



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Planning and Development

Final Mitigated Negative Declaration

Famcon Pipe and Supply Proposed Project

Case Number 24NGD-00011

May 6, 2025



Applicant

Steve Penza
Famcon Pipe and Supply
200 Lambert St
Oxnard, CA 93036
(805) 218-2805

Agent

Gelare Macon
Flowers and Associates, Inc.
115 West Canon Perdido Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 966-2224

Engineer

Russell Garrison
Bethel Engineering
2624 Airpark Drive
Santa Maria, CA 93455
(805) 934-5767

For More Information: Contact Steve Conner, Development Review Division, Planner
(805) 459-5740, conners@countyofsb.org

1.0 REQUEST/PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Famcon has outgrown its current facility located approximately six miles north (also adjacent to Highway 101) within City of Santa Maria, and the applicant chose the proposed site because close proximity to a highway is beneficial to the logistical needs of the warehousing and large materials sales business.

Rezone

The proposed project includes a request for a Rezone, Case No. 23RZN-00001, to change the Zone District from Commercial Highway (CH) to General Commercial (C-3) in order to allow the proposed “Building and landscape materials sales – Outdoor” as a permitted use (Figure 1).




FIGURE 1 PROPOSED REZONE MAP

General Plan Amendment

The proposed project includes a request for a General Plan Amendment (GPA), Case No. 23GPA-00001, to adjust the Urban/Rural Boundary and Land Use Designation on the Comp-1 Map of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element and the Community Plan and Land Use Designations Eastern Section Maps of the Orcutt Community Plan (Figure 2). The proposed Land Use Designation would change from Highway Commercial to General Commercial. The GPA includes revisions to Orcutt Community Plan Policy LU-O-6 to allow a change to the Urban/Rural Boundary, as follows (revisions shown in strikethrough and underlined font):

The Orcutt Urban/Rural Boundary shall separate principally urban land uses and those uses which are rural and/or agricultural in nature. This boundary shall represent the maximum extent of the Orcutt urban area and the Urban/Rural Boundary shall not be extended until existing inventories of vacant land within the urban area are nearing buildout, except for those parcels served by

existing public water and sewer utilities. Other boundary adjustments shall be approved only as part of a major Community Plan update.




FIGURE 2 URBAN/RURAL BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT TO COMP-1 MAP OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT

Development Plan

The proposed project includes a request for a Development Plan (DVP), Case No. 23DVP-00016, for construction of a pipe sales and storage site, including a new 11,040-sq.-ft.-structure. The Development Plan is required for proposed development to exceed the 20,000-sq.-ft. threshold in the General Commercial (C-3) Zone District. The proposed project includes a new 11,040 gross-square-foot structure containing a warehouse, offices, and employee areas (Attachment 1 Plans). The proposed project will include eight employees and hours of operations will be from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The site will also include approximately 40,000 square feet (sf) of outdoor, uncovered storage area for piping materials. The proposed project includes internal driveways with a 19-space parking lot, including two accessible spaces. The driveways will include 105,300 sf of class II base and 26,950 sf of hardscape (including sidewalks). Grading for the proposed project includes 5,005 cubic yards (cy) of cut, 21,348 cy of fill, and 16,343 cy of net fill with over-excavation and recompaction. One 32,000-sf Advanced Drainage Systems underground chamber stormwater retention basin (60,940 cubic feet of storage) will be constructed on the southern portion of the site to capture stormwater runoff from the proposed project.

As discussed above, buildout of the site will include an 11,000 sf, 25-ft-high single-story rectangular warehouse with clerestory; and associated grading and landscaping. The landscaping will include a 50-foot-wide screening buffer along the northern and southern portions of the site adjacent to Morningside Drive, and perimeter screening trees incorporated within existing trees along the “u-shaped” boundary adjoining the existing pet grooming business property to the west. Grading will provide a development pad for the building, 19-space parking lot, 40,000 sf outdoor storage area, and stormwater retention

basin. Grading will also create a 10-percent sloped driveway to allow an east to west egress. The egress driveway will be adjacent to the site boundary that adjoins the southern boundary of the existing pet grooming business property.

