



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Planning and Development

www.sbcountyplanning.org

Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration 08NGD-00000-00025

Firefox Sandstone Cutting & Quartering New Buildings 07LUP-00000-00301

November 4, 2008



Owner/Applicant

Edward Langhorne
5381 Ekwill Street
Goleta, California 93117
(805) 683-9194

Agent/Attorney

Kathleen Weinheimer
420 Alameda Padre Serra
Santa Barbara, CA 93103
(805) 965-2777

Architect

Gale Beth Goldberg
322 Elizabeth Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93103
(805) 966-9038

For More Information Contact Errin Briggs, Development Review Division South, Planner (805) 568-2047

1.0 REQUEST/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Mr. Edward Langhorne, of Firefox, Inc., requests the approval of a Land Use Permit (07LUP-00000-00301) to construct three new buildings in order to conduct sandstone cutting and quartering operations in an AG-I-10 zoned, 9.64 acre parcel located at 5381 Ekwil Road, Goleta, Assessors Parcel Number (APN) 071-140-071, in the South Patterson Agricultural Block (see vicinity map in Attachment 1).

Firefox, Inc. currently operates a wholesale nursery business at the subject property. Specifically, Firefox, Inc. imports mature trees (e.g., olive trees, palms, oak trees, toyons) that are removed or otherwise proposed to be destroyed due to construction. Firefox, Inc. maintains the trees onsite by replanting them in mounds of soil. Rocks of various sizes are used to stabilize the mounds. When a tree is sold, the mounds and rocks are transported with the trees to maintain stability and ensure survival. Firefox, Inc. proposes to enhance the nursery business by splitting and quartering stone onsite to create rocks of various sizes needed to construct the tree mounds and by producing and selling rough-cut and rough-finished sandstone benches, steps, and other rough-cut garden accessories in addition to the trees.¹

The requested permit includes construction of the following: One enclosed Rock Splitting Building (1,250 square feet) would contain the rock splitting equipment and two (2) air scrubbers. One enclosed Rock Cutting Building (3,000 square feet) would contain three (3) water cutting saws, a water scrubber, a water reclamation vault, an air scrubber, a rock crusher (to be rented as needed), a 300 square foot office, and a 125 square foot storage room. An Equipment Storage Shed Building (1,250 square feet) would be constructed that would contain a large forklift, a loader, a tractor, and a crane for lifting and transporting the rock onsite as well as for other agricultural purposes. The three new buildings plus a new area of asphalt between the buildings would occupy approximately 11,500 square feet. The buildings used for the stone cutting would total 4,250 square feet, or 1% of the total lot area.

The requested permit would replace the previously approved permit (02LUP-00000-00490) which includes the following: the use of an approximately 20,000 square foot stockpile area encompassing a maximum of 150 cubic yards of soil and a maximum of 800 tons of stone. ~~The stockpile area would be~~ located at the western portion of the property, approximately 400 feet from the northern parcel boundary and 550 feet from the southern parcel boundary. ~~The stockpiled soil and stone shall only be used for onsite planting and maintenance required for the onsite nursery operation. The stockpiles shall be~~ limited to a maximum height of 5 feet from existing grade. In addition, the previously approved permit (02LUP-00000-00490) allowed less than 40 cubic yards of as-built grading for five agriculture roads (total length approximately 1,750 feet) running from the eastern to the western parcel boundaries.

¹ The benches, steps, and other garden accessories cut on the site would be unfinished and very natural looking in appearance. Rough-cutting and rough-finishing does not include any fine finishing work, polishing, or carving. Subsequent to the original submittal of this application in 2002, Mr. Langhorne has obtained permits for and constructed a building in the City of Santa Barbara (located at 32 North Calle Cesar Chavez and permitted under Permit Number BLD2004-00308 issued on May 4, 2005) where he currently conducts the fine finishing work, polishing, and carving activities necessary to create more refined stone products. No fine finishing, polishing, or carving of stone would occur on the site at 5381 Ekwil Road.

The requested permit would allow the existing stockpile and the agricultural road described above to remain on site. This permit request would allow larger stones to only be split and quartered; no fine carving is included with this permit. Given the nature of the nursery operation, sometimes rocks of smaller diameter are necessary to build the tree mounds. Of the stone onsite, only approximately 20% would be rough-cut and rough finished into sandstone benches, steps, and other rough-cut garden accessories. The remaining approximately 80% of the stone would be used for the tree mounds, whether the stone is cut down to smaller sizes or left as-is.

Operation of the water cutting saws in the Rock Cutting Building would not require the use of chemicals, but would require the use of water. Water necessary to run the water cutting saws would be pumped from a 64 cubic foot, 4 foot deep, water reclamation vault proposed within the building. A maximum of 500 gallons of water a day would be necessary to run the water cutting saws. Use of the water cutting saws would generate a water/sand solution that would be directed to the water reclamation vault, then through the water scrubber. The water would then be pressurized and recycled back out to the water cutting saws. Any waste water generated from cleaning and maintenance activities would be used for irrigation of onsite trees and landscaping. An air scrubber within the building would remove any dust from the air, and would also tie into the water scrubber system. Dust pulled into the system and excess cuttings would be contained in sand-bags as a byproduct of the scrubbing system and used as potting-mix in the onsite tree planters. Rock tailings generated from the operation would be put through the rock crusher and stored in the existing staging area as sand or gravel for use in the tree mounds. The rock crusher would operate inside one of the buildings and would only be used to crush rock for use in stabilizing the mounds of soil that are used in the onsite tree mounds.

