period, and depend on the type of equipment, number of pieces operating, and equipment maintenance. Construction equipment generates noise levels of more than 80 or 90 dB(A) at a distance of 50 feet, and the shorter impulsive noises from other construction equipment (such as pile drivers and drills) can be even higher, up to and exceeding 100 dB(A). Noise during construction is generally intermittent and sporadic, and after completion of the initial demolition, grading and site preparation activities, tends to be quieter.

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

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

- Siting of a project such that persons would be subject to long-term ambient noise levels in excess of Noise Element land use compatibility guidelines as follows:
    - Residential: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 60 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 45 dB(A).
    - Schools: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 65 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 45 db(A).
    - Office Buildings: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 75 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 50 db(A).
    - Commercial - Wholesale: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 80 dB(A).
- Substantial noise from grading and construction activity in close proximity to noise-sensitive receptors for an extensive duration.

Noise – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

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

Long-Term Operational Noise. The project site is located in an area subject to average ambient noise levels of 60-65 dBA Ldn, as shown on the City's Master Environmental Assessment noise contour maps. An Environmental Noise Study for the project site was prepared in 2006 by Dudek, and was submitted by the applicant. The analysis included measurements of existing noise levels at locations along State and Islay Streets, which are the primary sources of noise in the project area. The measured noise level adjacent to the project site approximately 40 feet from the center of State Street was 69 dBA Leq. The measured noise level adjacent to the project site approximately 20 feet from the center of Islay Street was 56 dBA Leq. Calculated noise levels at the two measurement locations were within one dB of the measured noise levels.

Exterior Noise. The common outdoor living area to be provided by the proposed project would be a ground-level courtyard located near the center of the project site, behind (east of) the building adjacent to State Street. The proposed building would provide substantial noise shielding from existing and future traffic noise along State Street. The estimated noise level within the courtyard area resulting from future (2030) traffic conditions on State and Islay Streets is approximately 44 dB, which is substantially lower than the maximum exterior noise

criteria of 60 dBA CNEL.

Estimated future (2030) traffic noise levels at the required private outdoor living areas for proposed units A-J range between 46 and 57 dB CNEL. These noise levels would be within the City's adopted maximum exterior noise criteria of 60 dB CNEL, and no noise control mitigation is required for these units. Proposed units K and L would be located on the third floor of the building facing State Street, and estimated future traffic noise levels at the units' exterior balconies would be 64 dB CNEL, which exceeds the exterior noise threshold standard, creating a potentially significant impact. Noise control mitigation for these required outdoor living areas would be required to reduce exterior noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Interior Noise. A detailed interior noise analysis was not conducted as part of the noise study prepared for the proposed project, however, a preliminary evaluation was provided. Future (2030) traffic noise conditions along State Street in the vicinity of the project site are projected to be approximately 70 dBA CNEL. Standard construction materials and techniques for a multiple family development would typically result in a minimum exterior to interior noise attenuation of 15 dB. Therefore, with windows open or closed, the two proposed residential units facing State Street would have interior noise levels exceeding the 45 dB CNEL threshold standard, a potentially significant impact. To comply with the interior noise level requirement, an interior noise analysis will be required for the two proposed third-floor units (Units K and L) adjacent to State Street. Based on a preliminary review, the dwelling units would most likely require sound-rated windows, and such windows would also need to be closed to achieve an interior noise level of 45 db CNEL. Air conditioning or mechanical ventilation would be required so that the occupants could keep the windows closed at their discretion. Other residential units provided by the proposed project would experience lower interior noise levels due to shielding provided by the building adjacent to State Street. These units would comply with the interior noise standards and no mitigation would be required.

Project-Generated Traffic Noise. An evaluation of traffic that would be generated by the proposed project was prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers (2006). The evaluation determined that the former/current use of the existing project site building generates between 622 and 770 average daily vehicle trips (see section 11.0, Transportation/Circulation below). The study also determined that the proposed project would generate approximately 347 average daily trips. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a net decrease in vehicle traffic on roadways adjacent to the project site when compared to traffic volumes generated by the existing building. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in increased traffic noise impacts to land uses located adjacent to streets located in the project area.

Short-Term Construction Noise. Uses adjacent to the project site include offices and residences. Residences are considered to be a noise sensitive receptor. The highest construction-related noise levels would generally occur during the demolition and grading phases of the project, which would also include the relocation of the four project site ground monitoring wells. Demolition and grading operations are scheduled to last approximately 10 and 15 days, respectively, and have the potential to result in noise levels of 80-90 dBA measured at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. Noise from the construction of the proposed building would result in noise levels that are generally lower than demolition and grading operations, but noise impacts to surrounding uses would still have the potential to occur. The entire construction process for the proposed project is scheduled to last approximately 18 months.

