



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

**Planning and Development**

## **Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration**

### **Sabado Tarde Partners LLC Housing Development**

**Case Nos. 24DVP-00013, 24CDP-00074, &  
26NGD-00003**

**May 2026**



**Owner/Applicant**

Sabado Tarde Partners, LLC  
P.O. Box 91821  
Santa Barbara, CA 93190  
(805) 689-7665

**Agent**

C.J. Horstman  
134 W. Branch Street Suite B  
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420  
(805) 439-7719

**Engineer**

Flowers & Associates Inc.  
115 W. Canon Perdido Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
(805) 966-2224

For More Information Contact Willow Brown, Development Review Division, Planner (805) 568-2040

## 1.0 REQUEST/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is a request for a Development Plan and Coastal Development Permit to allow the demolition of an existing 1,600-square-foot duplex and construction of a new three-story 7,731-square-foot 15-unit apartment building. There will be 12 two-bedroom units and three studio units. The apartments are intended for long-term rental to students. The three studio units will be low-income units affordable to lower income students. Additionally, one of the two-bedroom units will be a moderate-income unit affordable to moderate income students. The building will have a maximum height of 29'-6". Other site improvements include the construction of two stairway towers in the northeast and southeast corners of the property, a new trash enclosure, a bicycle parking area, a 10' x 20' loading zone, a 6'-tall wood fence, concrete flatwork, and landscaping. Additionally, each unit will have in-unit laundry facilities. In conformance with the 2030 Climate Action Plan, the project will be all-electric with no natural gas hookup, will utilize 100% carbon free electricity (serviced by Southern California Edison), will implement a Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDMP), and will provide containers for recycling and green waste. The TDMP includes monthly rental incentives for those who use Uber, Lyft, or the new MTD Wave service, secure storage areas on-site for bicycles and e-bike charging stations, phased move-in/move-out procedures, and a storage/pick-up/drop-off site on the site with Lime or another scooter company.

The project is requesting the following waivers/concessions under State Density Bonus Law:

- Waiver/reduction of the provisions of Article II Section 35-76.7 to allow an increase to the allowed bedroom density from three to 27 total bedrooms.
- Waiver/reduction of the setback provisions of Article II Section 35-76.8, as follows:
  - a. Reduction of the required front setback of 50 feet from road centerline and 20 feet from the edge of right-of-way (ROW), to four feet from the Sabado Tarde ROW.
  - b. Reduction of the required side setbacks from five feet to zero feet.
  - c. Reduction of the required rear setback from 25 feet to zero feet.
- Waiver/reduction of Article II Section 35-76.10 height requirements to allow an increase to the required height limit from 25 feet to 29'-6".
- Waiver/reduction of the Article II Section 35-76.11 parking requirements to allow zero onsite parking spaces.
- Concession to reduce the landscape requirements of Article II Section 35-76.13, which requires that 15% of the net lot area be devoted to landscaping. The project proposes that 9.3%, or 467 square feet, of the project site be devoted to landscaping.

The parcel will be served by the Goleta Water District, the Goleta West Sanitary District, and the Santa Barbara County Fire Department. The property is a 0.12-acre parcel zoned SR-M-18 and shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 075-142-019, located at 6722 Sabado Tarde Road in the Goleta Community Plan area, Second Supervisorial District.

## 2.0 PROJECT LOCATION

The project is located at 6722 Sabado Tarde Road, identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 075-142-019, Second Supervisorial District.

| 2.1 Site Information           |                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comprehensive Plan Designation | Urban, RES-18.0 (Multiple Family, max. dwelling units 18.0/acre), Goleta Community Plan Area, Coastal Zone |

|                            |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Zoning District, Ordinance | SR-M-18 (Medium Density Student Residential, 18 units per acre gross), Article II                                                                                                      |
| Site Size                  | 0.12 acres (5,000 square feet)                                                                                                                                                         |
| Present Use & Development  | Duplex                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Surrounding Uses/Zoning    | North: Multi-Family Dwelling, SR-M-18<br>South: Single-Family Dwelling, SR-M-18<br>East: Multi-Family Dwelling, SR-M-18<br>West: Single-Family Dwelling, SR-M-18                       |
| Access                     | Sabado Tarde Road                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Public Services            | Water Supply: Goleta Water District<br>Sewage: Goleta West Sanitary District<br>Fire: Santa Barbara County Fire Department, County Station 17<br>Police: Santa Barbara County Sherriff |

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### 3.1 PHYSICAL SETTING

The project site is located within the Isla Vista area, in the Coastal Zone, and is currently developed with an approximately 1,600-square-foot duplex constructed in 1963. The site is currently accessed via a driveway off Sabado Tarde Road. The majority of the site is paved, with vegetation on site consisting of one ash tree and a hedge along the northern and eastern property lines. No rare, threatened, endangered or sensitive plant or animal species are associated with the project site. There are no significant historic resources on the project site and no archaeological sites or resources are known to be associated with the site. The site is relatively flat, and soils on the project site are mapped as "Concepcion fine sandy loam (CgA), 0 to 2 percent slopes". This soil type is not considered a prime agricultural soil. Surrounding uses include single-family and multi-family residences.

#### 3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

The environmental baseline from which the project's impacts are measured consists of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as described above.

### 4.0 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS CHECKLIST

The following checklist indicates the potential level of impact and is defined as follows:

**Potentially Significant and Unavoidable Impact:** A fair argument can be made, based on the substantial evidence in the file, that an effect may be significant.

**Significant but Mitigable:** Incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a Potentially Significant Impact to an Insignificant Impact.

**Insignificant Impact:** An impact is considered adverse but does not trigger a significance threshold.

**No Impact:** There is adequate support that the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the subject project.

**Beneficial Impact:** There is a beneficial effect on the environment resulting from the project.

**Reviewed Under Previous Document:** The analysis contained in a previously adopted/certified environmental document addresses this issue adequately for use in the current case and is summarized in the discussion below. The discussion should include reference to the previous documents, a citation of the page(s) where the information is found, and identification of mitigation measures incorporated from the previous documents.

#### 4.1 AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                              | Potent.<br>Signif. and<br>Unavoid. | Significant<br>but<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public or the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view? |                                    |                                 | X         |                                        |                                           |
| b. Change to the visual character of an area?                                                                                             |                                    |                                 | X         |                                        |                                           |
| c. Glare or night lighting which may affect adjoining areas?                                                                              |                                    |                                 | X         |                                        |                                           |
| d. Visually incompatible structures?                                                                                                      |                                    |                                 | X         |                                        |                                           |

**Existing Setting.** The project site is located approximately 430 feet north of the coastal bluff along Del Playa Drive, approximately 3,000 feet west of the UCSB campus, and approximately 1,800 feet east of the West Campus faculty housing, in an urban area bounded by residential development. Public views in this area are dominated by the Santa Ynez mountains to the north and the Pacific Ocean to the south. Views of this site are limited to the immediate neighboring properties and Sabado Tarde Road fronting the property.

**Environmental Thresholds.** The County's Visual Aesthetics Impact Guidelines classify coastal and mountainous areas, the urban fringe, and travel corridors as "especially important" visual resources. A project may have the potential to create a significantly adverse aesthetic impact if (among other potential effects) it would impact important visual resources, obstruct public views, remove significant amounts of vegetation, substantially alter the natural character of the landscape, or involve extensive grading visible from public areas. The guidelines address public, not private, views.

#### Impact Discussion.

**(a-d).** The project will not cause an obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public or the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. The project area is heavily developed and there is an existing duplex on the project site. There are no public views or views of the ocean from the project site. The project will not cause a change to the visual character of the area or introduce visually incompatible structures. The area is primarily developed with medium- and high-density student housing. The majority of the structures in the vicinity of the project are two-story, with a few three-story complexes such as a 19-unit apartment complex at 6565 Sabado Tarde Road with a maximum height of approximately 31 feet, located 0.4 miles from the project site, and a 22-unit condominium building (the ICON) with a maximum height of 45 feet for the residential component, located 0.5 miles from the project site. The project is for high-density student housing and will result in a 15-unit apartment building with a maximum height of 29'-6", consistent with other student housing complexes in the area. The proposed lighting is consistent with the requirements of Article II. Exterior lighting regulations specify that lighting shall be hooded and no unobstructed beam of exterior lighting shall be directed toward any area zoned or developed

residential, or toward any environmentally sensitive habitat area. No lighting shall be so designed as to interfere with vehicular traffic at any portion of a street. With the inclusion of standard County lighting conditions, impacts would be insignificant.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in any substantial change in the aesthetic character of the area since the development is visually compatible with its surroundings. Thus, the project would not cause a cumulatively considerable effect on aesthetics.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be insignificant.