The Rock Splitting Building would contain two (2) air scrubbers that would collect any dust generated by the rock splitting activities. These air scrubbers would also be tied into the water scrubber system in the Rock Cutting Building via pipes.

The proposed new buildings would be simple metal framed structures at the heights and square footages presented below.

Building	Maximum Height (feet)	Square Footage (Sf)
Rock Splitting	20	1,250
Rock Cutting	24	3,000
Equipment Storage Shed	20	1,250

Approximately 25,600 square feet of the existing agricultural storage and staging area located east of the new buildings would be reconfigured with new dividers constructed of 5 foot tall slump stone walls (commonly seen at rock/gravel wholesale businesses) to better organize and store the rocks of various sizes, soil, sand, and gravel for the tree mounds.

No new parking is proposed. The project would not result in any new truck trips to the site, as the stone cutting operation would use stone already delivered and stockpiled onsite and internalize operations currently conducted at an offsite location.

No vegetation removal is proposed as part of this project and less than 50 cubic yards of grading would be required to complete the project. Existing development includes a 3,000 square foot

office/storage building, a 2,000 square foot equipment storage building (unenclosed) and a 96 square foot storage building.

2.0 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located at 5381 Ekwil Lane approximately 200 feet west of the intersection of Ekwil Lane and Patterson Ave., APN 071-140-071, in the Goleta Area, Second Supervisorial District.

2.1 Site Information	
Comprehensive Plan Designation	Urban, A-I-10, Agriculture (minimum parcel size of 10 acres), Goleta Community Plan area, prime farmland
Ordinance, Zoning District	Countywide Land Use Development Code, AG-I-10, Agriculture (10 acre minimum parcel size), located in the South Patterson Agricultural Block; Flight Approach Zone for the Santa Barbara Airport
Site Size	9.64 acres (gross), 9.38 acres(net)
Present Use & Development	The site is currently used for a landscaping business that involves maintaining trees that are imported from offsite and replanting them in mounds of soil onsite until they are resold. The site is also currently being used to stockpile rock that is used to stabilize the trees in their mounds onsite and eventually resold. An office and storage building of approximately 3,000 square feet and a canopy of 2,000 square feet exist onsite; both are approximately 15 feet tall. There are 14 10-foot by 20-foot parking spaces onsite, one of which is a handicap parking space.
Surrounding Uses/Zoning	North: City of Goleta, Office and Institutional (Hospital complex) South: AG-I-10, Nurseries, Greenhouses (owned by Caird) East: AG-I-10, Field Crops (owned by Ekwil Investors, LLC) West: AG-I-10, Field Crops (owned by St. Athanasius)
Access	The site is accessed from a public road, Ekwil Street. The nearest cross street is Patterson Avenue.
Public Services	Water Supply: Goleta Water District Sewage: Goleta Sanitary District Fire: Santa Barbara County Fire District, Station No. 11

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The subject parcel is relatively flat (1 percent slope or less) and gently sloping to the southwest. The entire site is currently disturbed and hosts a nursery/landscaping business. Existing structural development includes an office/storage building and an unenclosed equipment storage building. Covering the majority of the parcel are other improvements including hundreds of imported trees in mounds of soil and a rock stockpile. There are no native habitat areas on the parcel and the site is expected to only support wildlife that are accustomed to developed urban areas.

The site is located within the South Patterson Agricultural Block which encompasses approximately 300 acres and is identified in the Goleta Community Plan as an urban agricultural area that is

designated for long-term preservation due to its long history of agricultural production and existing intensive crop production. The majority of the parcel (except for the northern boundary of the parcel) is considered Farmlands of Statewide Importance. The site is mostly underlain by Camarillo fine sandy loam (Class III non-prime soil).

The parcel is surrounded by agriculture to the south (nursery and row crops), east and west (row crops), and by institutional and commercial development to the north comprising the Goleta Valley Hospital and related office buildings. The hospital property line is approximately 875 feet from the project location and the nearest hospital building is approximately 1,500 feet from the project location. There are several industrial buildings east of Patterson Avenue and several office buildings directly north of the project site that are located between approximately 600 and 1,200 feet from the project location. The parcel is located just west of Patterson Avenue. Maria Ygnacio Creek passes to the east of the subject parcel, then merges into Atascadero Creek which passes south of the subject parcel; both creeks are located over 1,000 feet away from the parcel. The 100-foot flood hazard zone for Atascadero Creek, however, crosses the southern third of the subject parcel in an area that is set aside as a future growing area. The Santa Barbara County Flood Control District holds a 20-foot flood control easement south of the southern boundary of the parcel.

4.0 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS CHECKLIST

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation: Incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a Potentially Significant Impact to a Less Than Significant Impact.

Less Than Significant 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.

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:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous 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	

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
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		

Impact Discussion:

- a) Construction of the proposed project would not block any scenic vistas. The proposed heights of the buildings (24 feet or below) would not block public views of the mountains as seen from the surrounding street network or other public viewing areas. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts on public views of the mountains.

The public can partially view the subject parcel while traveling south on Patterson Avenue for a limited amount of time. Otherwise, there are no public views of the parcel given the surrounding agriculture in the area and the existing screen plantings located along each of the parcel boundaries. Given the limited public views of the parcel and the fact that the heights of the new buildings would be approximately 24 feet or lower, the proposed project would not create an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. The rock cutting, splitting and crushing activities would be housed completely within the proposed structures and would not be visible from public viewing locations. No impacts are expected.