A retaining wall (10-ft maximum height) will be constructed to maintain the grade difference between the proposed egress driveway and the existing pet grooming business development pad. The proposed project will remove two eucalyptus trees (*Corymbia citriodora*) to allow for grading of the proposed egress driveway. A parallel set of retaining walls (5-ft-maximum height) will be constructed to maintain the grade difference between the proposed development and the existing development pad along the eastern and northern boundaries of the pet grooming business. The proposed project will also include installation of a perimeter chain link fence and exterior night lighting around the building and parking lot.

This DVP is being processed concurrently with a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and Rezone (RZN), Case Nos. 23GPA-00001, 23RZN-00001 and 23DVP-00016. The proposed project site consists of two legal parcels, APNs 107-150-021 and 107-150-022, of 2.154 acres and 1.865 acres, respectively. The Applicant intends to voluntarily merge the two parcels prior to issuance of the DVP. The proposed project will take access via a new 40-foot wide driveway off Founders Avenue and an approximately 25-foot wide driveway off Morningside Drive. Water service will be provided by the Golden State Water Company, and wastewater treatment will be provided by the Laguna County Sanitation District. The proposed project site is addressed as 1350 Founders Ave, in the Orcutt Community Plan Area, Fourth Supervisorial District.

2.0 PROPOSED PROJECT LOCATION

The 4.01-acre proposed project site is comprised of APNs 107-150-024 (2.154 acres) and 107-150-022 (1.865 acres) and is located at 1350 Founders Avenue in the Santa Maria area, Fourth Supervisorial District (Figure 1). The proposed project plan is shown on Figure 2 and included in Attachment 1.




FIGURE 3 PROPOSED PROJECT VICINITY

2.1 Site Information	
Comprehensive Plan Designation	Rural Area, Highway Commercial, Orcutt Community Plan Key Site 33
Zoning District, Ordinance	Land Use Development Code (Inland) Section 35.24 Commercial Zones, Highway Commercial (CH), No minimum lot size
Site Size	4.02 gross and net
Present Use & Development	Vacant
Surrounding Uses	North: Vacant South: Elks Event Center East: Vacant/Santa Maria Joint Union High School Mark Richardson Career Technical Education Center and Agricultural Farm (CTECF) West: Pet Grooming and Boarding Business and Highway 101
Access	Ingress from Founders Avenue (private) via easements and existing 30-ft.-wide driveway shared with the adjacent land owners, CTCF, and Laguna County Sanitation District; Egress to Morningside Drive via proposed 26-ft-wide easement and 20-ft.-wide driveway
Public Services	Water Supply: Golden State Water Company Sewage: Laguna County Sanitation District Fire: Santa Barbara County Fire Department Battallion 2 North, Station #26




FIGURE 2 SITE PLAN

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 PHYSICAL SETTING

Slope/Topography: The existing topography of the subject site can be generally characterized as a relatively flat vacant area, with gentle rolling hills sloping downward from east to west. Elevations range from 432 feet above sea level (ASL) at the northeastern corner to 413 ft ASL along the western edge of Morningside Drive.

Fauna/Flora: Vegetation consists of grasslands. The thinly-scattered grassland on site provides little protective cover for fauna. The proposed project site does not contain any documented observations of special status animal species according to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), however, the site is located within the mapped range of the California Tiger Salamander (CTS).

Archaeological Sites: The proposed project site would be located within a previously disturbed area adjacent to existing agricultural and commercial development. The Central Coast Information Center of the University of California, Santa Barbara (CCIC) conducted a record search on November 18, 2024, and concluded that no known recorded archaeological sites are located on or within a 2,000-foot radius of the proposed project site.

Soils: The soils on the subject property primarily consist of Marina sand with slopes ranging from 9 to 30 percent, and Oceano sand, with slopes ranging from 2 to 15 percent. Marina sand is characterized by moderate erosion hazard and medium surface runoff. Oceano sand is characterized by slow runoff and slight to no erosion hazard.

Surface Water Bodies (including wetlands, riparian areas, ponds, springs, creeks, rivers, lakes, and estuaries): No surface water bodies are located on the subject parcel. The nearest blue line stream is an

unnamed intermittent stream located approximately one mile directly east of the site. Storm water runoff from the site generally flows west towards Highway 101.