Noise from demolition, grading and construction operations would result in elevated noise levels that would have the potential to result in adverse, but less than significant impacts to surrounding noise-sensitive uses. Project-related demolition and grading operations would likely result in peak noise levels and would occur over a period of approximatley one month. The implementation of routine construction site noise controls would be capable of reducing temporary peak construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors located adjacent to the project site.

Proposed construction activities would also generate short-term traffic as workers, equipment and materials are brought to the project site. The increase in traffic on roadways near the project site would result in an

incremental increase in existing traffic noise conditions, however, construction-related traffic would not result in a substantial increase in daily traffic volumes and would not result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels. Therefore, construction-related traffic would be less than significant.

Noise – Required Mitigation

N-1 **Exterior Noise Reduction.** A minimum five (5)-foot high wall extending upward from the exterior balcony floor shall be provided for units "K" and "L." The wall height requirement is relative to the patio floor elevation.

N-2 **Interior Noise Reduction**. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a final interior noise assessment for proposed units facing State Street (units "K" and "L") shall be provided to the City. The assessment shall identify noise attenuation measures to be provided to ensure that interior noise levels do not exceed 45 dBA CNEL. Noise control measures may include, but are not limited to:

- The use of sound-rated windows.
- Installation of a ventilation system/air conditioning system.

Noise – Recommended Mitigation

N-3 **Construction Notice.** At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall provide written notice to all property owners and building occupants within 450 feet of the project area. The notice shall contain a description of the proposed project, a construction schedule including days and hours of construction, the name and phone number of the Project Environmental Coordinator (PEC) who can answer questions, and provide additional information or address problems that may arise during construction. A 24-hour construction hot line shall be provided. Informational signs with the PEC's name and telephone number shall also be posted at the site.

N-4 **Construction Hours.** Noise-generating construction activities (which may include preparation for construction work) shall be permitted weekdays between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., excluding holidays observed by the City as legal holidays: New Year's Day (January 1st); Martin Luther King Jr.'s Birthday (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.

Occasional night work may be approved for the hours between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m. weekdays by the Chief of Building and Zoning (per Section ~~9.13.015~~ 9.16.015 of the Municipal Code). In the event of such night work approval, the applicant shall provide written notice to all property owners and occupants within 450 feet of the project property boundary and the City Planning and Building Divisions at least 48 hours prior to commencement of night work. Night work shall not be permitted on weekends and holidays.

N-5 **Construction Equipment Sound Control.** All construction equipment, including trucks, shall be professionally maintained and fitted with standard manufacturers' muffler and silencing devices.

N-6 **Sound Barriers.** Prior to the approval of a demolition permit, the applicant shall ~~prepare and~~ submit a sound control plan, prepared by a qualified Noise Consultant, that identifies noise attenuation measures and/or devises, such as the use of noise shields and blankets, to reduce noise impacts to the office uses located north of and adjacent to the project site. If noise control devises are provided, they shall be maintained on the project site throughout all proposed demolition and grading operations.

Noise – Residual Impact

Implementation of the required mitigation measures would reduce future traffic noise levels at required outdoor

and interior living areas for units "K" and "L" to below 60 dB CNEL and 45 dB CNEL, respectively, consistent with the City's adopted threshold requirements. With the implementation of proposed construction noise control mitigation measures, less than significant short-term noise impacts to adjacent noise-sensitive land uses would be minimized.

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 site is located in an existing developed urban area already served by urban infrastructure. No extensions of infrastructure or urban services would be necessary to serve the project site. The proposed residential units are intended to meet existing demand for ownership housing units within the community and would not induce growth. Growth inducing impacts as a result of the project would be less than significant.

8.b) Housing Displacement

The project would not result in the displacement of any housing. No adverse housing-related impacts would result from the project.

Population and Housing - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Population and Housing – Residual Impact

Impacts would be 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.

Public Services – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

9a-b, d-g. Facilities and Services

The project site is located in an urban area where all public services are available. In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Condition, Trends, and Issues (CTI) Report (September 2005) that examined existing conditions associated with fire protection, police protection, library services, public facilities, governmental facilities, electrical power, and natural gas. The CTI Report specifically analyzed whether there were deficiencies, existing or anticipated, for each of the public services. The CTI report determined that police and

fire protection services, and library services are being provided at acceptable levels to the City. In addition, the CTI Report determined that electricity, natural gas, telephone, and cable telecommunication services are being provided at acceptable service levels and utility companies did not identify any deficiencies in providing service in the future. Finally, the CTI Report determined that demand for City buildings and facilities will continue to be impacted by growth, although no appropriate/acceptable levels of service have been established.

The project site has access to existing roads and would be served with connections to existing public services for gas, electricity, cable, and telephone that are available at the site. The project would not result in a substantially increased demand on fire or police protection services, library services, or City buildings and facilities than created by the existing on-site use and than that was anticipated in the CTI Report. Therefore, impacts to fire protection, police protection, library services, City buildings and facilities, electrical power, natural gas, telephone, and cable telecommunication services would be less than significant.