## 4.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                                    | Poten. Signif. and Unavoid. | Significant but Mitigable | Insignif. | No Impact / Beneficial Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. Convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use, impair agricultural land productivity (whether prime or non-prime) or conflict with agricultural preserve programs? |                             |                           |           | X                             |                                  |
| b. An effect upon any unique or other farmland of State or Local Importance?                                                                                                    |                             |                           |           | X                             |                                  |

**Impact Discussion.** The majority of the project site is paved, and the site is developed with and surrounded by urban development. The site does not contain prime agricultural soils or a combination of acreage and/or soils which render the site an important agricultural resource. The site does not adjoin and/or will not impact any neighboring agricultural operations.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

### 4.3a AIR QUALITY

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Poten. Signif. and Unavoid. | Signif. But Mitigable | Insignif. | No Impact / Beneficial Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. The violation of any ambient air quality standard, a substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (emissions from direct, indirect, mobile and stationary sources)? |                             |                       | X         |                               |                                  |
| b. The creation of objectionable smoke, ash or odors?                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                             |                       | X         |                               |                                  |
| c. Extensive dust generation?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                             |                       | X         |                               |                                  |

**Existing Setting.** As the local air quality management agency, the Santa Barbara County APCD is responsible for monitoring air pollutant levels to ensure National Ambient Air Quality Standards and California Ambient Air Quality Standards are met, and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards. Depending on whether the standards are met or exceeded, Santa Barbara County is classified as being in "attainment" or "nonattainment". Currently, Santa Barbara County is in nonattainment for the

State standards for ozone and Particulate Matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less (PM<sub>10</sub>) (Santa Barbara APCD 2022a).

**Environmental Threshold.** Chapter 5 of the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (as revised in August 2024) addresses the subject of air quality. The thresholds provide that a proposed project will not have a significant impact on air quality if operation of the project will:

- emit (from all project sources, mobile and stationary), less than the daily trigger for offsets for any pollutant (currently 240 pounds per day for NO<sub>x</sub> and ROC, and 80 pounds per day for PM<sub>10</sub>);
- emit less than 25 pounds per day of oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) or reactive organic compounds (ROC) from motor vehicle trips only;
- not cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone);
- not exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board; and
- be consistent with the adopted federal and state Air Quality Plans.

No thresholds have been established for short-term impacts associated with construction activities. However, the County's Grading Ordinance requires standard dust control conditions for all projects involving grading activities. Long-term/operational emissions thresholds have been established to address mobile emissions (i.e., motor vehicle emissions) and stationary source emissions (i.e., stationary boilers, engines, and chemical or industrial processing operations that release pollutants).

**(a-c).** The scope of the project includes demolition of the existing duplex and construction of a 15-unit apartment building. The project site is relatively flat, and grading for the project consists of 70 cubic yards of cut and 10 cubic yards of fill. Earth moving operations at the project site would not have the potential to result in significant project-specific short-term emissions of fugitive dust and PM<sub>10</sub>, with the implementation of standard dust control measures that are required for all new development in the County. The project proposes to restrict the use of private automobiles by only leasing to potential tenants that do not have a vehicle to park in the Isla Vista area, and will include rent/lease agreement language restricting vehicle storage in the area. Because of this, there will be minimal new vehicle emissions as trips will be limited to ride services such as Uber/Lyft, carpooling, public transportation, etc.

Project construction will require site preparation, grading, demolition, building construction, and paving activities, which will temporarily produce air pollutant emissions. Emissions of ozone precursors (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROC) during project construction would result primarily from the on-site use of heavy earthmoving equipment. Due to the limited period of time that grading activities would occur on the project site, construction-related emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and ROC would not be significant on a project-specific or cumulative basis. However, due to the non-attainment status of the air basin for ozone, the project should implement measures recommended by the APCD to reduce construction-related emissions of ozone precursors to the extent feasible. Compliance with these measures is routinely required for all new development in the County.

Long-term emissions are typically estimated using the CalEEMod computer model program. However, the proposed project, consisting of 15 new residential units is below threshold levels for significant air quality impacts, pursuant to the screening table maintained by the Santa Barbara County APCD. The screening table indicates that a housing project involving apartments of fewer than 400 units will likely not exceed the air quality threshold. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a potentially significant long-term impact on air quality.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level.

In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the significance criteria for air quality. Therefore, the project's contribution to regionally significant air pollutant emissions is not cumulatively considerable, and its cumulative effect is insignificant.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

#### 4.3b AIR QUALITY - GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

| Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Will the project:                                                                                     | Poten. Signif. and Unavoid. | Signif. But Mitigable | Insignif. | No Impact / Beneficial Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?      |                             |                       | X         |                               |                                  |
| b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? |                             |                       | X         |                               |                                  |

**Existing Setting.** Greenhouse gases (GHG) include carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>), and nitrogen trifluoride (NF<sub>3</sub>) (California Health and Safety Code, § 38505(g)). These gases create a blanket around the earth that allows light to pass through but traps heat at the surface, preventing its escape into space. While this is a naturally occurring process known as "the greenhouse effect," human activities have accelerated the generation of GHG emissions above pre-industrial levels (U.S. Global Change Research Program 2018). The global mean surface temperature increased by approximately 1.8°F (1°C) in the past 80 years, and is likely to reach a 2.7°F (1.5°C) increase between 2030 and 2050 at current global emission rates (IPCC 2023).

The largest source of GHG emissions from human activities in the United States is from fossil fuel combustion for electricity, heat, and transportation. Specifically, the *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gases and Sinks: 1990-2022* (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2024) states that the primary sources of GHG emissions from fossil fuel combustion in 2022 included electricity production (25%), transportation (29%), industry (30%), agriculture (10%), and commercial and residential end users (31%, combined).

The County of Santa Barbara's 2030 Climate Action Plan (2030 CAP) and the accompanying Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) contain a detailed description of the proposed project's existing regional setting as it pertains to GHG emissions. Regarding non-stationary sources of GHG emissions within Santa Barbara County specifically, the transportation sector produces 48% of the total emissions, followed by natural gas used in buildings and facilities (21%), agriculture (14%), electricity used in buildings and facilities (7%), off-road equipment (5%), and solid waste (4%) sectors (2030 CAP).

The overabundance of GHG in the atmosphere has led to a warming of the earth and has the potential to substantially change the earth's climate system. More frequent and intense weather and climate-related events are expected to damage infrastructure, ecosystems, and social systems across the United States

(U.S. Global Change Research Program 2018). California's Central Coast, including Santa Barbara County, will be affected by changes in precipitation patterns, reduced foggy days, increased extreme heat days, exacerbated drought and wildfire conditions, and acceleration of sea level rise leading to increased coastal flooding and erosion (Langridge, Ruth 2018).

Global mean surface warming results from GHG emissions generated from many sources over time, rather than emissions generated by any one project (IPCC 2014). As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, and discussed in Section 15130, "'Cumulative impacts' refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." Therefore, by definition, climate change under CEQA is a cumulative impact.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b) states that a lead agency "should focus its analysis on the reasonably foreseeable incremental contribution of the project's [GHG] emissions to the effects of climate change." A project's individual contribution may appear small but may still be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, it is not appropriate to determine the significance of an individual project's GHG emissions by comparing against state, local, or global emission rates. Instead, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research recommends using an established or recommended threshold as one method of determining significance during CEQA analysis (OPR 2008, 2018). A lead agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution to an existing cumulatively significant issue, such as climate change, is not significant based on supporting facts and analysis [CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(2)].

**Environmental Threshold.** In 2024, Santa Barbara County adopted its 2030 Climate Action Plan (2030 CAP), with an emission reduction goal of 50 percent below 2018 levels by 2030 and achieving carbon neutrality by 2045 or sooner, which are in line with the State's GHG emission reduction goals. The 2030 CAP is a qualified greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, which allows discretionary non-industrial projects to tier their GHG emissions analysis off the 2030 CAP Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) if the project is found consistent with the 2030 CAP. To aid in determining a project's consistency with the 2030 CAP, the County has developed the Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist (Checklist). A project found to be consistent with the 2030 CAP that tiers GHG emissions analysis off the 2030 CAP PEIR will have an insignificant environmental impact in regards to GHG emissions.

Concurrent with adoption of the 2030 CAP, Santa Barbara County adopted new GHG emissions thresholds of significance (Thresholds) for non-industrial stationary source projects based on the County's 2030 GHG target (i.e., 50 percent below 2018 levels by 2030). The thresholds were developed and adopted consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7, Thresholds of Significance. The thresholds are designed to identify (1) a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing adverse condition, and (2) a cumulatively significant impact in combination with other projects causing related impacts. A CEQA lead agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution to an existing cumulatively significant issue, such as climate change, is not significant based on supporting facts and analysis (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, Discussion of Cumulative Impacts, Subsection (a)(2)). The CEQA Guidelines direct that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered insignificant if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure designed to alleviate the cumulative impact (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(3)). Any non-industrial stationary source project that does not demonstrate consistency with the 2030 CAP shall be subject to the following applicable threshold based on project type: 2.68 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year per resident for residential projects; 2.63 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year per employee for non-residential projects; and 2.67 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year per service person for mixed-use projects. If the estimated GHG emissions are less than the applicable threshold, staff can

conclude that the project will have an insignificant environmental impact, and the project would require no further analysis. For projects that exceed the threshold, mitigation measures are needed.