Surrounding Land Uses: The subject parcels are surrounded by other commercially-zoned (CH - Highway Commercial) parcels to the north, east and south, and the properties abut a frontage road (Morningside Drive) with Highway 101 to the west. The site parcels surround (in a horseshoe formation) two adjacent parcels to the west that contain an existing pet grooming business within an existing building which was formerly a California Highway Patrol Office. The Santa Maria Joint Union High School Mark Richardson Career Technical Education Center and Agricultural Farm (CTECAF) is located on a parcel to the east, with access from an easement along Founders Avenue (driveway located immediately north of the site).

Existing Development: Historically, the site contained agricultural operations such as a Christmas tree farm and may have been utilized for livestock grazing, but it has not been under any agricultural production for at least 20 years. The vacant site contains no existing structures. There are abandoned stem walls on APN 107-150-022 (formerly part of Ikola Historical Park), a ten-foot-deep, approximately 19,700 square foot drainage basin on the southwest corner of the site (APN 107-150-022), and a graded slope associated with the building pad which was developed for the offsite pet grooming business on the inset parcels (APNs 107-150-006, -016, and -017).

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

The environmental baseline from which the proposed project's impacts are measured consists of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project, as described above. In addition to the on the ground conditions described above, the environmental baseline from which the proposed project's impacts are measured includes several recorded access/pipeline/utility easements running east-west across the northern, middle, and southern portions of the site. The 26-foot-wide public secondary emergency access and sewer easement which traverses east-west through the middle portion of the site was recorded as part of a proposed 30,000 square foot (sf) church on APN 107-150-020 immediately adjacent and east of the subject property. The church project was approved by the County Planning Commission on November 28, 2007 under a Conditional Use Permit and Development Plan (06CUP-00000-00055 and 06DVP-00000-00012) and also included Parcel Map 14,711 (06TPM-00000-00022/08MPC-00000-00001) which created the current configuration of the subject parcels and the adjacent APN 107-150-020. The 30-foot-wide recorded easement along the northern portion of the site was recorded for construction of water and sewer utilities in 2019 (Recording No 2019-0048787) and also to provide primary access to the church. The driveway and easement currently provide access to the Santa Maria Joint Union High School Mark Richardson Career Technical Education Center and Agricultural Farm (CTECAF), which was constructed after the church project was proposed. Utilities such as water and sewer main lines were constructed within the easement as part of the CTECAF project and services are provided to CTECAF by Golden State Water Company and Laguna County Sanitation District (respectively). The roadway, pipeline and utilities easement along the southern portion of the site was recorded to provide access and utilities in favor of a previous owner of the property that was subsequently sold and developed into the CTECAF.

The project proponent for the church allowed the CUP and DVP permits to expire and the church was never constructed. The 6.41-acre "church" parcel (APN 107-150-020) remains undeveloped and is not part of the proposed Famcon site or project. However, the potential environmental impacts of the proposed church project were analyzed under an Addendum to the Orcutt Community Community Plan EIR (OCP EIR/95-EIR-01). The Orcutt Community Plan EIR (OCP EIR) evaluated the impacts on the development potential contained within the Orcutt Community Plan as a whole. The OCP EIR contained detailed analyses for a number of Key Sites, including Key Site 33, which contains the proposed Famcon site.

In regards to the likely buildout of Highway Commercial Uses allowed on Key Site 33, the Orcutt Community Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, groundwater resources, traffic/circulation, wastewater, and visual resources. The County Board of Supervisors adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for those identified environmental impacts which could not be fully mitigated. The Statement of Overriding Considerations concluded that the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the OCP EIR were ultimately determined to be acceptable when balanced against the merits of the OCP. When the OCP was adopted, the County determined that several mitigation measures were feasible and those measures were incorporated as policies and development standards in the OCP.