9.c) Schools

The project site is served by the Santa Barbara Elementary and High School Districts for elementary and high school. The project would provide an increase of 12 residential units, which could generate additional students.

The project would also result in a minor increase in area employees. It is expected that most of the project-site employees would already reside in the area, however, some portion of new employees may migrate to the project region. The commercial portion of the proposed project may generate new elementary and secondary students to the extent that new employment created by the project results in new residents to the area. Unlike the residential portion of this project that falls into a defined school attendance area, students generated by the commercial portion of the proposed project could live and attend a school in any area of the South Coast. Some students generated by the commercial portion of this project could also live outside the boundaries of the Santa Barbara School Districts 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. Project impacts to schools would be less than significant.

9.h,i) Water and Sewer

Water Demand. The City of Santa Barbara's water supply comes from the following sources, with the actual share of each determined by availability and level of customer demand: Cachuma Reservoir and Tecolote Tunnel, Gibraltar Reservoir and Mission Tunnel, 300 Acre Feet per Year (AFY) of contractual transfer from Montecito Water district, groundwater, State Water Project entitlement, desalination, and recycled water. Conservation and efficiency improvements are projected to contribute to the supply by displacing demand that would otherwise have to be supplied by additional sources. In 1994, based on the comprehensive review of the City's water supply in the Long Term Water Supply Alternatives Analysis (LTWSAA), the City Council approved the Long Term Water Supply Program (LTWSP). The LTWSP outlines a strategy to use the above sources to meet the projected demand of 17,900 AFY (including 1,500 AFY of demand projected to be met with conservation) plus a 10 percent safety margin for a total of 19,700 AFY. Therefore, the target for the amount of water the system will actually have to supply, including the safety margin, is 18,200 AFY. The 2003 Water Supply Management Report documents an actual system demand of 13,460 AFY and a theoretical commitment of 16,170 AFY. Of the total system production, 95% was potable water and 5% was reclaimed water.

In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Condition, Trends, and Issues (CTI) Report (September 2005) that examined existing conditions associated with water supply, treatment, and distribution system, and specifically analyzed and determined that there were no existing or anticipated deficiencies for the next 20-year planning period based on a growth rate of 0.7% per year.

The proposed project would receive water service from the City of Santa Barbara. The project is within the anticipated growth rate for the City and, therefore, the City's long-term water supply and existing water treatment and distribution facilities would adequately serve the proposed project.

The water demand resulting from the use of the existing 7,500 square foot building on the project site as a classroom facility, the estimated water use if the existing building were used as commercial space, and the estimated water use that would result from the proposed project is summarized in the following table.

Land Use	Water Use Factor	Units	Estimated Water Use (AFY)
Existing Usage	413 GPD [1]	N/A	0.46 AFY
Existing Sq. Ft. (Commercial)	103.9 GPD/1,000 sq. ft.	7.5 sq. ft.	0.87
Proposed Commercial	103.9 GPD/1,000 sq. ft.	15.576 sq. ft.	1.81 AFY
Proposed Residences	250 GPD/unit	12 units	3.36 AFY
Total Proposed Water Use	--	--	**5.17 AFY**
Net Change from Existing Conditions	--	--	**+ 4.71 AFY**
Net Change if Existing Building is Used as General Commercial			**+ 4.3 AFY**

GPD = Gallons per day; AFY = Acre feet per year

[1] Source: City of Santa Barbara, Water Consumption History for 1722 State Street, Three Year Usage Average

The use of 5.17 acre feet of water per year by the proposed project would not result in a significant water supply impact. Therefore, the water demand resulting from the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to the City water supply, treatment, and distribution facilities.

Waste Water Generation. The maximum capacity of the El Estero Treatment Plant is 11 million gallons per day (MGD), and the current average daily flow is 8.5 MGD. Waste water generation by residential and commercial uses is generally related to potable water use, and waste water generation is commonly estimated to be approximately 90% of the project's potable water demand. Therefore, approximately 4.65 AFY (0.004 MGD) of the proposed project's water demand would be returned as waste water. There would be adequate treatment capacity at the Treatment Plant to accommodate waste water generated by the proposed project. Therefore, the waste water generation/disposal resulting from the proposed project can be accommodated by the existing City sewer system and sewage treatment plant, and would result in a less than significant impact.