**Impact Discussion.**

**(a, b).** The proposed project has been found consistent with the 2030 Climate Action Plan, as demonstrated by the Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist (Attachment 3). The proposed project can therefore tier GHG emissions analysis from the 2030 CAP PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Based on the 2030 CAP measures included in the proposed project description, the project would result in less than significant GHG emissions and would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to GHG emissions and climate change.

Certain 2030 CAP measures do not apply to the proposed project as follows, and inclusion of these measures is not required for consistency with the 2030 CAP.

- EV Charging Infrastructure: This measure is not applicable because there is no parking proposed as part of the project.
- Off-Road Equipment Electrification: The project only provides 467 square feet of landscaped area, and will not require major landscaping equipment such as mowers, chippers, and tractors for ongoing operations and maintenance.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

**References:**

County of Santa Barbara Sustainability Division, Community Services Department, *Climate Action Plan*, August 2024.

County of Santa Barbara Sustainability Division, Community Services Department, *Final Environmental Impact Report for the Climate Action Plan*, May 2024.

County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development, *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, October 2008 (Revised August 2024).

Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*, June 2008.

Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), *CEQA and Climate Change Advisory, Discussion Draft*, December 2018.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II, and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Mayer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 151 pp.

IPCC, 2023: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Core Writing Team, H. Lee and J. Romero (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, pp. 1-34, doi: 10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647.001

Langridge, Ruth (University of California, Santa Cruz). California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment, Central Coast Summary Report, September 2018.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gasses and Sinks: 1990-20122*, April 2024.

U.S. Global Change Research Program, *Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume II: Impacts, Risks, and Adaptation in the United States*, 2018.

#### 4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                      | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| <b>Flora</b>                                                                                                                                                      |                                      |                             |           |                                        |                                           |
| a. A loss or disturbance to a unique, rare or threatened plant community?                                                                                         |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| b. A reduction in the numbers or restriction in the range of any unique, rare or threatened species of plants?                                                    |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| c. A reduction in the extent, diversity, or quality of native vegetation (including brush removal for fire prevention and flood control improvements)?            |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| d. An impact on non-native vegetation whether naturalized or horticultural if of habitat value?                                                                   |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| e. The loss of healthy native specimen trees?                                                                                                                     |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| f. Introduction of herbicides, pesticides, animal life, human habitation, non-native plants or other factors that would change or hamper the existing habitat?    |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| <b>Fauna</b>                                                                                                                                                      |                                      |                             |           |                                        |                                           |
| g. A reduction in the numbers, a restriction in the range, or an impact to the critical habitat of any unique, rare, threatened or endangered species of animals? |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| h. A reduction in the diversity or numbers of animals onsite (including mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish or invertebrates)?                             |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| i. A deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat (for foraging, breeding, roosting, nesting, etc.)?                                                        |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| j. Introduction of barriers to movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?                                                                    |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| k. Introduction of any factors (light, fencing, noise, human presence and/or domestic animals) which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife?              |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |

**Impact Discussion.** No natural plant communities, habitats, or sensitive wildlife species are known to exist or inhabit the premises based on review of the Goleta Community Plan sensitive resource mapping, County's CNDDDB database, and the ESH overlay found in the County's GIS software, as well as a site visit. Additionally, no native or specimen trees are located in the area of project disturbance. The only tree that will be impacted by the project is a five-inch-diameter ash tree, which is neither native nor a specimen tree. There is no vegetation on site of habitat value. The project would not introduce barriers to movement or factors which

hinder the normal activities of wildlife as the site is currently developed with an occupied duplex. Additionally, the project site is surrounded by urban development. As a result, no impacts to biological resources are anticipated.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact<sup>1</sup>.** No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

#### 4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

| Will the proposal:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Poten. Signif. and Unavoid. | Signif. But Mitigable | Insignif. | No Impact / Beneficial Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any object, building, structure, area, place, record, or manuscript that qualifies as a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                             |                       | X         |                               |                                  |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric or historic archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                             | X                     |           |                               |                                  |
| c. Disturb any human remains, including those located outside of formal cemeteries?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                             | X                     |           |                               |                                  |
| d. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in the Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:<br><br>1) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or<br><br>2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. |                             | X                     |           |                               |                                  |

**County Environmental Thresholds.** Chapter 8 of the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (2008, revised February 27, 2018) contains guidelines for the identification, significance evaluation, and mitigation of impacts to cultural resources, including archaeological, historic,

<sup>1</sup> May require payment of fees to the California Department of Fish and Game

and tribal cultural resources. In accordance with the requirements of CEQA, these guidelines specify that if a resource cannot be avoided, it must be evaluated for importance under specific CEQA criteria. CEQA Section 15064.5(a)(3)A-D contains the criteria for evaluating the importance of archaeological and historic resources. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the significance criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources: (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage; (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. The resource also must possess integrity of at least some of the following: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. For archaeological resources, the criterion usually applied is (D).

CEQA calls cultural resources that meet these criteria "historical resources". Specifically, a "historical resource" is a cultural resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources, or included in or eligible for inclusion in a local register of historical resources, as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1, or deemed significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (g) of Section 5024.1. As such, any cultural resource that is evaluated as significant under CEQA criteria, whether it is an archaeological resource of historic or prehistoric age, a historic built environment resource, or a tribal cultural resource, is termed a "historical resource".

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b) states that "a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b), substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired. The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project: (1) demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; (2) demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources; or (3) demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

For the built environment, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Weeks and Grimmer 1995), is generally considered as mitigated to an insignificant impact level on the historical resource.

#### **Existing Setting:**

*Prehistoric Resources.* For at least the past 10,000 years, the area that is now Santa Barbara County has been inhabited by Chumash Indians and their ancestors. There are no known cultural resources on the project site. The majority of the project site is paved, and it is developed with an existing duplex, thus inhibiting a cultural resources survey. Based on a records search by the CCIC (Central Coast Information Center of the University of California, Santa Barbara), there are no archaeological sites recorded within the parcel or within 2,000 feet. However, there is a lack of survey data in the general area of the project

to provide clear insight into the local environmental patterning of site locations. Therefore, it was determined that there is a moderate potential for cultural resources to be within the project area.

*Historic Resources (Built Environment).* The subject property consists of a 0.12 acre parcel on Sabado Tarde Road in the Isla Vista area. The parcel was created as part of the Isla Vista Tract in 1925. The parcel is developed with a duplex of approximately 1,600 square feet, constructed in 1963. The structure is not considered a historical resource.

*Tribal Cultural Resources.* On September 24, 2025, a formal notice of application completeness for the proposed project was sent to Gabriel Frausto, Chairman of the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation, Matthew Vestuto, Chair of the Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians, and Kenneth Kahn, Tribal Chairman and Sam Cohen, Government Affairs and Legal Officer of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians. The notice provided notification of the opportunity for consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1 and in accordance with the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, and included a description of the proposed project. On September 30, 2025, the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation responded, requesting formal consultation for the project. A meeting took place on October 9, 2025. They requested that a cultural resource monitor be present during ground disturbing activities such as demolition of existing footings and additional excavations to accommodate new structures. There were no responses from the Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians or the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians.

#### **Impact Discussion.**

**(a).** No historic resources are known to occur within the project site; therefore, demolition of the existing structures and hardscapes would have no effect on historic resources. Impacts to historic resources from the proposed project would be insignificant.

**(b - d).** As described above in the “Existing Setting” section, there are no known archaeological or tribal cultural resources (TCRs) or evidence of human remains on the subject parcel. Due to the majority of the project site being covered with structures and hardscape, the site cannot be adequately surveyed. Given the lack of survey data in the general area of the project, there is the potential that unknown cultural resources, including TCRs, could be encountered during grading and ground disturbance. Impacts are considered significant but mitigable with monitoring (CulRes-07), which requires all earth disturbances including grading and placement of fill within the project area to be monitored by a P&D approved archaeologist and a Native American consultant as recommended through the AB 52 consultation process and in compliance with the provisions of the County Archaeological Guidelines. Additionally, the standard condition requiring that work be stopped in the event that cultural materials are uncovered during grading (CulRes-09) will be applied. These measures would ensure that any previously unidentified cultural resources discovered during site development, including Tribal Cultural Resources, are treated in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and Chapter 8 of the County’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines. Impacts would be significant but mitigable.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Since the project would not significantly impact cultural resources, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on the County’s cultural resources with implementation of the mitigation measure described below.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** The following mitigation measure, along with standard County conditions, would reduce the project's cultural resource impacts to an insignificant level:

1. **CulRes-07 Cultural Resource Monitor.** The Owner/Applicant shall have all earth disturbances including scarification and placement of fill within the archaeological site area monitored by a P&D approved archaeologist and a Native American consultant in compliance with the provisions of the County Archaeological Guidelines.

**TIMING:** Prior to Zoning Clearance issuance, the Owner/Applicant shall submit for P&D review and approval, a contract or Letter of Commitment between the Owner/Applicant and the archaeologist, consisting of a project description and scope of work, and once approved, shall execute the contract.

**MONITORING:** The Owner/Applicant shall provide P&D compliance monitoring staff with the name and contact information for the assigned onsite monitor(s) prior to grading/building permit issuance and pre-construction meeting. P&D compliance monitoring staff shall confirm monitoring by archaeologist and Native American consultant and P&D grading inspectors shall spot check field work.