When the Planning Commission approved the church project, they determined that the proposed project must be consistent with the policies and development standards of the OCP. The Hope Church 06DVP-12 Staff Report referenced the Orcutt Community Plan EIR analysis of Key Site 33, which included a potential development scenario of: a 400-room motel, two restaurants, two gas stations, a large-scale RV park, and two convenience stores. The addendum to the OCP EIR did not discuss impacts to Land Use, Archaeological and Historical Resources, Recreation, Public Services, Noise, or Solid Waste because no significant impacts to those resources were identified during evaluation of the proposed church project and site. Significant impacts were anticipated for several other issue areas, including Agriculture, Biology, Geology and Soils/Flooding and Drainage, Water Resources, Air Quality, Risk of Upset/Oil Hazards, Wastewater, and Visual/Aesthetic Resources. Therefore, several mitigation measures from the OCP EIR were incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for the church project. The impacts and corresponding mitigation measures are discussed in the analyses of potentially significant effects under the respective issue areas below.

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 proposed project.

Beneficial Impact: There is a beneficial effect on the environment resulting from the proposed 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. Signif. and Unavoid.	Significant but Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial 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			
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 proposed project site is located approximately 100 feet East of Highway and 2,000 feet south of the Santa Maria Way intersection with Highway 101, in a rural area bounded by vacant properties and an area characterized by agricultural, commercial, and institutional land uses, including buildings such as the existing pet grooming business and the CTECAF. Public views in this area are dominated by open rolling grasslands with small eucalyptus windrows on the site and nearby properties. The primary public viewshed for this proposed project is along the north- and south-bound lanes of Highway 101; offering travelers open northbound views of the distant Sierra Madre Mountains and southbound views of the Solomon Hills. Highway 101 is eligible for “Scenic Highway Designation” along its entire length in Santa Barbara County. The topography is relatively flat and existing nearby development does not silhouette against the skyline. Views of this site are available from Highway 101 roughly ¼-mile north and south of the site. Topography generally limits views of the site from viewpoints further than ¼-mile north, and vegetation generally limits views of the site from neighborhoods west of Highway 101. There are no public views of the site from the east.

County 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 proposed 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 views, but aesthetic impacts are not addressed for private views.

Impact Discussion:

Development of the site would add a building, storage of water/utility conveyance (pipe) materials, paving, roads, signs, and night lighting. In addition, a General Plan Amendment and Rezone is proposed to change the land use designation from Highway Commercial (H) to General Commercial (C) and the zoning designation from Highway Commercial (CH) to General Commercial (C-3). The General Plan Amendment would also adjust the Urban/Rural Boundary to change the site from Rural Lands designation to Urban Lands designation.

a.-b., d.) The proposed urban land use designation, rezone to the General Commercial (C-3) Zone District, and construction of the pipe supply and outdoor storage site have the potential to cause **significant but mitigable impacts** to the visual character of the area when compared to the site’s surroundings and may result in visually incompatible development (Impact VIS-1). The proposed project would develop a semi-rural and vacant property and allow more urbanized uses (such as outdoor storage of materials) with adjustment of the Urban/Rural Lands boundary. Specifically, the proposed building and outdoor storage

of construction (pipe) materials on site would be visible to the public view along Highway 101. Buildout of the site will include an 11,000 sf, 25-ft-high single-story rectangular warehouse with clerestory; and associated grading and landscaping. The landscaping will include a 50-foot-wide screening buffer along the northern and southern portions of the site adjacent to Morningside Drive, and perimeter screening trees incorporated within existing trees along the “u-shaped” boundary adjoining the existing pet grooming business property to the west. Grading will include 5,005 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 21,348 cy of fill (16,343 cy net soil import). Grading will provide a development pad for the building, internal driveways and 19-space parking lot, 40,000 sf outdoor storage area for large pipe materials, and 31,000 sf underground chamber stormwater retention basin. Grading will also create a 10-percent sloped driveway to allow an east to west egress. The egress driveway will be adjacent to the site boundary that adjoins the southern boundary of the existing pet grooming business property.