9.j) Solid Waste Generation/ Disposal

Solid waste generated in the City of Santa Barbara is collected and transported to the Tajiguas Landfill for disposal. The Tajiguas Landfill is operated by the County of Santa Barbara, and is located approximately 26 miles west of the City. Final approvals by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and California Integrated Waste Management Board were obtained in 2003 to expand the landfill. Based on current solid waste disposal trends, it is anticipated the recent landfill expansion will provide approximately 18 years of the solid waste disposal capacity. A Multi-Jurisdictional Task Group was established in June 2001 by the County Board of Supervisors and the Santa Barbara City Council to provide the communities in Santa Barbara County with a forum to discuss and plan long-term solid waste management strategies and facilities.

The County of Santa Barbara 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 4,000 tons per year) in solid waste generation over the 15-year period.

The County's threshold for project-specific impacts to the solid waste system is 196 tons per year (this figure represents 5% of the expected average annual increase in solid waste generation [4000 tons/year]). 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 (TPY), is considered an adverse cumulative impact.

Long-Term (Operational). Based on the following waste generation rates, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate approximately 50 tons of solid waste per year.

Attached Residential: 2.65 people/unit * 12 units * 0.95 tons/year =	30.21 tons/year
Commercial/Medical: 15,576 s.f. * 0.0013 tons/year =	20.25 tons/year
Total	50.46 tons/year

With application of source reduction, reuse, and recycling, landfill disposal of solid waste could be reduced to approximately 25.23 TPY. The project-specific and cumulative impacts are considered less than significant because the 196 TPY project-specific threshold and the 40 TPY cumulative threshold would not be exceeded.

Short-Term (Demolition and Construction). The solid waste generation/disposal thresholds adopted by the County do not apply to short-term construction projects. While project-related demolition and grading would result in the generation of waste material, this impact would not exceed an adopted threshold or result in a significant waste disposal impact. The implementation of recommended mitigation measures to reduce, re-use, and recycle construction and demolition waste to the extent feasible would further minimize the potential for short-term waste disposal impacts. It is anticipated that the implementation of a City-approved construction and demolition waste recovery/diversion plan would divert approximately 70% of the project's construction and demolition waste from landfill disposal.

Public Services – Recommended Mitigation

PS-1 **Trash Enclosure Provision.** A trash enclosure with adequate area for recycling containers shall be provided on the project site and screened from view from surrounding properties and the street. Dumpsters and containers with a capacity of 1.5 cubic yards or more shall not be placed within five (5) feet of combustible walls, openings, or roofs, unless protected with fire sprinklers.

PS-2 **Construction Materials Recycling.** Recycling and/or reuse of construction materials shall be carried out to the extent feasible, and containers shall be provided on site for that purpose, in order to minimize construction-generated waste conveyed to the landfill. Indicate on the plans the location of an appropriately sized container for collection of demolition/construction materials.

PS-3 **Construction and Demolition Material Salvage.** Prior to the approval of a demolition permit for the proposed project, a construction and demolition waste management plan shall be developed and submitted to the City's Environmental Analysis for review and approval.

Public Services – Residual Impacts

Implementation of the identified recommended mitigation measures would further reduce less than significant impacts.

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

Recreation - Discussion

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

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

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

Recreation – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

10.a) Recreational Demand

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

In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Condition, Trends, and Issues (CTI) Report (September 2005) that examined existing conditions associated with recreation and parks. Population characteristics including income, age, population growth, education and ethnicity affect recreation interests and participation levels.

The CTI Report determined that there is an uneven distribution of parkland in the City, such that some areas of the City may currently be underserved with neighborhood parks, but overall the City has adequate passive, community, beach, regional, open space, and sports facility parks.

The development of the proposed residences would create an increase in the demand for park and recreational opportunities. As indicated above, the City of Santa Barbara has ample parkland, albeit unevenly distributed throughout the City, and adequate recreation facilities. The proposed project would introduce additional residents into the Upper East neighborhood where existing nearby parks include Alameda Park and the Alice Keck Park Memorial Garden. In this case, sufficient neighborhood and community parks are located near the project site. Residents would also have access to other community, beach, regional, open space, and sports facility parks, and all City recreation programs. Therefore, the increase in park and recreational demands associated with the residences would be a less than significant impact.

10.b) Existing Recreational Facilities

The proposed project is nearby but not adjacent to existing park facilities. The proposed residential and commercial uses would not result in population increases that would have the potential to result in a substantial

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

Recreation - Mitigation

None required.

Recreation – Residual Impacts

Impacts are less than significant.

11. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Could the project result in:		NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a)	Increased vehicle trips? Long-Term	X	
	Short Term		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?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
d)	Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?		Less than Significant
e)	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? Long-Term	X	
	Short-Term		Less than Significant

Transportation - Discussion

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

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

Vehicle Traffic

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

Circulation and Traffic Safety

- Create potential hazards due to addition of traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g., narrow width, roadside ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or that supports uses that would be incompatible with substantial increases in traffic.

- Diminish or reduce safe pedestrian and/or bicycle circulation.
- Result in inadequate emergency access on-site or to nearby uses.