With the incorporation of this measure, residual impacts would be insignificant.

#### 4.6 ENERGY

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                        | Poten. Signif. and Unavoid. | Signif. But Mitigable | Insignif. | No Impact / Beneficial Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. Substantial increase in demand, especially during peak periods, upon existing sources of energy? |                             |                       | X         |                               |                                  |
| b. Requirement for the development or extension of new sources of energy?                           |                             |                       | X         |                               |                                  |

**Impact Discussion.** The County has not identified significance thresholds for electrical and/or natural gas service impacts (Thresholds and Guidelines Manual). Private electrical and natural gas utility companies provide service to customers in Central and Southern California, including the unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County. The proposed project consists of a 15-unit apartment building. Based on an estimated occupancy rate of 2.65 people per household (attached residences), energy use is estimated as follows:

##### Energy Use

| Multiplier                                                             | Project Demand                                                                                      |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Natural Gas<br>(13.7 million BTU per capita <sup>2</sup> )             | 544.58 million BTU per year (15 apartments * 2.65/household = 39.75 residents, * 13.7 m BTU/capita) |
| Electricity<br>(7.4MWh/yr/home PG&E; 6.9 MWh/yr/home SCE) <sup>3</sup> | 103.5 megawatt hours per year (15 apartments * 6.9 MWh/yr)                                          |

<sup>2</sup> <http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/states/residential.cfm/state=CA#ng>

<sup>3</sup> <http://enduse.lbl.gov/info/LBNL-47992.pdf>

Based on these figures, the natural gas use for a project of this size is estimated to be 544.58 million BTU per year and the electricity use is estimated to be 103.5 MWh per year. The proposed project will not result in a substantial increase in energy demand or require the development of extension of new sources of energy. In summary, the project would have minimal long term energy requirements and a negligible effect on regional energy needs. No adverse impacts would result.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The project's contribution to the regionally significant demand for energy is not considerable, and is therefore insignificant.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be insignificant.

#### 4.7 FIRE PROTECTION

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| a. Introduction of development into an existing high fire hazard area or exposure of people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?                                                 |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| b. Project-caused high fire hazard?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| c. Introduction of development into an area without adequate water pressure, fire hydrants or adequate access for fire fighting?                                                                                                                                   |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| d. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| e. Introduction of development that will substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan, emergency evacuation plan, or fire prevention techniques such as controlled burns or backfiring in high fire hazard areas?                                       |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| f. Development of structures beyond safe Fire Dept. response time?                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |

**Existing Setting.** The project site is not located within a designated High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The site is currently developed with an approximately 1,600-square-foot duplex. The project site falls within the jurisdiction of the Santa Barbara County Fire Department and is served by County Station 17, located in the northwest corner of the University of California Santa Barbara campus, approximately 1.4 miles northeast of the project site.

**County Standards.** The following County Fire Department standards are applied in evaluating impacts associated with the proposed development:

- The emergency response thresholds include Fire Department staff standards of one on-duty firefighter per 4,000 persons (generally 1 engine company per 12,000 people, assuming three firefighters/station). The emergency response time standard is approximately 5-6 minutes.
- Water supply thresholds include a requirement for 750 gpm at 20 psi for urban single family dwellings in urban and rural developed neighborhoods, and 500 gpm at 20 psi for dwellings in rural areas (lots larger than five acres).
- The ability of the County's engine companies to extinguish fires (based on maximum flow rates through hand held line) meets state and national standards assuming a 5,000 square foot structure. Therefore, in any portion of the Fire Department's response area, all structures over 5,000 square feet are an unprotected risk (a significant impact) and therefore should have internal fire sprinklers.
- Access road standards include a minimum width (depending on number of units served and whether parking would be allowed on either side of the road), with some narrowing allowed for driveways. Cul-de-sac diameters, turning radii and road grade must meet minimum Fire Department standards based on project type.
- Two means of egress may be needed and access must not be impeded by fire, flood, or earthquake. A potentially significant impact could occur in the event any of these standards is not adequately met.

**Impact Discussion.**

(a – f). The project is not located within a High Fire Hazard Area and does not involve new fire hazards. The Santa Barbara County Fire Department reviewed and approved the project with conditions requiring an automatic fire sprinkler system, an upgrade to the fire hydrant located at the corner of Camino Del Sur and Sabado Tarde Road to a commercial fire hydrant, recorded addressing, and the payment of Fire Department Development Impact Mitigation Fees. There is adequate water pressure to serve the project site, and adequate fire hydrants with the upgrade of the fire hydrant located at the corner of Camino Del Sur and Sabado Tarde Road to a commercial hydrant. The project site is served by the Goleta Water District. The Goleta Water District issued a Preliminary Water Service Determination, dated June 21, 2024, stating that the District has sufficient water supply available to serve the project, and the project site has adequate historic water credit for the forecasted demand associated with the proposed project. There is no new infrastructure proposed as part of the project, and the project site will be accessed off of Sabado Tarde Road. The project site is not located in an area that would require controlled burns or other fire prevention techniques. The project is located approximately 1.4 miles away from the nearest Santa Barbara County Fire Department Station, an approximate five-minute drive, and is therefore located in an area with an adequate response time from fire protection services.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Since the project would not create significant fire hazards, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on fire safety within the County.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be insignificant.

#### 4.8 GEOLOGIC PROCESSES

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, soil creep, mudslides, ground failure (including expansive, compressible, collapsible soils), or similar hazards? |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| b. Disruption, displacement, compaction or overcovering of the soil by cuts, fills or extensive grading?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| c. Exposure to or production of permanent changes in topography, such as bluff retreat or sea level rise?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| d. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands or dunes, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river, or stream, or the bed of the ocean, or any bay, inlet or lake?                                                                                                                                   |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| g. The placement of septic disposal systems in impermeable soils with severe constraints to disposal of liquid effluent?                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| h. Extraction of mineral or ore?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| i. Excessive grading on slopes of over 20%?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| j. Sand or gravel removal or loss of topsoil?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| k. Vibrations, from short-term construction or long-term operation, which may affect adjoining areas?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| l. Excessive spoils, tailings or over-burden?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |

**Existing Setting.** The project site is located in a portion of the County that is identified in the Seismic Safety and Safety Element as having a low potential for liquefaction, landslides, expansive soils, soil creep, compressible/collapsible soils, and high ground water. The project site has a moderate potential for seismic/tectonic activity. Its overall geological problems index is Category III (Moderate). The Seismic Safety and Safety Element states that areas designated Category III would have moderate problems, but would generally be suitable for all types of development.

**County Environmental Threshold.** Pursuant to the County's Adopted Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, impacts related to geological resources may have the potential to be significant if the proposed project involves any of the following characteristics:

1. The project site or any part of the project is located on land having substantial geologic constraints, as determined by P&D or PWD. Areas constrained by geology include parcels located

near active or potentially active faults and property underlain by rock types associated with compressible/collapsible soils or susceptible to landslides or severe erosion. "Special Problems" areas designated by the Board of Supervisors have been established based on geologic constraints, flood hazards and other physical limitations to development.

2. The project results in potentially hazardous geologic conditions such as the construction of cut slopes exceeding a grade of 1.5 horizontal to 1 vertical.
3. The project proposes construction of a cut slope over 15 feet in height as measured from the lowest finished grade.
4. The project is located on slopes exceeding 20% grade.

#### **Impact Discussion.**

**(a, e, j, k).** Based on the Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan's Seismic Safety Element maps, the project site has an overall geologic problems index of moderate. The project site is not underlain by any known fault. Compliance with existing building regulations will reduce potential ground shaking impacts caused by movement along any distant fault to a less than significant level. Liquefaction potential in the area has been determined to be low. Any potential for expansive soils will be mitigated by the use of non-expansive engineered fill. All soils-related hazards will be less than significant through the normal building permit review and inspection process. Grading operations that would occur on the project site would remove vegetative cover and disturb the ground surface, thereby increasing the potential for erosion and sedimentation impacts. However, the potential for the project to cause substantial erosion and sediment transport would be adequately mitigated by the County's standard erosion control and drainage requirements. Additionally, the site is relatively flat, and grading is limited to 70 cubic yards of cut and 10 cubic yards of fill. Thus, impacts would be less than significant with standard conditions. There is the potential for vibrations due to short-term construction. However, application of the standard County condition limiting construction hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (Noise-02) would reduce short-term construction impacts to an insignificant level.