- b, d) Although the site is subject to the “Site Design Overlay”, the structures would not be required to be reviewed by the County’s South Board of Architectural Review (SBAR) because accessory structures are exempt from the Eastern Goleta Valley Design Guidelines and therefore, SBAR review. The proposed new buildings would be unfinished metal framed structures of 20 to 24 feet in height, consistent with the design of the other onsite structures and a large number of greenhouses located on the adjacent parcels to the south and east. Additionally, the structures would be clustered in the center of the site close to the existing office and storage buildings. The style of the proposed buildings is also consistent with the agricultural zoning/use of the parcel and the density of the proposed project would be consistent with greenhouses and other agricultural development in the surrounding area. As such, the structures would not be visually incompatible with the surrounding area and would not significantly change the visual character of the area. Impacts are considered less than significant.
- c) Outdoor night lighting associated with the development of the new buildings could create glare off-site and/or light spillage resulting in potential impacts to neighboring properties. Impacts are considered potentially significant.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

1. Any new exterior night lighting installed on the project site shall be of low intensity, low height and low glare design, and shall be fully hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and to prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels. **Plan Requirements/Timing:** Lighting shall be installed prior to occupancy clearance. This condition shall be met for the life of the project. **Monitoring:** Lighting fixtures shall be approved by P&D and detailed on building plans. Permit Compliance staff shall respond to complaints.

With incorporation of the mitigation measure listed above, residual project specific and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

4.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No 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	

Existing Setting:

The subject parcel is zoned for Agriculture in the AG-I-10 zone district, which requires a minimum parcel size of 10 acres. The parcel is currently used to operate a nursery/landscaping business where mature trees are imported from offsite and kept alive in mounds of onsite soil/rock before they are sold to the public for landscaping purposes. The site contains an office/storage building, an equipment storage building, 14 parking spaces and a soil and rock stockpiling which together, total approximately 23% of the site area. The remainder of the 9.64 acre site is used for storing, processing and growing salvaged, mature trees.

The site is located within the South Patterson Agricultural Block which encompasses approximately 300 acres and is identified in the Goleta Community Plan as an urban agricultural area that is designated for long-term preservation due to its long history of agricultural production and existing intensive crop production over most of the area. The surrounding agricultural properties and the majority of the subject parcel (except for the northern boundary of the parcel) are considered Farmlands of Statewide Importance. Approximately 0.6 acre at the northern end of the subject parcel contains Class I Goleta loam soils and is considered prime farmlands if irrigated. The remainder of the parcel contains Class III, Camarillo fine sandy loam soils and is considered Farmlands of Statewide Importance. The site is not under an agricultural preserve contract and without the benefit of combined farming operations with surrounding parcels, could not qualify for the County's agricultural preserve program due to its limited size.

Impact Discussion:

The proposed project would expand the scope of existing onsite operations by internalizing the rock cutting and splitting which is currently conducted offsite in the City of Santa Barbara. The area of proposed new development including the structures and new paving area is limited in size and would total approximately 11,784 square feet or 2.8% of the site. Additionally, the area of the site to be developed has been previously disturbed and is currently in open space and not used by the nursery for storage of trees. The remainder of the lot (approximately 97%) would continue to be dedicated to the ongoing nursery operations. Further, the proposed project would not convert existing prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use, or conflict with an agricultural preserve program because the subject property is not within such a program.

An open field with rotational crops lies to the west, greenhouses to the south and a fallow field lies to the east of the project site. Because the rock cutting and splitting operations would

be conducted wholly inside a metal-framed building with active air-scrubbers, significant amounts of noise and fugitive/operational dust resulting from such operations is not expected to impact neighboring agricultural operations. Therefore, the proposed activities would not have a negative effect upon the surrounding unique farmland of State and Local Importance. No impacts to agriculture are expected.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The project would not cause impacts to agriculture. Therefore, no mitigation would be required.

4.3 AIR QUALITY

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No 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 including, CO hotspots, 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			

Impact Discussion:

The proposed uses can be segregated into two distinct operations for the purpose of studying potential impacts to air quality; rock cutting and rock splitting.

Rock cutting would be accomplished by the use of electrically-powered rock cutting saws. Operation of the rock cutting saws would be contained within the Rock Cutting Building and would utilize water to lubricate the saw blade/cutting surface to prevent overheating and also to prevent extensive dust generation. Use of the water cutting saws would generate a water/sand solution that would be directed to a water reclamation vault via floor sumps, then through a water scrubber (Sigma Engineering Depuration System). The water scrubber would separate any stone particulates/gravel/dust from the water to ensure only clean water is used to lubricate the saws. Sand and small gravel would be discharged from the system into sandbags by the reclamation unit and the wastewater recycled back into the system for continued use. Air quality would be further protected by a redundant air scrubbing system. An air scrubber (Sigma Engineering MODULBOX model MB 30 SV inox), similar to a fume-hood used in chemistry laboratories, would be located in close proximity to the saws and would remove any remaining dust from the air. The system works by sucking the air from the saw area through a continuous “waterfall” where the dust is absorbed into the water. The air scrubbers would also tie into the reclamation unit of the water scrubber system so that the sand/dust pulled into the water are then contained in sand-bags as a byproduct of the scrubbing system and eventually used as potting mix in the onsite tree planters.

Rock splitting would be accomplished with the use of an electrically-powered rock crusher to be rented on an as-needed basis and would be located within the Rock Splitting Building. The Rock Splitting Building would contain two (2) air scrubbers identical to the unit described above and would collect any dust generated by the rock splitting activities by use of the “waterfall”. These air scrubbers would also be tied into the reclamation unit of the water scrubber system in the

Rock Cutting Building via pipes so that the sand/dust could be collected and re-used. Rock tailings generated from the splitting operation would be put through the rock crusher and stored in the existing staging area as sand or gravel. All dust generated by such activities would be reclaimed as sand and used as potting mix for onsite use. Assuming the continuous use of the air and water scrubbers during rock cutting and crushing activities, there would be no impacts to air quality from the ongoing operations described above. However, if the rock cutting and splitting activities were undertaken outside the proposed buildings, the air scrubbing units could not be utilized and potentially significant impacts to air quality could occur.