Parking

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Transportation – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

11.a) Traffic

Long-Term Traffic. A Revised Traffic and Parking Study (April, 2006) was prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers for the proposed project. The traffic analysis compares the potential traffic generation of the proposed project to the traffic generation characteristics of the former and existing uses of the building located on the project site.

The existing project site building is a 7,500 square foot structure that was originally developed as a bank. Based on published traffic generation rates, it was estimated that the former use of the building as a bank generated approximately 622 average daily trips, 31 AM peak hour trips and 132 PM peak hour trips. The average daily trip and PM peak hour trip estimates include a 47% reduction in traffic generation or "pass-by" factor. Pass-by trips already exist on the adjacent street system and would combine a stop at the bank building with another trip, such as driving to or from work. The existing building is currently used as a classroom by the Brooks Institute of Photography, and also includes two functioning automatic teller machines (ATMs). Traffic generated by the existing classrooms and ATMs was estimated based on published traffic generation rates and peak hour traffic counts conducted at the project site. Based on these factors, it was estimated that the existing use of the building generates approximately 770 average daily trips, 44 AM peak hour trips and 77 PM peak hour trips.

Trip generation estimates for the proposed project were calculated based on published traffic generation factors, and it was assumed that the project would provide 12 condominium units, 1,400 square feet of specialty retail, 4,850 square feet of general office, and 2,988 square feet of medical-dental office. The estimates of the types of commercial uses that may occupy the proposed building, and the area the different types of uses may occupy, are

considered reasonable estimates of future conditions that may exist at the project site. Based on the future building uses projections, it was estimated that commercial uses occupying the proposed project would generate approximately 277 average daily trips, 23 AM peak hour trips and 61 PM peak hour trips. The residential units provided by the project would generate approximatley 70 average daily trips, five (5) AM peak hour trips and six (6) PM peak hour trips. The combined total traffic generation for the project would be approximatley 347 average daily trips, 28 AM peak hour trips and 67 PM peak hour trips. A comparison of trip generation characteristics for the proposed project and the former/existing uses of the existing on-site building are summarized on the following table.

Land Use	Average Daily Trips	AM Peak Hour Trips	PM Peak Hour Trips
Bank	622	31	132
Proposed Project	347	28	67
Difference	**-275**	**-3**	**-65**
Classrooms/ATMs	770	44	77
Proposed Project	347	28	67
Difference	**-423**	**-16**	**-10**

The proposed project would result in a reduction of 275 average daily trips, three AM peak hour trips and 65 PM peak hour trips when compared to previous bank operations at the project site. Compared to the existing use of the building for classroom/ATM purposes, the proposed project would result in a reduction of 423 average daily trips, 16 AM peak hour trips and 10 PM peak hour trips. Since the proposed project would result in a reduction in AM and PM peak hour traffic when compared to former and existing uses of the on-site building, the proposed project would result in no impact to the operation of intersections located in the project area.

Short-Term Construction Traffic. It is estimated that the proposed project's construction process would last approximately 18 months. The most intensive construction operations (i.e., removing demolition material and excess soil) would occur during the project's demolition and grading phases, which would occur over a period of approximately 10 and 15 working days, respectively. Project-related construction activities would require approximately four to 20 construction workers on the project site, depending on the construction phase (GRD Construction, 2006). Staging, equipment and materials storage would occur onsite when feasible. A temporary staging area has been proposed adjacent to the project site in the State Street right-of-way, however, the use of the public right-of-way for project construction staging is generally not permitted by the City. Locations for construction worker parking have not yet been identified. Traffic resulting from the use of a remote construction worker parking area would also have the potential to contribute to temporary increases in traffic in the project area.

The project would generate construction-related traffic over a period of approximatley 18 months, and the amount of temporary traffic generated would vary depending on the stage of construction. The project's location along State Street would minimize the potential for construction traffic to impact surrounding residential streets. Temporary construction traffic generated by the proposed project would be less than significant. Implementation of standard construction traffic mitigation measures, such as restrictions on the hours permitted for construction trips and approval of routes for construction traffic would further reduce this less than significant impact.

11.b Access/Circulation

The project's access drive and ramp that would connect the proposed subterranean parking area to State Street would meet parking design standards required by SBMC 28.90.045. Adequate line of sight distance from the

State Street ingress/egress driveway would also be provided. Traffic safety impacts of the project would be less than significant.

11.c Emergency Access

The Fire Department has reviewed the site plan for the proposed project and indicated that the proposed project does not comply with the Department's commercial access standard that requires a 20-foot wide access to within 150 feet of the furthest exterior wall of the proposed building. This access standard would not be met along the southern perimeter of the project site, thus creating a potentially significant impact. The Fire Department has requested that the project applicant apply for a modification from the access standard. Potential reasons for approval of a site access modification would be providing fire sprinklers in accordance with NFPA 13 standards, providing a mixed-use fire alarm, and providing a new fire hydrant in front of the project site. Approval of a modification of the access standard requirement would reduce the proposed project's potential emergency access impacts to a less than significant level.