**(b - d, f-i, l).** The project would involve a negligible amount of fill which would have negligible impacts on the environment. The site is relatively flat, and grading is limited to 70 cubic yards of cut and 10 cubic yards of fill. The project site is not located on a coastal bluff. The project site is located over 400 feet from the bluff, and there is significant infrastructure between the project site and the bluff, including Sabado Tarde Road, Del Playa Drive, multiple residences, and Walter Capps Park. There are no mapped creeks or other water bodies within 3,000 feet of the project site. Therefore, there would be no changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands or dunes, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river, or stream, or the bed of the ocean, or any bay, inlet or lake. There are no unique geological features located on the project site, and the project would not result in the use of septic systems. The project would not involve mining.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Since the project would not result in significant geologic impacts, and geologic impacts are typically localized in nature, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on geologic processes within the County.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

#### 4.9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/RISK OF UPSET

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                                                                   | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| a. In the known history of this property, have there been any past uses, storage or discharge of hazardous materials (e.g., fuel or oil stored in underground tanks, pesticides, solvents or other chemicals)? |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| b. The use, storage or distribution of hazardous or toxic materials?                                                                                                                                           |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| c. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (e.g., oil, gas, biocides, bacteria, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?                     |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| d. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?                                                                                                                      |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| e. The creation of a potential public health hazard?                                                                                                                                                           |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| f. Public safety hazards (e.g., due to development near chemical or industrial activity, producing oil wells, toxic disposal sites, etc.)?                                                                     |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| g. Exposure to hazards from oil or gas pipelines or oil well facilities?                                                                                                                                       |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| h. The contamination of a public water supply?                                                                                                                                                                 |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |

**Existing Setting.** The parcel was created as part of the Isla Vista Tract in 1925 and was vacant until it was developed with a duplex of approximately 1,600 square feet in 1963. There has not been additional development since that time, and the parcel has remained occupied with residential uses.

#### Impact Discussion.

**(a – h).** There is no evidence that hazardous materials were used, stored or spilled on site in the past, and there are no aspects of the proposed use that would include or involve hazardous materials at levels that would constitute a hazard to human health or the environment. The project site has historically been developed with residential uses, and the project is for residential development consisting of a 15-unit apartment building. There will be no hazardous or toxic materials stored on the project site. The use of common household materials (cleaners, gardening products, etc.) on the project site would not result in significant hazardous materials/waste impacts. The project will not result in significant traffic impacts, and therefore would not substantially interfere with emergency response capabilities to the project site or to other properties in the project area. There are no oil or gas pipelines or oil wells on or adjacent to the project site.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

#### 4.10 LAND USE

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| a. Structures and/or land use incompatible with existing land use?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| c. The induction of substantial unplanned population growth or concentration of population?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| d. The extension of sewer trunk lines or access roads with capacity to serve new development beyond this proposed project?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| e. Loss of existing affordable dwellings through demolition, conversion or removal?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| f. Displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| g. Displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| h. The loss of a substantial amount of open space?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| i. An economic or social effect that would result in a physical change? (i.e. Closure of a freeway ramp results in isolation of an area, businesses located in the vicinity close, neighborhood degenerates, and buildings deteriorate. Or, if construction of new freeway divides an existing community, the construction would be the physical change, but the economic/social effect on the community would be the basis for determining that the physical change would be significant.) |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| j. Conflicts with adopted airport safety zones?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |

**Existing Setting.** The subject 0.12-acre project site is developed with an existing 1,600-square-foot duplex located on Sabado Tarde Road in the Isla Vista area of the Goleta Community Plan. The project site is located in the urban area and is surrounded by residential development. The project site is zoned SR-M-18. The purpose of the SR-M Zone District is to provide for residential development which is unique to a student-oriented community. The intent is to provide for multiple residential development at moderate densities to mitigate potential adverse impacts on traffic, parking, open space, aesthetics, health, and safety and to encourage combining substandard lots to allow for a more efficient utilization of space.

**Environmental Threshold.** The Thresholds and Guidelines Manual contains no specific thresholds for land use. Generally, a potentially significant impact can occur if a project would result in substantial growth

inducing effects or result in a physical change in conflict with County policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

**Impact Discussion.**

**(a - c, f, g).** The project is for student residential housing in a zone designated for residential development unique to a student-oriented community. The project will not result in structures incompatible with existing land use. The project does not meet all of the applicable land use policies and regulations. However, the project is utilizing the "Builder's Remedy" (Government Code Section 65589.5(d)), which limits disapproval of the project to specific, adverse impacts upon the public health or safety caused by the project. Additionally, the project is utilizing California's State Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915). Pursuant to Government Code Sections 65915(e)(1) and 65915(e)(2), a developer can waive or reduce development standards, as defined in the statute, when those requirements will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development at the allowed density. The project is requesting waivers from the required landscape area for the SR-M Zone, the property setbacks, the bedroom density standard, the standard parking requirements, and the allowable building height. These waivers will not have an adverse impact on the public health or safety, and will not cause a significant environmental impact. There would be an insignificant environmental impact due to conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations. The project will have an insignificant impact on population growth and concentration of population. Isla Vista has a clear and demonstrated need for additional units, and units are being built in response to existing housing needs. Although the proposed density is greater than the zone allows, the area is primarily developed with medium- and high-density student housing. The majority of the structures in the vicinity of the project are two-story, with a few three-story complexes such as a 19-unit apartment complex at 6565 Sabado Tarde Road with a maximum height of approximately 31 feet, located 0.4 miles from the project site, and a 22-unit condominium building (the ICON) with a maximum height of 45 feet for the residential component, located 0.5 miles from the project site. The project is for high-density student housing and will result in a 15-unit apartment building with a maximum height of 29'-6", consistent with other student housing complexes in the area. The project includes the demolition of an existing duplex, which is currently occupied with tenants. However, the project proposes to construct a greater amount of units than are being demolished. There are two existing units, and the project is proposing to construct 15, resulting in 13 additional units. Additionally, the site is zoned SR-M-18 (Medium Density Student Residential, 18 units per acre gross). Due to the nature of student housing, tenants typically occupy units on a temporary basis and vacate the unit once the school year is over. Impacts regarding displacement of people or housing would be insignificant.

**(d, e, h - j).** The project will not result in the extension of sewer trunk lines or access roads beyond the proposed development boundaries that could serve other new developments. The parcel is served by the Goleta West Sanitary District, who issued a letter stating there is sewer capacity presently available to serve the project. The project site takes access off of Sabado Tarde Road, and there are no driveways or vehicular access proposed on the project site. The surrounding properties are developed and have existing sewer service and access. There is no existing affordable housing on the project site. The project site is currently developed with a duplex, and open space on the site is limited to paving for parking. There is no public open space on the site, and the project will not impact any public open spaces. No physical changes are proposed that will result in an economic or social effect. The project site is not within an adopted airport safety zone.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in any substantial change to the site's conformance with environmentally protective policies and standards or have

significant growth inducing effects. Thus, the project would not cause a cumulatively considerable effect on land use.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

#### 4.11 NOISE

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                         | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| a. Long-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding County thresholds (e.g. locating noise sensitive uses next to an airport)? |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| b. Short-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding County thresholds?                                                        |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| c. Project-generated substantial increase in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas (either day or night)?                     |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |

**Environmental Setting/Threshold.** Noise is generally defined as unwanted or objectionable sound which is measured on a logarithmic scale and expressed in decibels (dB(A)). The duration of noise and the time period at which it occurs are important values in determining impacts on noise-sensitive land uses. The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and Day-Night Average Level ( $L_{dn}$ ) are noise indices which account for differences in intrusiveness between day- and night-time uses. County noise thresholds are: 1) 65 dB(A) CNEL maximum for exterior exposure, 2) 45 dB(A) CNEL maximum for interior exposure of noise-sensitive uses, and 3) an increase in noise levels by 3 db(A) – either individually or cumulatively when combined with other noise-generating sources when the existing (ambient) noise levels already exceed 65 db(A) at outdoor living areas or 45db(A) at interior living areas. Noise-sensitive land uses include: residential dwellings; transient lodging; hospitals and other long-term care facilities; public or private educational facilities; libraries, churches; and places of public assembly.

The proposed project site is located outside of 65 dB(A) noise contours for roadways, public facilities, airport approach and take-off zones. Surrounding noise-sensitive uses consist of residential dwellings.

#### Impact Discussion:

**(a – c).** The proposed project consists of a 15-unit apartment building on a site currently developed with a duplex (proposed for demolition). The project will not result in long-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding County thresholds. The property is surrounded on all sides by residentially-zoned lots that are developed with single- and multi-family dwellings. Standard building requirements will reduce the interior noise level to below 45 db(A). Application of the standard County condition limiting construction hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (Noise-02) would reduce short-term construction related noise impacts to an insignificant level. Therefore, future short-term construction-related noise impacts would have an insignificant impact on the neighborhood. Long-term noise generated onsite from future residential uses would not: 1) exceed County thresholds, or 2) substantially increase ambient noise levels in adjoining areas. Impacts would be insignificant.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in any substantial noise effects. Therefore, the project would not contribute in a cumulatively considerable manner to noise impacts.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** With the incorporation of standard County conditions, residual impacts would be insignificant.

#### 4.12 PUBLIC FACILITIES

| Will the proposal require or result in:                                                                                                                                                                               | Poten.<br>Signif. and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| a. A need for new or altered police protection and/or health care services?                                                                                                                                           |                                   |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| b. Student generation exceeding school capacity?                                                                                                                                                                      |                                   |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| c. Significant amounts of solid waste or breach any federal, state, or local standards or thresholds relating to solid waste disposal and generation (including recycling facilities and existing landfill capacity)? |                                   |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| d. The relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities (sewer lines, lift-stations, etc.) the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?        |                                   |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| e. The relocation or construction of new or expanded storm water drainage or water quality control facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                               |                                   |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |

#### Environmental Thresholds.

(Schools) A significant level of school impacts is generally considered to occur when a project would generate sufficient students to require an additional classroom.