The rock cutting and splitting activities are currently undertaken at an offsite warehouse facility located in the City of Santa Barbara. The applicant intends to use identical scrubbers to those used at this facility. Staff has toured the facility (Errin Briggs, June 12, 2008), reviewed these operations and noted that no perceptible air quality impacts are currently generated there.

Grading activities related to the construction of the proposed buildings would have the potential to create short-term dust. This impact is considered potentially significant.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

2. If the construction site is graded and left undeveloped for over four weeks, the applicant shall employ the following methods immediately to inhibit dust generation:
 - a. seeding and watering to revegetate graded areas; and/or
 - b. spreading of soil binders; and/or
 - c. any other methods deemed appropriate by Planning and Development.

Plan Requirements: These requirements shall be noted on all plans. **Timing:** Plans are required prior to approval of Land Use Permits. **Monitoring:** Grading Inspector shall perform periodic site inspections.

3. Dust generated by the development activities shall be kept to a minimum with a goal of retaining dust on the site. Follow the dust control measures listed below.
 - a. During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems are to be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.
 - b. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the later morning and after work is completed for the day and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.
 - c. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.

Plan Requirements: All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans. **Timing:** Condition shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods. **Monitoring:** P&D shall ensure measures are on plans. P&D Grading and Building inspectors shall spot check; Grading and Building shall ensure compliance on-site. APCD inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.

4. Rock cutting and splitting operations shall be conducted inside the designated buildings only. No cutting or splitting operations shall be conducted outside the designated buildings at any time. **Plan Requirements:** All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans. **Timing:** This condition shall be adhered to for the life of the project. **Monitoring:** P&D shall ensure measures are on plans. P&D Grading and Building inspectors shall spot check; Grading and Building shall ensure compliance on-site. APCD inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.

With incorporation of the mitigation measure listed above, impacts to air quality would be reduced to less than significant levels and cumulative impacts would be avoided.

4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
Flora					
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	
Fauna					
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:

- a-f) The CNDDDB database does not identify any rare, threatened or endangered species located within the vicinity of the project site, nor does it identify the project site as critical habitat for any such species. Because the site has been completely disturbed by past agricultural operations and the current operation of the nursery business, no specimen trees or native vegetation occur onsite. The proposed project would have no

direct or indirect impacts on a sensitive plant species or native plant communities, and there is no non-native vegetation onsite that provides habitat value. The proposed project would also not affect specimen trees. Therefore, the project would have no impact on these resources.

- g, i) The proposed project would have no direct effects on sensitive fish or wildlife species. However, storm drains adjacent to the property eventually lead directly to Atascadero Creek, and ultimately the mouth of Goleta Slough, which provide habitat for a number of fish and wildlife species including the southern steelhead, a federally and state Endangered Species. Should sediment-laden wastewater from the rock cutting operation be allowed to enter the storm drains on a regular basis, this runoff could increase sedimentation of the creek which can have a deleterious effect on the quality of breeding habitat for steelhead and on the general quality of habitat for other fish and wildlife species by increasing the turbidity of the water. In addition, discharge of this water directly to the storm drains would be an illegal act pursuant to the Clean Water Act and state and local standards.

Similarly, wastewater from construction-related activities, if not contained properly, could be discharged to downstream waterbodies and adversely impact fish and wildlife habitat. These indirect impacts are considered potentially significant.

- h, j, k) Because the site is highly disturbed and only wildlife that are accustomed to urban environments are expected at the site, the light and noise associated with the proposed project is not expected to adversely impact wildlife in the area. The proposed project would not introduce any barriers to fish or wildlife movement. No impacts are expected.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

5. Rock cutting and splitting activities shall occur only in areas where polluted water and materials can be contained for subsequent removal from the site. Equipment necessary to filter polluted water shall be completely functional during all rock cutting and splitting activities. Wash-water shall not be discharged to the nearby storm drains, street, or drainage ditches, or to any creeks or wetlands. **Plan Requirements/Timing:** The water reclamation basin and water scrubbing equipment shall be in place and maintained throughout all rock cutting operations. **Monitoring:** Permit Compliance staff shall conduct spot checks of the installation of the water reclamation basin during construction.
6. During construction, the washing of concrete trucks, paint, equipment, or similar activities shall occur only in areas where polluted water and materials can be contained for subsequent removal from the site. Wash water shall not be discharged to the storm drains, street, drainage ditches, creeks, or wetlands. Areas designated for washing functions shall be at least 100 feet from any storm drain, water body or sensitive biological resources. The location(s) of the washout area(s) shall be clearly noted at the construction site with signs. **Plan Requirements/Timing:** A washout area, acceptable to P&D, shall be shown on all grading and building plans prior to issuance of the Coastal Development Permit. This condition shall be printed on all grading and building plans. **Monitoring:** The washout area(s) shall be in place and maintained throughout construction. Permit Compliance shall site inspect throughout the construction period to ensure proper use, location, and maintenance of the washout area(s).

With incorporation of the mitigation measures listed above, impacts to biological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels and cumulative impacts would be avoided.