11.d. Parking

The proposed project would provide 55 parking spaces in an underground parking garage. Based on the Municipal Code parking requirements for each of the uses that would be provided by the project, 63 parking spaces would be required. ATE has estimated the peak parking demand of the proposed uses based upon ITE parking generation reports and the Urban Land Institute's Shared Parking Manual for mixed use projects. The use of shared parking recognizes that the peak parking demand for different types of uses occurs at different times of day, and that parking spaces can be shared by different uses at different times of the day and evening. The shared parking demand estimate assumes that all of the proposed commercial space would be occupied by medical-dental offices, which have a higher parking demand than retail and office uses. The shared parking analysis also assumes that 22 parking spaces would be reserved for the 12 proposed residential units. The ATE study concludes that the peak parking demand for the proposed project would occur at 11:00 AM, and would result in a demand for 55 spaces. Based on the study results, the proposed project was designed to provide a total of 55 parking spaces. Since the project would accommodate the peak parking requirements of the proposed project, the proposed shared parking arrangement would result in a less than significant parking-related impact.

11.e. Circulation Safety

The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts associated with long-term hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, as adequate site distance would be provided from the project's driveway. City policy generally prohibits the staging of construction activities within the public right-of-way. Implementation of standard construction traffic mitigation measures to this effect would further reduce this less than significant impact.

Transportation – Required Mitigation

T-1 **Fire Department Access Modification.** Prior to the approval of a building permit, a modification of Fire Department access standards shall be submitted to the Fire Department for review and approval. A copy of an approved access modification shall be provided on the cover sheet of proposed building plans.

Transportation – Recommended Mitigation

T-2 **Construction Traffic.** The haul routes for all construction-related trucks, three tons or more, entering or exiting the site, shall be approved by the Transportation Engineer. Construction-related truck trips shall not be scheduled during peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) to help reduce truck traffic and noise on adjacent streets and roadways. The route of construction-related traffic shall be established to minimize trips through residential neighborhoods and minimize congestion.

T-3 **Construction Parking.** Construction parking and vehicle/equipment/materials storage shall be provided as follows:

A. During construction, free parking spaces for construction workers shall be provided on-site or off-site in a location subject to the approval of the Transportation and Parking Manager.

B. On-site or off-site storage shall be provided for construction materials, equipment, and vehicles. Storage of construction materials within the public right-of-way is prohibited.

Transportation – Residual Impact

The proposed project would not increase traffic levels along streets or at intersections located in the project area. No long-term traffic impacts would result and no mitigation measures are required. Potential short-term less than significant impacts resulting from a temporary increase in traffic/parking demand and safety/circulation caused by construction operations can be further reduced by implementation of recommended mitigation measures that minimize the potential for traffic- and parking-related impacts to surrounding neighborhoods. Potentially significant impacts associated with Fire Department access can be minimized by implementing structural and building code requirements. Implementation of such measures to the satisfaction of the Fire Department would reduce potential access impacts to a less than significant level.

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

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.

Flooding

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

Water Quality

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

Water Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

12.a,e) Drainage and Surface Runoff Rate

Drainage. The project site is developed with an existing building and parking areas. The project site is predominantly covered by impervious surfaces, with the exception of several small landscaped areas. Drainage from the site sheet flows southward to State Street.

The proposed project would result in the development of a new mixed use building. A preliminary drainage analysis prepared by Penfield and Smith (May 2005) compared existing and proposed stormwater runoff conditions for 25- and 100-year storm events based on the requirements of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District. The drainage study concluded that under existing project site conditions, storm runoff from the site is 1.60 cubic feet per second (cfs) during a 25-year storm, and 2.13 cfs during a 100-year storm. Under proposed conditions, storm runoff from the site would be 1.55 cfs during a 25-year storm, and 2.10 cfs during a 100-year storm. Therefore, the proposed project would result in an incremental decrease in storm water runoff from the project site. Runoff rates in residential areas are assumed to be slightly lower than runoff rates in commercial areas, predominately due to the additional landscape area that is typically provided in residential areas.

The proposed project would not result in an increase in the amount or velocity of runoff leaving the project site during a 25- or 100-year storm event when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no drainage impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

12.b) Flooding

The project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood plain as shown on the Flood Insurance Rate maps published by FEMA. No flood-related impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

12.c) Drainage into Surface Waters and Water Quality

Short-term Impacts. The proposed project would result in demolition and grading activities that would expose and disturb project site soils, resulting in potentially significant erosion-related water quality impacts. Construction activities also have the potential to result in discharges of petroleum-based products, construction materials and other substances that have potentially significant impacts to the quality of runoff water. Numerous federal, state and local regulatory programs have been established to minimize impacts to water quality resulting from construction operations. Compliance with applicable regulations and the mitigation requirements provided below will reduce the potential for the proposed project to result in short-term construction-related water quality impact to a less than significant level.