(Solid Waste) A project is considered to result in significant impacts to landfill capacity if it would generate 196 tons per year of solid waste (operational). This volume represents 5% of the expected average annual increase in waste generation, and is therefore considered a significant portion of the remaining landfill capacity. In addition, construction and demolition waste from new construction, remodels and demolition/rebuilds is considered significant if it exceeds 350 tons. A project which generates between 40 and 196 tons per year of solid waste is considered to have an adverse **cumulative** effect on solid waste generation, and mitigation via a Solid Waste Management Plan is recommended.

**Table 4.12.A: Typical Waste Generation During Construction**

| Commercial Development  | Amounts in Pounds per Square foot |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Remodel                 | 40                                |
| Demolition              | 100                               |
| New construction        | 25                                |
| Residential Development | Amounts in Pounds per Square foot |
| Remodel                 | 100                               |
| Demolition              | 60                                |
| New construction        | 15                                |

Note: These estimates are based on the US Environmental Protection Agency's 1998 C&D study (Document: EPA530-R-98-010; June 1998) and data gathered by the San Luis Obispo Integrated Waste Management Authority in 2005 and 2006.

#### **Impact Discussion.**

(a - e). The proposed project would result in the demolition of the existing 1,600-square-foot duplex and construction of a 15-unit apartment complex, resulting in an addition of 13 units. This level of new development would not have a significant impact on existing police protection or health care services. The project would not generate the number of students (approximately 20) that would require an additional classroom. The project is for student housing intended for college students, and would not impact any elementary or high schools in the area. Additionally, school fees for residential development would be paid at the time the development is constructed, as required by State Law. The project would not cause the need for new or altered sewer system facilities as it is already in the service district, and the District has adequate capacity to serve the project (Goleta West Sanitary District letter, dated November 22, 2024). The proposed project will not result in significant drainage impacts or require the construction of stormwater facilities that would have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. The project submitted a Tier 1 Stormwater Control Plan. Pursuant to the Stormwater Control Plan, the project will result in 260 square feet of additional impervious surface area. Stormwater runoff will be dispersed from the roof and pavement to the proposed landscaped areas on site.

Based on the waste generation factors in the County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, the proposed project will generate approximately 37.8 tons per year of operational solid waste. This is based on a project description of 15 attached apartments; residency estimates of 2.65 people per household for attached residences (e.g. apartments); and a factor of 0.95 tons of solid waste generated per person per year. This amount is less than the threshold for operational solid waste of 196 tons per year.

The proposed project will involve approximately 1,600 square feet of demolition and 7,731 square feet of new residential construction. Based on generation rates of 60 lbs. / sq. ft. for residential demolition and 15 lbs. / sq. ft. for new residential construction, the development of the project will generate approximately 211,965 pounds (106 tons) of solid waste. As this is less than the threshold of 350 tons, a Solid Waste Management Plan is not required to reduce the amount of waste generated during construction. Standard County conditions requiring covered receptacles for construction and employee trash, and frequent pickup of this trash, will prevent trash and debris from blowing off-site and will ensure that the site is free of trash and debris when construction is complete.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the threshold of significance for

public services. Therefore, the project's contribution to the regionally significant demand for public services is not considerable, and is insignificant.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** With the incorporation of standard County conditions, residual impacts would be insignificant.

#### 4.13 RECREATION

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                                                                       | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with established recreational uses of the area?                                                                                                                                                        |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| b. Conflict with biking, equestrian and hiking trails?                                                                                                                                                             |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| c. Substantial impact on the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities (e.g., overuse of an area with constraints on numbers of people, vehicles, animals, etc. which might safely use the area)? |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |

**Environmental Setting/Threshold.** The Thresholds and Guidelines Manual contains no threshold for park and recreation impacts. However, the Board of Supervisors has established a minimum standard ratio of 4.7 acres of recreation/open space per 1,000 people to meet the needs of a community. The Santa Barbara County Parks Department maintains more than 900 acres of parks and open spaces, as well as 84 miles of trails and coastal access easements.

The proposed project site is located in a developed residential area of Isla Vista. No established recreational uses (including parks, biking, equestrian or hiking trails) are located on or adjacent to the proposed project site.

##### **Impact Discussion.**

(a - c). The proposed project would result in the development of a 15-unit apartment building. Project implementation would not result in any conflicts with established recreational uses of the area, including biking, equestrian or hiking trails. Additionally, the apartments are intended for student housing. There is a housing shortage for UCSB students, and rather than increasing the population, the project would provide more housing opportunities for existing students. There would not be a population increase associated with project implementation and the project would result in insignificant adverse impacts on the quality and quantity of existing recreational opportunities, both in the project vicinity and County-wide. Impacts would be insignificant.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Since the project would not affect recreational resources, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on recreational resources within the County.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

#### 4.14 TRANSPORTATION

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                     | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?       |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?                                                                                          |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| d. Result in inadequate emergency access?                                                                                                                        |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |

**Existing Setting.** The proposed project site is located in the Isla Vista area, approximately 2,000 feet south of El Colegio Road and 1.7 miles south of Highway 101. The site is accessed off of Sabado Tarde Road, a public road, in between Camino Corto and Camino Del Sur. The project does not propose vehicular access, and does not propose any on-site parking areas. The project proposes to restrict the use of vehicles by including clauses in tenant leases that prohibit tenants from maintaining a privately owned vehicle in the Isla Vista area.

#### County Environmental Thresholds.

According to the County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, a significant transportation impact would occur when:

- a. **Potential Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy.** A transportation impact occurs if a project conflicts with the overall purpose of an applicable transportation and circulation program, plan, ordinance, or policy, including impacts to existing transit systems and bicycle and pedestrian networks pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(1).
- b. **Potential Impact to VMT.** According to the OPR Technical Advisory, the County considers transportation projects that will (1) reduce VMT, or (2) not likely lead to a substantial or measurable increase in vehicle travel, to have insignificant VMT impacts. The County's VMT Calculator incorporates screening criteria, thresholds of significance, mitigation measures, and data from the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments' (SBCAG) Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM). The County estimates VMT for transportation projects using total roadway VMT, or the VMT generated by the number of vehicles on each roadway segment and length of each roadway segment in the defined area. Total Roadway VMT reflects all vehicles (passenger and commercial vehicles) assigned on the roadway network.

The OPR Technical Advisory contains screening criteria for land use and transportation projects. Land use or transportation projects meeting any of the screening criteria, absent substantial evidence to the contrary, will have insignificant VMT impacts and will not require further analysis. A multiple-component project must have each component meet at least one applicable screening criteria related to each specific land use. The screening criteria for small projects is included in the table below.

#### Screening Criteria for Land Use Projects

| Screening Category |                                                           |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Small Projects     | A project that generates 110 or fewer average daily trips |

Transportation projects that would (1) reduce VMT, or (2) are not likely to lead to a substantial or measurable increase in vehicle travel would have insignificant VMT impacts. Additionally, the County threshold of significance for residential projects that do not meet the screening criteria are included in the table below.

| Project Type | Threshold for Determination of Significant VMT Impacts                                              |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Residential  | Project VMT exceeds a level of 15 percent below existing County VMT for home-based VMT per resident |

- c. **Design Features and Hazards.** A transportation impact occurs if a project would result in potential roadway hazards, such as a driveway that would not meet site distance requirements, a new traffic signal, or a new use and substantial traffic that would create potential safety problems.
- d. **Emergency Access.** A significant impact occurs if a project will potentially impede emergency access vehicles.

#### Impact Discussion:

- (a-d). The project will not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance, or policy and therefore impacts would be insignificant. The project is consistent with Goleta Community Plan Policy CIRC-GV-4, which states that new development shall be sited and designed to provide maximum access to non-motor vehicle forms of transportation, including well designed walkways, paths and trails between new residential development and adjacent and nearby commercial uses and employment centers. Transit services are located within two blocks of the project site. MTD Line 27 is the closest with service to UCSB and the Camino Real Marketplace. The transit route has a stop at Embarcadero del Mar and Seville with headways of 36 minutes. Travel time to/from UCSB is approximately 10 minutes via bus from this stop. Lines 11, 15x, 24X, and 28 all provide additional transit service along El Colegio Road between Isla Vista/UCSB, Camino Real Marketplace, and the main Transit Center (with connections to SBCC and other MTD routes). There is bike parking provided on site, and if tenants ride their bicycle to UCSB, the ride would be in the 5-10 minute range. Walking from the project site to campus is about a 15-20 minute walk. The project does not conflict with ordinance requirements regarding parking because the project site is located within a half-mile from the MTD El Colegio and Camino Corto stop, which qualifies as a major transit stop. Pursuant to California Assembly Bill 2097 (AB 2097), no on-site parking is required for a development project if the project is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop. Therefore, no parking is required for the project. The project also includes a Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDMP), which includes monthly rental incentives for those who use Uber, Lyft, or the new MTD Wave service, secure storage areas on-site for bicycles and e-bike charging stations, phased move-in/move-out procedures, and a storage/pick-up/drop-off site on the site with Lime or another scooter company

Pursuant to the Santa Barbara County VMT tool, the proposed project has the potential to generate 67 Average Daily Trips (ADT). The project was analyzed using the Santa Barbara County VMT tool, and it was determined that the small increase in ADT is consistent with County transportation policies related to roadway and intersection operations. The net increase in ADT is less than the 110 ADT that is used as a screening criteria for small projects. The project can be screened from analyzing potential impacts to VMT, and a VMT transportation study is not required. A Traffic Impact Statement was submitted by Orosz Engineering Group, dated May 13, 2024 (Attachment 4), which states that the proposed project would result in a reduction in ADT from the existing use as a duplex since the tenants will be restricted by lease from owning a vehicle while living in the apartments. Trips would be limited to request-a-ride/delivery services such as Uber/Lyft, DoorDash, GrubHub, etc. which are often not single destination trips and postal, trash, building service, and other utility traffic which would also be going to other properties in the area. The project would result in insignificant VMT impacts.