4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
Archaeological Resources					
a. Disruption, alteration, destruction, or adverse effect on a recorded prehistoric or historic archaeological site (note site number below)?				X	
b. Disruption or removal of human remains?				X	
c. Increased potential for trespassing, vandalizing, or sabotaging archaeological resources?				X	
d. Ground disturbances in an area with potential cultural resource sensitivity based on the location of known historic or prehistoric sites?		X			
Ethnic Resources					
e. Disruption of or adverse effects upon a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic group?				X	
f. Increased potential for trespassing, vandalizing, or sabotaging ethnic, sacred, or ceremonial places?				X	
g. The potential to conflict with or restrict existing religious, sacred, or educational use of the area?				X	

Impact Discussion:

The nearest archaeological site is located over a ½ mile away from the subject parcel. The project site has been extensively disturbed due to past agricultural and nursery-related activities. In addition, less than 50 cubic yards of ground disturbance would be associated with the proposed project. Therefore, the potential for the project to affect intact cultural resources is low. Nevertheless, given the history of Native American presence within the area, the discovery of cultural resources during construction is a possibility, and impacts would be adverse and significant without mitigation.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

- In the event archaeological remains are encountered during grading, work shall be stopped immediately or redirected until a P&D qualified archaeologist and Native American representative are retained by the applicant to evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigations of the County Archaeological Guidelines. If remains are found to be significant, they shall be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with County Archaeological Guidelines and funded by the applicant. **Plan Requirements/Timing:** This condition shall be printed on all building and grading plans. **Monitoring:** P&D shall check plans prior to approval of Land Use Permits/Coastal Development Permits and shall spot check in the field.

With the above mitigation, cultural resources impacts would be considered less than significant and cumulative impacts would be avoided.

4.6 ENERGY

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No 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:

While the new equipment proposed as part of the project would be powered by electricity, the proposed rock cutting and quartering operation would not create a substantial increase in demand for energy or require the development or extension of new sources of energy. Therefore, the project's impacts on energy would be less than significant.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

Project impacts on energy would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation would be required.

4.7 FIRE PROTECTION

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Introduction of development into an existing high fire hazard area?				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. Introduction of development that will hamper fire prevention techniques such as controlled burns or backfiring in high fire hazard areas?				X	
e. Development of structures beyond safe Fire Dept. response time?				X	

Impact Discussion:

The project site is not located in a high fire hazard area. The equipment used to undergo the proposed operations would be housed in metal, pre-fabricated buildings constructed with non-combustible materials. A new fire hydrant is proposed to be located at the entrance of the property per County Fire Department requirements. The project would not result in the introduction of development that would hamper fire prevention techniques or in the development of structures beyond safe Fire Department response time. No impacts to Fire Protection are expected.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The project would not cause impacts to Fire Protection. Therefore, no mitigation would be required.

4.8 GEOLOGIC PROCESSES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. 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. Permanent changes in topography?				X	
d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic, paleontologic or physical features?				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		

Impact Discussion:

- a-d) Minimal grading would be required to prepare the site for development of the three proposed accessory structures as the site is flat. The project site would not be exposed to, or cause exposure to unstable earth conditions such as landslides, liquefaction or similar hazards. Project implementation would not cause the disruption, displacement or over-covering of the onsite soils by cuts, fills or extensive grading or permanent changes in topography. No unique geologic, paleontologic or physical features of the site would be destroyed or modified. No impacts are expected.
- e) The majority of water used in the stone cutting, splitting and scrubbing operations would be recycled back into the operational system. All wastewater is proposed to be used for irrigation of the onsite trees stored as part of the nursery business. No water would be directly discharged into onsite drainage swales or offsite. Therefore, no increase in water erosion is expected to result from project implementation.
- f-k) The project would not cause changes in the deposition of sand dunes, siltation or cause erosion which would modify the channel of any water bodies. The project does not propose to add any new septic systems. No extraction of mineral or ore, or sand and gravel removal would occur as the rocks used in the ongoing nursery business are obtained from off-site sources. No grading would occur on slopes greater than 20%. The project would not cause vibrations that would affect adjoining areas. No impacts are expected.

- l) While the project would generate sand/gravel as a by-product of the rock splitting and crushing operations, it would be captured in sand bags and recycled into potting mix to support the ongoing nursery operation. Such activities would have a less than significant impact because the excess spoils and tailings would be re-used onsite.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The project would have less than significant impacts to Geologic Processes. Therefore, no mitigation would be required.

4.9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/RISK OF UPSET

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous 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	

Impact Discussion:

- a, b) No hazardous materials would be used in the proposed rock cutting/splitting operations and hazardous waste would not be generated by the use of the necessary equipment. However, materials such as fuels, oils, fertilizers and pesticides are stored in small quantities onsite to serve the ongoing nursery business and related equipment including trucks, tractors and small cranes. The site is not known to be contaminated by such chemicals. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c-g) The project would not pose an explosion risk or potentially cause the release of hazardous substances in the event of an accident or upset conditions. Project implementation would not cause interference with an emergency response or evacuation plan and would not cause a potential public health hazard or public safety hazard. No oil and gas pipelines or oil well facilities exist onsite. No impacts are expected.
- h) The proposed rock cutting/splitting operations would not affect a public water supply.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No impacts to hazardous materials would result from the project. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary and no cumulative impacts would result.

4.10 HISTORIC RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Adverse physical or aesthetic impacts on a structure or property at least 50 years old and/or of historic or cultural significance to the community, state or nation?				X	
b. Beneficial impacts to an historic resource by providing rehabilitation, protection in a conservation/open easement, etc.?				X	

Impact Discussion:

a, b) No historic structures currently exist on the project site. The proposed project would not result in adverse physical or aesthetic impacts on a structure or property which is of historical significance to the community, state or nation.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No impacts to historic resources would result from the project. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary and no cumulative impacts would result.