Long-term Impacts. The residential and commercial uses proposed for the project site would not be a substantial source of runoff of pollutants. Project site parking would be located beneath the proposed structure, which would minimize the potential for runoff water to collect oil, grease and other pollutants commonly associated with parking lot runoff. Additionally, runoff from the parking garage that is generated would be directed to a proposed grease/oil separator filter prior to discharge from the project site. Compliance with standard City requirements would reduce the project's potentially significant long-term water quality impacts to a less than significant level. These requirements include the preparation of an operation and maintenance plan for the use of storm drain surface water pollutant interceptors, stenciling of storm drain warnings of the direct connection of the drainage system to creeks and the ocean, and implementation of water quality protection best management practices (BMPs).

12.d) Groundwater

The proposed project would not result in significant changes in the quantity, quality, direction or rate of flow of groundwater, and there are no direct groundwater extractions proposed by the project. Due to the 80-90 feet depth of groundwater below the project site, it is unlikely that construction activities will encounter groundwater. Therefore, there would be no project-related impacts to groundwater and no mitigation measures are required.

Water Resources – Required Mitigation

W-1 **Erosion Control/Water Quality Protection Plan.** Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit for the proposed project, the applicant or project developer shall prepare an erosion control plan that is consistent with the requirements outlined in the *Procedures for the Control of Runoff into Storm Drains and Watercourses* and the Building and Safety Division *Erosion/Sedimentation Control Policy* (2003). The erosion control/water quality protection plan shall specify how the required water quality protection procedures are to be designed, implemented and maintained over the duration of the development project. A copy of the plan shall be submitted to the Community Development and Public Works Departments for review and approval, and a copy of the approved plan shall be kept at the project site.

At minimum, the erosion control/water quality protection plan prepared for the proposed project shall address the implementation, installation and/or maintenance of each of the following water resource protection strategies:

- Paving and Grinding
- Sandbag Barriers
- Spill Prevention/Control
- Solid Waste Management
- Storm Drain Inlet Protection
- Stabilize Site Entrances and Exits
- Illicit Connections and Illegal Discharges
- Water Conservation
- Stockpile Management
- Liquid Wastes
- Street Sweeping and Vacuuming
- Concrete Waste Management
- Sanitary/Septic Waste Management
- Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance
- Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning
- Vehicle and Equipment Fueling

W-2 **Minimization of Storm Water Pollutants of Concern.** The applicant shall implement approved plans incorporating long-term storm water best management practices (BMPs) to minimize identified storm water pollutants of concern including automobile oil, grease and metals. The applicant shall submit project plans incorporating long-term BMPs to minimize storm water pollutants of concern to the extent feasible, and obtain approval from Public Works Engineering. The owners association shall maintain approved facilities in working order for the life of the project, and shall inspect annually and submit report to City annually.

W-3 **Storm Drain System Stenciling and Signage.** Within the project area, the applicant shall implement stenciling of all storm drain inlets and catch basins, and posting of signs at all public access points along channels and creeks, with language in English and Spanish and graphic icons prohibiting dumping, per approved plans. The applicant shall submit project plans to the satisfaction of Public Works Engineering that identify storm drain inlet locations throughout the project area, and specified wording and design

treatment for stenciling of storm drain inlets and signage for public access points that prohibit dumping. The owners association shall maintain ongoing legibility of the stenciling and signage for the life of the project, and shall inspect at least annually and submit report to City annually.

W-4 **Trash Storage Area Design.** Project trash container areas shall incorporate approved long-term structural storm water best management practices (BMPs) to protect water quality: Trash containers shall have drainage from adjoining roofs and pavement diverted around the areas; and trash container areas shall be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash. The applicant shall submit project plans to the satisfaction of Public Works Engineering and Solid Waste that incorporate long-term structural best management practices for trash storage areas to protect storm water quality. The owners association shall maintain these structural storm water quality protections in working order for the life of the project, and shall inspect at least annually and report to City annually.

Water Resources – Residual Impact

Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce potential short- and long-term water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

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.

The project site is located in a portion of the City that is almost entirely urbanized and biological resources are limited. Vegetation on the project site consists primarily of ornamental landscaping. No endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats currently listed nor candidates for State or Federal protection are present at this site. The proposed project would not result in impacts to native plants, animals, their habitats or wildlife movement opportunities. Potential impacts resulting from the removal of two mature trees from the project site can be reduced to a less than significant level by providing replacement trees. Proposed mitigation measure B-1 requires that at least four replacement trees be provided, and mitigation measure B-2 requires the protection of the mature tree that is to remain on the project site during the construction of the project.