The project would not result in potential roadway hazards from an increase in traffic because the project will not result in a substantial amount of new vehicle trips, and may result in a reduction of trips due to the tenants being restricted by lease from owning a vehicle while living in the apartments. There would not be potential hazards from a new driveway not meeting Public Works standards because no driveway or parking is proposed. The project includes a loading area on site for move-in and move-out, maintenance, and temporary loading and unloading. This area has been reviewed and approved by Public Works. The project would not impede emergency access because fire access is required to extend within 150 feet of all portions of a building. The site has a depth of 100 feet, and the fire hose would be able to reach all parts of the building from Sabado Tarde Road. The Santa Barbara County Fire Department reviewed and approved the project with conditions requiring an automatic fire sprinkler system, an upgrade to the fire hydrant located at the corner of Camino Del Sur and Sabado Tarde Road to a commercial fire hydrant, recorded addressing, and the payment of Fire Department Development Impact Mitigation Fees.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the threshold of significance for transportation. Therefore, the project's contribution to the regionally significant transportation impacts is not considerable, and is insignificant.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary

#### 4.15 WATER RESOURCES/FLOODING

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                             | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters? |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| b. Changes in percolation rates, drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?       |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| c. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?                                              |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| d. Discharge, directly or through a storm drain system, into surface waters (including but not limited to wetlands, riparian areas, ponds, springs, creeks, streams, rivers, lakes, estuaries, tidal areas, bays, ocean, etc) or alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, or thermal water pollution? |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| e. Alterations to the course or flow of flood water or need for private or public flood control projects?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                      |                             |           | X                                      |                                           |
| f. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding (placement of project in 100 year flood plain), accelerated runoff or tsunamis, sea level rise, or seawater intrusion?                                                                                                                                                                       |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| g. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwater?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| h. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or recharge interference?                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| i. Overdraft or over-commitment of any groundwater basin? Or, a significant increase in the existing overdraft or over-commitment of any groundwater basin?                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| j. The substantial degradation of groundwater quality including saltwater intrusion?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| k. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |
| l. Introduction of storm water pollutants (e.g., oil, grease, pesticides, nutrients, sediments, pathogens, etc.) into groundwater or surface water?                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |

**Existing Setting.** The subject parcel is located within the jurisdiction of the Goleta Water District. There are no water bodies located on the subject parcel or within the project site area.

**Water Resources Thresholds.** A project is determined to have a significant effect on water resources if it would exceed established threshold values which have been set for each overdrafted groundwater basin. These values were determined based on an estimation of a basin's remaining life of available water storage. If the project's net new consumptive water use [total consumptive demand adjusted for recharge less discontinued historic use] exceeds the threshold adopted for the basin, the project's impacts on water resources are considered significant.

A project is also deemed to have a significant effect on water resources if a net increase in pumpage from a well would substantially affect production or quality from a nearby well.

**Water Quality Thresholds.** A significant water quality impact is presumed to occur if the project:

- Is located within an urbanized area of the county and the project construction or redevelopment individually or as a part of a larger common plan of development or sale would disturb one (1) or more acres of land;
- Increases the amount of impervious surfaces on a site by 25% or more;
- Results in channelization or relocation of a natural drainage channel;
- Results in removal or reduction of riparian vegetation or other vegetation (excluding non-native vegetation removed for restoration projects) from the buffer zone of any streams, creeks or wetlands;
- Is an industrial facility that falls under one or more of categories of industrial activity regulated under the NPDES Phase I industrial storm water regulations (facilities with effluent limitation; manufacturing; mineral, metal, oil and gas, hazardous waste, treatment or disposal facilities; landfills; recycling facilities; steam electric plants; transportation facilities; treatment works; and light industrial activity);
- Discharges pollutants that exceed the water quality standards set forth in the applicable NPDES permit, the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) Basin Plan or otherwise impairs the beneficial uses<sup>4</sup> of a receiving water body;
- Results in a discharge of pollutants into an "impaired" water body that has been designated as such by the State Water Resources Control Board or the RWQCB under Section 303 (d) of the Federal Water Pollution Prevention and Control Act (i.e., the Clean Water Act); or
- Results in a discharge of pollutants of concern to a receiving water body, as identified by the RWQCB.

#### **Impact Discussion**

**(a, c, e).** The project would not result in changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters. The project will not include alterations, such as new revetments or jetties, that could change the course or direction of water movements or activities, such as water withdrawals, that could change the amount of water in the surface water bodies surrounding the site. No private or public flood control projects are included as part of the proposed project. The project site is located approximately 430 feet north from the coast and there are no mapped creeks or other water bodies within 3,000 feet of the project site. Additionally, there is significant residential development surrounding the project site. The project is not located within a mapped floodway or floodplain.

**(b, d, f - l).** The project will be expected to generate only minor amounts of storm water pollutants, however, the site has historically been used for residential activities. The project will not introduce new pollutants not already used. These pollutants include fertilizers, pesticides, and household cleaners, chemicals, and runoff from paving. Minor amounts of such household hazardous material will not present a significant potential for release of waterborne pollutants and will be highly unlikely to create a public health hazard.

The proposed project will not result in a significant increase in impermeable surfaces that would lead to increased stormwater runoff. The project submitted a Tier 1 Stormwater Control Plan. Pursuant to the Stormwater Control Plan, the project will result in 260 square feet of additional impervious surface area. Stormwater runoff will be dispersed from the roof and pavement to the proposed landscaped areas on site.

---

<sup>4</sup> Beneficial uses for Santa Barbara County are identified by the Regional Water Quality Control Board in the Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coastal Basin, or Basin Plan, and include (among others) recreation, agricultural supply, groundwater recharge, fresh water habitat, estuarine habitat, support for rare, threatened or endangered species, preservation of biological habitats of special significance.

Construction activities such as grading could also potentially create temporary runoff and erosion problems. Application of standard County grading, erosion, and drainage-control measures will ensure that no significant increase of erosion or storm water runoff will occur.

Predictions about the long-term effects of global climate change include rising sea levels due to melting of glaciers and thermal expansion. Rising sea levels could increase the incidence of flooding in coastal areas with altitudes at or near sea-level. Although the exact rate of future sea level rise is unknown, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has estimated that sea levels may rise between 50 and 90 centimeters (approximately 1.6-to-3 feet) by the year 2100.<sup>5</sup> Although the project does involve lands in a coastal area, the site is located approximately 430 feet from the bluff and there is significant infrastructure including Sabado Tarde Road, Del Playa Drive, multiple residences, and Walter Capps Park between the project site and the bluff. Therefore, even if these rates of sea level rise are realized, the project site would remain well above sea level within that planning horizon. The project is not located within a mapped floodway or floodplain.

The project would be supplied water from the Goleta Water District, which receives its water from the Goleta groundwater basin. Since the volume of water extracted annually does not exceed its safe yield, this basin is not overdrafted. The Goleta Water District issued a Preliminary Water Service Determination, dated June 21, 2024, stating that the District has sufficient water supply available to serve the project, and the project site has adequate historic water credit for the forecasted demand associated with the proposed project. The proposed project would not use septic systems and therefore groundwater quality would not be impacted by effluent associated with septic systems.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the threshold of significance for water resources. Therefore, the project's contribution to the regionally significant issues of water supplies and water quality is not considerable, and is insignificant.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact.** No mitigation is required. Residual impacts will be insignificant.