4.11 LAND USE

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Structures and/or land use incompatible with existing land use?				X	
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?		X			
c. The induction of substantial 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 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	

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
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	

Impact Discussion:

a) The project proposes to construct three new agricultural accessory structures to serve an ongoing nursery business, thus functioning to enhance the ongoing operations. The project would also allow the property owner to undergo rock cutting and splitting operations to produce products to be used in the nursery business. The proposed structures and uses would not be incompatible with the existing agricultural land use (nursery.) No impacts are expected.

b) The project site is zoned AG-I-10. Nursery operations such as the existing nursery business are considered agriculture by the definitions contained in the Countywide Land Use Development Code (LUDC). Further, “agricultural processing” is an allowed use in the AG-I-10 zone district.

Each use allowed in the LUDC may include “accessory structures and uses that are customarily incidental to the primary use.” Operation of the nursery business on the subject parcel is considered the primary use as allowed in the AG-I-10 zone district. Specific to this project, the processing (cutting and splitting), use and sale of these incidental garden and landscape materials have been found by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to be customarily incidental to the primary nursery use and therefore allowed pursuant to the LUDC. Additionally, the LUDC authorizes the sale of “incidental garden and landscape materials,” such as garden accessories, interpreted to include the rock materials that would be generated by the proposed use by the BOS. With incorporation of the mitigation measures contained in this document, the project would be consistent with applicable land use policies and zoning requirements and no impacts related to land use are expected.

c-i) The project would not cause substantial growth or concentration of population, the extension of sewer lines, the loss of existing affordable housing, the displacement of existing housing or people or the loss of open space. Construction of the proposed accessory structures and the use of the rock cutting/splitting equipment would not cause an economic or social effect that would result in a physical change to the surrounding area. No impacts are expected.

j) While the project site is located within the flight path of the Santa Barbara Airport, the proposed structures and uses would not conflict with the adopted airport safety zone. No impacts are expected.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

All mitigation included in this document provides assurance that impacts to land use would be reduced to less than significant levels.

4.12 NOISE

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous 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		

Impact Discussion:

The proposed project includes a rock-cutting, splitting and crushing operation as described above and the construction of the following structures: one enclosed Rock Splitting Building (1,250 square feet) which would contain the rock splitting equipment and two (2) air scrubbers; one enclosed Rock Cutting Building (3,000 square feet) which would contain three (3) water cutting saws a water scrubber, a water reclamation vault, an air scrubber, a rock crusher (to be rented as needed), a 300 square foot office, and a 125 square foot storage room; and an Equipment Storage Shed Building (1,250 square feet) which would be constructed to contain a large forklift, a loader, a tractor, and a crane for lifting and transporting the rock onsite as well as for other agricultural purposes.

Short-term: Short-term noise impacts due to construction-related activities have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to noise levels exceeding County thresholds. Impacts are considered potentially significant.

Long-term: A noise study analyzing the proposed rock-cutting and splitting operations was conducted by Dudek and dated July 23, 2008. Equipment noise levels were estimated based on the noise levels monitored during rock cutting operations at the existing facility located in Santa Barbara and at the proposed site. Sound levels measured for the rock cutting equipment were conducted with the building’s roll-up doors open. Sound levels measured for the rock splitting equipment were taken in open air at the project site with identical equipment to that proposed. Data for the rock crushing operation was taken from the Noise Control for Buildings and Manufacturing Plants manual published by BBN- Laymon N. Miller- 1981.

The noise levels from the cutting, splitting and crushing operations were estimated to range between 49 and 58 dBA at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor which is the Goleta Valley Hospital located approximately 1,500 feet away. The noise levels at the Hospital property line located approximately 875 from the project site were estimated to range between 54 and 63 dBA. These noise levels are not expected to exceed the County’s 65-dBA CNEL/Ldn quantitative threshold at noise sensitive receptors near the project site. Additionally, the metal buildings in which the equipment would be operating would further reduce the project noise levels at the

nearest noise sensitive locations by an estimated 10 to 12 dBA, and noise shielding by on- and off-site buildings and structures would further reduce such noise levels.

Therefore, long-term noise impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

- 8. Construction activity for site preparation and for future development shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. No construction shall occur on State holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day). Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions. **Plan Requirements:** *Three* signs stating these restrictions shall be provided by the applicant and posted on site. **Timing:** Signs shall be in place prior to beginning of and throughout grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits. **Monitoring:** Building Inspectors and Permit Compliance shall spot check and respond to complaints.

With the above mitigation, noise related impacts would be considered less than significant and cumulative impacts would be avoided.

4.13 PUBLIC FACILITIES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous 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 national, state, or local standards or thresholds relating to solid waste disposal and generation (including recycling facilities and existing landfill capacity)?			X		
d. A need for new or altered sewer system facilities (sewer lines, lift-stations, etc.)?				X	
e. The construction of new storm water drainage or water quality control facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X	

Impact Discussion:

- a, b) The proposed project would not require new or altered police protection and/or health care services. No additional students would be generated by the proposed project. No impacts are expected.
- c) The proposed rock cutting/splitting operations would generate sand/gravel as a waste by-product. However, the sand/gravel would be collected in sand bags and reused onsite for potting mix to support the ongoing nursery operations. The project would not breach any national, state, or local standards or thresholds relating to solid waste disposal and generation (including recycling facilities and existing landfill capacity). Impacts would be less than significant.

- d, e) The subject parcel would continue to be served by the Goleta Sanitary District under the proposed project. No additional sewer system infrastructure would be necessary. The proposed project would not require the construction of a new storm water drainage system or water quality control facilities. No impacts are expected.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No impacts to public facilities would result from the project. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary and no cumulative impacts would result.