Previous archaeological resource surveys of the project site and within a ¼-mile of the site area have not documented prehistoric resources. However, the project site is considered sensitive for the potential presence of buried prehistoric artifacts. Potentially significant impacts to previously undetected archaeological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing proposed mitigation measures CR-1 and 2, which require on-site monitoring of initial site demolition and grading and additional measures should archaeological resources be discovered.

With the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, project-related impacts to biological and cultural resources would be less than significant.

b) Short-Term vs. Long-Term Environmental Goals.

The proposed project would not result in significant long-term impacts related to environmental issue areas such as air quality, public services, or traffic. Potential long-term impacts of the project related to the loss of mature trees, geologic and other hazards can be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures. Other potential short- and long-term impacts of the proposed project can also be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, the proposed project's long-term impacts would be less than significant. A preliminary review of proposed project's consistency with applicable policies of the General Plan concluded that it would be potentially consistent with the long-term environmental protection goals that have been adopted by the City.

c) Cumulative Impacts.

The proposed project would not result in air emissions that would exceed the threshold adopted by the APCD related to cumulative air quality impacts. Traffic generated by the proposed project would be reduced when compared to the existing and previous uses of the existing on-site building, therefore, the project would not result in significant cumulative traffic-related impacts. The proposed project would not result in the substantial use of available potable water supplies or available waste water treatment capabilities, and would not result in significant cumulative public service/utility impacts. Other impacts of the proposed project can also be reduced to a less than significant level and would not substantially contribute to cumulative environmental impacts. Therefore, the proposed project's cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

d) Other Environmental Effects.

The groundwater beneath the project site that has been impacted by gasoline constituents is approximately 80-90 feet below the ground surface and is unlikely to result in a potential health risk to future occupants of the proposed project. However, the SBC FPD will require soil gas sampling at the project site to determine if there is a potential for harmful vapors to collect in the underground parking area or proposed residences and commercial areas. If there is a potential for the project to be adversely affected by the impacted ground water, a health risk assessment will be required to quantitatively evaluate the potential for significant health risk effects to project occupants. If the health risk analysis concludes that potential cancer risk greater than one in one million may result, measures to reduce potential health risks would be required. The most likely mitigation measure would be the installation of a vapor barrier beneath the proposed structure, which is a very effective method for controlling vapor migration. Therefore, potential health-related effects to occupants of the proposed building can be reduced to a less than significant level.

Proposed units K and L would be located on the third floor of the building facing State Street, and estimated future traffic noise levels at the units' exterior balconies would be 64 dB CNEL, which exceeds the City's exterior noise threshold standard. Noise control mitigation (Measure N-1) for these required outdoor living areas has been proposed to reduce exterior noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Proposed units K and L would also have interior noise levels exceeding the City's 45 dB CNEL threshold standard. To comply with the interior noise level requirement, proposed mitigation measure N-2 requires the preparation of an interior noise analysis. Based on a preliminary review, the dwelling units would most likely require sound-rated windows, and such windows would also need to be closed to achieve an interior noise level

of 45 dB CNEL. Air conditioning or mechanical ventilation would be required so that the occupants could keep the windows closed at their discretion. Other residential units provided by the proposed project would experience lower interior noise levels and would comply with the interior noise standards.

With the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, project-related impacts to human beings would be less than significant.

INITIAL STUDY CONCLUSION

On the basis of this initial evaluation it has been determined that the proposed project's potentially significant environmental impacts can be feasibly reduced to a less than significant level by identified mitigation measures, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental review document.

Case Planner: Ali De Busk

Environmental Analyst: DAandaleno Date: 2-15-07

EXHIBITS:

A. Vicinity Map

B. Project Plans

C. Preliminary Foundation Investigation, Pacific Materials Laboratory, July 27, 2005.

D. Environmental Noise Study, Dudek, August 8, 2006.

E. Draft Phase 1 ESA, Rincon, July 27, 2005.

F. Oak Tree Evaluation, Bill Spiewak, February 27, 2006.

G. Revised Traffic and Parking Study, Associated Transportation Engineers, August 1, 2006.

H. Preliminary Construction Plan, GRD Construction, July 31, 2006.

I. Preliminary Drainage Analysis, Penfield and Smith, May, 2006.

LIST OF SOURCES USED IN PREPARATION OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

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

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) & CEQA Guidelines

General Plan Circulation Element

General Plan Conservation Element

2003 Housing Element

General Plan Land Use Element

General Plan Noise Element w/appendices

General Plan Map

General Plan Seismic Safety/Safety Element

General Plan Update 2030: Conditions, Trends and Issues Report

Master Environmental Assessment

Santa Barbara Municipal Code