A retaining wall (10-ft maximum height) will be constructed to maintain the grade difference between the proposed egress driveway and the existing pet grooming business development pad. The proposed project will remove two eucalyptus trees (*Corymbia citriodora*) to allow for grading of the proposed egress driveway. A parallel set of retaining walls (5-ft-maximum height) will be constructed to maintain the grade difference between the proposed development and the existing development pad along the eastern and northern boundaries of the pet grooming business. The proposed project development would be similar to the existing character of the area, which includes a 4,000 sf building (pet grooming business) with 2,000 sf of kennels and three CTECAF buildings which total approximately 46,000 sf.

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the Addendum to the OCP EIR identified mitigation measures from the OCP EIR that were applied to the formerly-proposed Hope Community Church project and included in the Conditions of Approval for the CUP, DVP, and TPM permits. Additionally, the TPM Conditions of Approval were recorded with the Final Parcel Map. Impact VIS-1 above corresponds with OCP DevStd KS33-3 and OCP EIR Impacts VIS-3, VIS-4, VIS-5, VIS-7, and VIS-16 and mitigation measures MM-VIS-3, MM-VIS-4 and MM-VIS-7. Therefore, the impacts will be mitigated with implementation of MM-VIS-1 Frontage Road Landscaping, MM-VIS-2 Landscape Buffer, MM-VIS-3 Parking Landscaping, MM-VIS-4 Rural Character, and MM-VIS-5 Design Review.

Aesthetic/Visual Resources impacts will also be mitigated by MM-VIS-2 Right-Of-Way Landscape Maintenance and MM-VIS-3, which will require landscaping and maintenance within the parking area and frontage road right-of-way. In addition, the proposed project will be required to obtain North Board of Architectural Review approval of proposed project design to ensure the proposed development (including scale, character, colors, materials, and landscaping) will be compatible with vicinity development (MM-VIS-4 and MM-VIS-6). The architecture shall be compatible with the rural character of the area (MM-VIS-4), pursuant to the mitigation measures that were recorded for the subject properties as part of the church project (Case No. 06DVP-00000-00012).

c.) The proposed project has the potential to cause **significant but mitigable** impacts to nighttime dark skies of adjoining areas, because it would install exterior night lighting for security purposes and to meet California Building Code requirements (Impact VIS-2). Impact VIS-2 coincides with OCP EIR Impact VIS-2, and mitigation measure MM-VIS-2. Therefore, the impact will be mitigated with implementation of MM-VIS-6 Lighting Plan, which will require the incorporation of a Lighting Plan that includes low intensity, low glare, hooded and downward-directed exterior lighting. In addition, the Lighting Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the North Board of Architectural Review.

Cumulative Impacts. The OCP EIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts caused by expansion of urban activities into existing rural open space and degradation of views from designated scenic corridors (Impacts VIS-17 and VIS-18). As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Setting, the Board

of Supervisors adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for those impacts which could not be fully mitigated. The project's incremental contribution to this overall impact would be addressed by the Statement of Overriding Considerations previously approved by the Board of Supervisors when the OCP was adopted. As described in the impact section above, implementation of the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any substantial change in the aesthetic character of the area since the development will be visually compatible with its surroundings. Thus, the proposed project would not cause a cumulatively considerable effect on aesthetics.

Mitigation and Residual Impact.

The following mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's aesthetic impacts to an insignificant level:

MM-VIS-1 Frontage Road Landscaping: Proposed project development shall incorporate the adjacent portion of the Morningside Drive right-of-way into landscape plans. The landscaping shall utilize drought-tolerant species to the maximum extent feasible, consisting of low maintenance trees, shrubs, and groundcover which do not obstruct views of motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians. The owner of the property shall be responsible for the maintenance of the adjacent right-of-way area.

MONITORING: Permit Compliance staff shall inspect landscaping prior to occupancy to ensure material has been installed consistent with the approved landscaping plans.

MM-VIS-2 Landscape Buffer: All new development adjacent to Highway 101 shall include a 50-foot landscaped buffer along the western boundary of the site with Highway 101, not including the frontage road. The buffers shall be vegetated with sufficient plantings of drought tolerant and/or native trees and shrubs to screen parking areas and "break up" building masses. The landscaping shall utilize a large proportion of trees reaching a minimum height of 35 feet to help preserve the areas rural character.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND TIMING: The applicant shall submit architectural drawings, fencing plans, grading plans, and landscape plans of the proposed project which reflect the 50-foot landscape buffer for review and final approval by the Board of Architectural Review prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for structural development on the project site.