4.14 RECREATION

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous 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	

Impact Discussion:

There are no established recreational uses on or near the parcel, including public trails or bike lanes. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on recreation.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No impacts to recreation would result from the project. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary and no cumulative impacts would result.

4.15 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement (daily, peak-hour, etc.) in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?				X	
b. A need for private or public road maintenance, or need for new road(s)?				X	
c. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?				X	
d. Substantial impact upon existing transit systems (e.g. bus service) or alteration of present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?				X	
e. Alteration to waterborne, rail or air traffic?				X	
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians (including short-term construction and long-term operational)?				X	
g. Inadequate sight distance?				X	

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
ingress/egress?				X	
general road capacity?				X	
emergency access?				X	
h. Impacts to Congestion Management Plan system?				X	

Impact Discussion:

Construction of the proposed structures and implementation of the proposed uses would allow the property owner to internalize a significant portion of the landscaping/nursery business’s ongoing operations. The rock cutting/splitting operations are currently undertaken at a facility located in downtown Santa Barbara, approximately 15 miles from the project site. Rocks and materials are frequently transported between the downtown facility and the nursery site in Goleta in order to carry out necessary operations. Bringing the rock cutting/splitting operations onto the nursery site would reduce traffic trips, thus reducing use of the surrounding road network and incrementally improving local traffic conditions.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No impacts to traffic and circulation would result from the project. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary and no cumulative impacts would result.

4.16 WATER RESOURCES/FLOODING

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous 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	
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?				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	

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
i. Overdraft or overcommitment of any groundwater basin? Or, a significant increase in the existing overdraft or overcommitment 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			

Impact Discussion:

- a, c) The project would not result in changes to currents, the course or direction of water movements or a change in the amount of surface water in any water body. No impacts are expected.

- b) Development of the three proposed structures and the paved loading area would introduce new impervious surfaces to the site and would thereby increase stormwater runoff. This runoff could transport non-point source pollutants (such as oil and grease, organic materials, and other urban/agricultural contaminants) into nearby drainages and the downstream intertidal zone. However, the level of impervious surfaces would be limited and additional pollutants generated by such development would likely not be considered significant due to the ample opportunity for onsite stormwater percolation/filtration and the distance the water would travel in on/offsite drainage swales prior to its discharge. Impacts would be less than significant

- d) The use of the rock cutting/splitting equipment would generate sand/gravel as a waste by-product. Such waste would be contained within the water scrubber system and collected into sand bags. However, if the water scrubber system were not used or damaged during operations, waste sand/gravel could be transported to surface water bodies via on/offsite drainage swales. The drainage swales adjacent to the property eventually lead directly to Atascadero Creek, and ultimately the mouth of Goleta Slough. Should sediment-laden wastewater from the rock cutting/splitting operation be allowed to enter the drainage swales on a regular basis, this runoff could increase sedimentation of the creek causing turbidity and thereby reducing overall water quality. Mitigation number 4 in Section 4.4 requires that the water scrubber be completely functional during all rock cutting and splitting activities. The condition also requires that wash-water shall not be discharged to the nearby storm drains, street, or drainage ditches, or to any creeks or wetlands. With this mitigation, impacts related to discharges into nearby water bodies would be reduced to less than significant levels. No further mitigation would be necessary.

- l) Materials used in the construction of any future project (e.g., wash water, paint, solvents, concrete, etc.), if not contained properly, could be carried to nearby drainages and compromise water quality and degrade sensitive habitat. Impacts are considered potentially significant. Mitigation measure no. 5 in Section 4.4 above would require designation of a wash out area where contaminated materials could be collected and removed from the site.

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce impacts related to waste water to less than significant levels.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

With the inclusion of mitigation measures 4 and 5 in Section 4.4 above, impacts to water quality would be less than significant and cumulatively considerable impacts would be avoided.

5.0 INFORMATION SOURCES

5.1 County Departments Consulted

Fire, Public Works, Flood Control, Environmental Health, Agricultural Planning

5.2 Comprehensive Plan

<u> X </u>	Seismic Safety/Safety Element	<u> X </u>	Conservation Element
<u> </u>	Open Space Element	<u> X </u>	Noise Element
<u> </u>	Coastal Plan and Maps	<u> X </u>	Circulation Element
<u> </u>	ERME	<u> </u>	

5.3 Other Sources

<u> X </u>	Field work	<u> </u>	Ag Preserve maps
<u> X </u>	Calculations	<u> X </u>	Flood Control maps
<u> X </u>	Project plans	<u> X </u>	Other technical references (reports, survey, etc.)
<u> </u>	Traffic studies	<u> X </u>	Planning files, maps, reports
<u> </u>	Records	<u> X </u>	Zoning maps
<u> </u>	Grading plans	<u> X </u>	Soils maps/reports
<u> X </u>	Elevation, architectural renderings	<u> X </u>	Plant maps
<u> </u>	Published geological map/reports	<u> X </u>	Archaeological maps and reports
<u> X </u>	Topographical maps	<u> X </u>	Other
			Agricultural Planner

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

Project Specific Impacts:

Class I Impacts: None

Class II Impacts: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Noise and Water Resources

Cumulative Impacts: As discussed in this initial study, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to agricultural resources, energy, fire protection, geologic processes, hazardous materials, historic resources, land use, public facilities, recreation or transportation so no cumulative impacts would result. Project-specific impacts related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Noise and Water Resources would be mitigated to levels below significance, so no cumulative impacts would result.