## 5.0 INFORMATION SOURCES

### 5.1 County Departments Consulted

Police, Fire, Public Works, Flood Control, Parks, Environmental Health, Air Pollution Control District, County HCD, Project Clean Water, Transportation, Resource Recovery and Waste Management, Special Districts, Regional Programs

### 5.2 Comprehensive Plan

|                                     |                               |                                     |                      |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Seismic Safety/Safety Element |                                     | Conservation Element |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Open Space Element            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Noise Element        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Coastal Plan and Maps         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Circulation Element  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | ERME                          | <input type="checkbox"/>            |                      |

### 5.3 Other Sources

|                                     |               |                                     |                            |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Field work    | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Ag Preserve maps           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Calculations  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Flood Control maps         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Project plans | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Other technical references |

<sup>5</sup> The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is a scientific intergovernmental body set up by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

|                                     |                                                |                                                                     |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Traffic studies                                | (reports, survey, etc.)                                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Records                                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning files, maps, reports   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Grading plans                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Zoning maps                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Elevation, architectural renderings            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soils maps/reports              |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Published geological map/reports               | Plant maps                                                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Topographical maps                             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archaeological maps and reports |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual | Other                                                               |

## 6.0 PROJECT SPECIFIC (*short- and long-term*) AND CUMULATIVE IMPACT SUMMARY

The proposed project does not have potential impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels.

- I. Project specific impacts which are of unavoidable significance levels: **None**
- II. Project specific impacts which are potentially significant but can be reduced to less than significant levels with incorporation of mitigation measures: **Cultural Resources**
- III. Potentially significant adverse cumulative impacts: **None**

## 7.0 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Poten. Signif. and Unavoid. | Signif. But Mitigable | Insignif. | No Impact / Beneficial Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions or significantly increase energy consumption, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |                             |                       | X         |                               |                                  |
| 2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                             |                       | X         |                               |                                  |

| Will the proposal result in:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Poten.<br>Signif.<br>and<br>Unavoid. | Signif.<br>But<br>Mitigable | Insignif. | No<br>Impact /<br>Beneficial<br>Impact | Reviewed<br>Under<br>Previous<br>Document |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 3. Does the project have 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         |                                        |                                           |
| 4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                      | X                           |           |                                        |                                           |
| 5. Is there disagreement supported by facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts and/or expert opinion supported by facts over the significance of an effect which would warrant investigation in an EIR ?                                                                                                                           |                                      |                             | X         |                                        |                                           |

- As discussed in this document, the project would not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions or significantly increase energy consumption, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- There are no short-term environmental goals that would be achieved by the proposed project to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- As discussed throughout this document, the project does not have any impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Any contribution of the project to significant cumulative impacts would be adequately reduced by mitigation measures identified to address project-specific impacts.
- The project would allow for the construction of a 15-unit apartment building. As discussed in this document, with implementation of identified required mitigation measures, all impacts to human beings, either directly or indirectly, would be adequately reduced to insignificant levels.
- There is no known disagreement supported by facts, reasonable assumptions predicted upon facts and/or expert opinion supported by facts over the significance of an effect which would warrant investigation in an EIR.

## 8.0 INITIAL REVIEW OF PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE SUBDIVISION, ZONING AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

The project will be subject to all applicable requirements and policies under Article II and the County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan (including the Goleta Community Plan and Coastal Land Use Plan). Specific relevant policies include those listed below:

### **Noise Element**

**Noise Element Policy 1:** *In the planning of land use, 65dB Day-Night Average Sound Level should be regarded as the maximum exterior noise exposure compatible with noise-sensitive uses unless noise mitigation features are included in the project design.*

### **Coastal Land Use Plan**

**Coastal Plan Policy 2-4:** *Within designated urban areas, new development other than that for agricultural purposes shall be serviced by the appropriate public sewer and water district or an existing mutual water company, if such service is available.*

**Coastal Plan Policy 2-6:** *Prior to issuance of a development permit, the County shall make the finding, based on information provided by environmental documents, staff analysis, and the applicant, that adequate public or private services and resources (i.e., water, sewer, roads, etc.) are available to serve the proposed development. The applicant shall assume full responsibility for costs incurred in service extensions or improvements that are required as a result of the proposed project. Lack of available public or private services or resources shall be grounds for denial of the project or reduction in the density otherwise indicated in the land use plan . . .*

**Coastal Plan Policy 4-4:** *In areas designated as urban on the land use plan maps and in designated rural neighborhoods, new structures shall be in conformance with the scale and character of the existing community. Clustered development, varied circulation patterns, and diverse housing types shall be encouraged.*

**Coastal Plan Policy 9-35:** *Oak trees, because they are particularly sensitive to environmental conditions, shall be protected. All land use activities, including cultivated agriculture and grazing, should be carried out in such a manner as to avoid damage to native oak trees. Regeneration of oak trees on grazing lands should be encouraged.*

**Coastal Plan Policy 9-1:** *Prior to the issuance of a development permit, all projects on parcels shown on the land use plan and/or resource maps with a Habitat Area overlay designation or within 250 feet of such designation or projects affecting an environmentally sensitive habitat area shall be found to be in conformity with the applicable habitat protection policies of the land use plan. All development plans, grading plans, etc., shall show the precise location of the habitat(s) potentially affected by the proposed project. Projects which could adversely impact an environmentally sensitive habitat area may be subject to a site inspection by a qualified biologist to be selected jointly by the County and the applicant.*

**Coastal Plan Policy 10-2:** *When developments are proposed for parcels where archaeological or other cultural sites are located, project design shall be required which avoids impacts to such cultural sites if possible.*

**Coastal Plan Policy 10-3:** *When sufficient planning flexibility does not permit avoiding construction on archaeological or other types of cultural sites, adequate mitigation shall be required. Mitigation shall be designed in accord with guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State of California Native American Heritage Commission.*

**Coastal Plan Policy 10-5:** *Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted which impact significant archaeological or cultural sites.*

**Coastal Plan Policy 5-10:** *Because of Isla Vista's location adjacent to the University of California and the critical need to provide affordable housing opportunities for the student population, which forms the majority of the community's residents, the following requirements shall be met in new residential developments of five units or more:*

- d. *Twenty-five percent of the total units in the project shall be affordable to persons of low or moderate income, depending on the size of the unit as follows:*

| <b>Size of Unit</b>  | <b>Max Affordable Rent</b> |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Studio</i>        | <i>Low</i>                 |
| <i>One-bedroom</i>   | <i>Low</i>                 |
| <i>Two-bedroom</i>   | <i>Moderate</i>            |
| <i>Three-bedroom</i> | <i>Moderate</i>            |

*Affordable units required pursuant to this policy shall be provided on site and maintained as affordable units for a period of twenty-five years, consistent with Policy 5-5(c).*

#### **Goleta Community Plan**

**DevStd HA-GV-1.5:** *In the event that archaeological or paleontological remains are uncovered during construction, excavation shall be temporarily suspended and redirected until the provisions of Public Resources Code section 5097.5, 5097.9 et seq. are satisfied.*

**Policy WAT-GV-1:** *For discretionary projects which would result in a net increase in water use, there shall be a sufficient supply of water to serve known existing commitments plus the proposed project.*

**Policy BIO-GV-8:** *The minimum buffer strip and setbacks from streams and creeks for new development and actions within the ESH overlay that are regulated by the County Zoning Ordinances shall be as follows, except on parcels designated for agriculture in inner rural areas where Policy BIO-GV-9 shall apply:*

- a. *ESH areas within urban, inner rural and existing developed rural neighborhoods: a setback of 50 feet from either side of top-of-bank of creeks or existing edge of riparian vegetation, whichever is further, minimizing all ground disturbance and vegetation removal, shall be indicated on all grading plans.*

**Policy FLD-GV-2:** *No structures (except flood control) shall be allowed within creek channels or along creekbanks. Structural setbacks (usually a minimum of 50-feet from top-of-bank) which are adequate to protect life and property from potential flood hazards shall be provided.*

## **9.0 RECOMMENDATION BY P&D STAFF**

**On the basis of the Initial Study, the staff of Planning and Development:**

- ☐ Finds that the proposed project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, recommends that a Negative Declaration (ND) be prepared.
- ☒ Finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures incorporated into the REVISED PROJECT DESCRIPTION would successfully mitigate the potentially significant impacts. Staff recommends the preparation of an ND. The ND finding is based on the assumption that mitigation

measures will be acceptable to the applicant; if not acceptable a revised Initial Study finding for the preparation of an EIR may result.

\_\_\_ Finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and recommends that an EIR be prepared.

\_\_\_ Finds that from existing documents (previous EIRs, etc.) that a subsequent document (containing updated and site-specific information, etc.) pursuant to CEQA Sections 15162/15163/15164 should be prepared.

Potentially significant unavoidable adverse impact areas:

\_\_\_ With Public Hearing   X   Without Public Hearing

PREVIOUS DOCUMENT:   Not Applicable  

PROJECT EVALUATOR:   Willow Brown   DATE:   5/5/2026  

#### 10.0 DETERMINATION BY ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING OFFICER

  X   I agree with staff conclusions. Preparation of the appropriate document may proceed.

\_\_\_ I DO NOT agree with staff conclusions. The following actions will be taken:

\_\_\_ I require consultation and further information prior to making my determination.

SIGNATURE:   Joseph Dargatzis  

INITIAL STUDY DATE:   11/3/2025  

SIGNATURE:   Joseph Dargatzis  

NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE:   5/5/2026  

SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

REVISION DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

FINAL NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 11.0 ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. Project Plans
3. 2030 CAP Checklist
4. Traffic Study