7.0 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No 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 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	
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	

- 1) As discussed in Sections 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.12 and 4.16 of this Initial Study, the proposed project has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment. The mitigation measures proposed in these sections would reduce impacts to levels of less than significance.

8.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

As no potentially significant, adverse unmitigable impacts would result from the proposed development, project alternatives have not been evaluated.

9.0 APPLICABLE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICIES

Land Use Element Policy 4: 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. Affordable housing projects proposed pursuant to the Affordable Housing Overlay regulations, special needs housing projects or other affordable housing projects which include at least 50% of the total number of units for affordable housing or 30% of the total number of units affordable at the very low income level shall be presumed to be consistent with this policy if the project has, or is conditioned to obtain all

necessary can and will serve letters at the time of final map recordation, or if no map, prior to issuance of land use permits.

Visual Resource Policy 3: 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.

Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies:

1. Plans for development shall minimize cut and fill operations. Plans requiring excessive cutting and filling may be denied if it is determined that the development could be carried out with less alteration of the natural terrain.
2. All developments shall be designed to fit the site topography, soils, geology, hydrology, and any other existing conditions and be oriented so that grading and other site preparation is kept to an absolute minimum. Natural features, landforms, and native vegetation, such as trees, shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Areas of the site which are not suited to development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards shall remain in open space.
4. Sediment basins (including debris basins, desilting basins, or silt traps) shall be installed on the project site in conjunction with the initial grading operations and maintained through the development process to remove sediment from runoff waters. All sediment shall be retained on site unless removed to an appropriate dumping location.
5. Temporary vegetation, seeding, mulching, or other suitable stabilization method shall be used to protect soils subject to erosion that have been disturbed during grading or development. All cut and fill slopes shall be stabilized as rapidly as possible with planting of native grasses and shrubs, appropriate non-native plants, or with accepted landscaping practices.
6. Provisions shall be made to conduct surface water to storm drains or suitable watercourses to prevent erosion. Drainage devices shall be designed to accommodate increased runoff resulting from modified soil and surface conditions as a result of development. Water runoff shall be retained onsite whenever possible to facilitate groundwater recharge.
7. Degradation of the water quality of groundwater basins, nearby streams, or wetlands shall not result from development of the site. Pollutants, such as chemicals, fuels, lubricants, raw sewage, and other harmful waste, shall not be discharged into or alongside coastal streams or wetlands either during or after construction.

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. This policy shall be implemented consistent with the direction of policy WAT-GV-2.

Policy WAT-GV-6: In order to minimize water use to the maximum extent possible all new development shall utilize water-conserving landscaping and low-flow irrigation.

Policy AQ-GV-1: The County shall impose appropriate restrictions and control measures upon construction activities associated with each future development project, in order to avoid significant deterioration of air quality.

DevStd AQ-GV-1.1: Future project construction should follow all requirements of the SBCAPCD, and should institute Best Available Control Technology (BACT) where necessary to reduce emissions below APCD threshold levels.

DevStd AQ-GV-1.2: Project construction shall minimize the generation of pollution and fugitive dust during construction.

DevStd BIO-GV-19.2: Washing of concrete, paint, or other equipment shall be allowed only in areas where polluted water can be contained during construction and in industrial settings.

DevStd GEO-GV-5.3: All surface water runoff shall be culverted and diverted to avoid exposed slopes and directed to the nearest natural drainage channel with an energy-dissipating outfall installed.

Policy HA-GV-1: Significant cultural, archaeological and historical resources in the Goleta area shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible.

Policy LUA-GV-1: Land designated for agriculture within the urban boundary shall be preserved for agricultural use, unless the County makes findings that the land is no longer appropriate for agriculture or there is an overriding public need for conversion to other uses for which there is no other land available in the Goleta urban area.

Policy N-GV-1: Interior noise-sensitive uses (e.g., residential and lodging facilities, educational facilities, public meeting places and others specified in the Noise Element) shall be protected to minimize significant noise impacts.

Policy VIS-GV-1: The County shall through its discretionary and design review process, ensure the maintenance and where necessary the improvement of the quality in the design and landscaping of industrial, commercial, institutional, and residential facilities.

Policy VIS-GV-6: Outdoor lighting in Goleta shall be designed and placed so as to minimize impacts on neighboring properties and the community in general.

Ag Element GOAL I: Santa Barbara County shall assure and enhance the continuation of agriculture as a major viable production industry in Santa Barbara County. Agriculture shall be encouraged. Where conditions allow, (taking into account environmental impacts) expansion and intensification shall be supported.

Ag Element Policy I.E: The County shall recognize that the generation of noise, smoke, odor, and dust is a natural consequence of the normal agricultural practices provided that agriculturalists exercise reasonable measures to minimize such effects.

Ag Element Policy III.B: It is a County priority to retain blocks of productive agriculture within Urban Areas where reasonable, to continue to explore programs to support that use, and to recognize the importance of the objectives of the County's Right to Farm Ordinance.

Ag Element GOAL V: Santa Barbara County shall allow areas and installations for those supportive activities needed as an integral part of the production and marketing process on and/or off the farm.

10.0 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: N/A

With Public Hearing Without Public Hearing

PREVIOUS DOCUMENT: None

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Errin Briggs DATE: _____

11.0 DETERMINATION BY ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING OFFICER

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: _____

INITIAL STUDY DATE: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

REVISION DATE: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

FINAL NEG DEC DATE: _____

12.0 ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. Site Plans

G:\GROUP\Permitting\Case Files\LUP\07 cases\07LUP-00000-00301 Firefox (see also 06DVP...21 & 02CUP...38)\Environmental Review\Proposed Final Negative Declaration.doc