MONITORING: Prior to occupancy clearance, Permit Compliance staff shall site inspect for conformance to approved plans.

MM-VIS-3 Parking Landscaping: All parking areas shall include a minimum of one planter for every 10 parking spaces. The planters shall include trees of sufficient canopy upon maturity to provide at least 50% canopy coverage of parking areas. Larger planters should be included at the end of each row of parking spaces and planted with trees, smaller shrubs, and drought tolerant ground cover.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND TIMING: The applicant shall submit architectural drawings, fencing plans, grading plans, and landscape plans of the proposed project for review and final approval by the Board of Architectural Review prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for structural development. Fencing that is proposed around the storm water retardation basin shall also be approved by the Flood Control District.

MONITORING: Prior to occupancy clearance, Permit Compliance staff shall site inspect for conformance to approved plans.

MM-VIS-4 Rural Character: The design, scale, and character of the proposed project architecture shall be compatible with the rural character of the area. All development including building, fences, and parking shall be sited and designed to protect the visual character of the surrounding areas and blend in with natural landforms through the use of such methods as setbacks, building orientation, materials and colors (earth tones and non-reflective paints), landscape buffers, shielded exterior lighting, and screening of parking areas.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND TIMING: The applicant shall submit architectural drawings of the proposed project for review and final approval by the Board of Architectural Review prior to Zoning Clearance for structural development.

MM-VIS-5 Design Review: The Owner/Applicant shall obtain Board of Architectural Review (BAR) approval for project design. All project elements (e.g., design, scale, character, colors, materials and landscaping shall be compatible with vicinity development and shall conform in all respects to BAR approval (23BAR-00152).

TIMING: The Owner/Applicant shall submit architectural drawings of the project for review and shall obtain final BAR approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance. Grading plans, if required, shall be submitted to P&D concurrent with or prior to BAR plan filing.

MONITORING: The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to P&D compliance monitoring staff that the project has been built consistent with approved BAR design and landscape plans prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance.

MM-VIS-6 Lighting Plan: The Owner/Applicant shall ensure any exterior night lighting installed on the proposed project site is of low intensity, low glare design, minimum height, and shall be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject lot and prevent spill-over onto adjacent lots. No unobstructed beam of exterior light shall be directed toward any area zoned or developed residential. The Owner/Applicant shall install timers or otherwise ensure lights are dimmed after 10 p.m.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The Owner/Applicant shall develop a Lighting Plan for P&D and BAR approval incorporating these requirements and showing locations and height of all exterior lighting fixtures.

TIMING: P&D and BAR shall review a Lighting Plan for compliance with this measure prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for structures.

MONITORING: Compliance Monitoring staff shall inspect structures upon completion to ensure that exterior lighting fixtures have been installed consistent with their depiction on the final Lighting Plan prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance.

With the incorporation of these measures, 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	

Existing Setting:

As discussed in Section 3.0 Environmental Setting, the site does not contain any agricultural operations and the surrounding properties to the north and east are vacant. The adjoining property to the south is zoned AG-II-100 and is currently occupied by the Elks Event Center. One driveway immediately adjacent and along the southern property boundary provides access (via easement) to agricultural operations on property located approximately 1,000 feet to the east of the proposed Famcon site. Another driveway (located approximately 80 feet south of the southern property boundary) provides secondary access to the Elks Event Center and parking areas located in the fields on the northeast portion of the Elks Event Center.

Impact Discussion:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR analyzed impacts to Agricultural Resources. No significant impacts to Agricultural Resources were identified during evaluation of the proposed church project and site. Therefore, none of the OCP EIR mitigations for impacts to Archaeological and Historical Resources have been applied to the Famcon project.

a.-b) The proposed project site does not contain a combination of acreage and/or soils which render the site an important agricultural resource. The site does not adjoin any neighboring agricultural operations, nor will it impact any neighboring agricultural operations.

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

Cumulative Impacts:

The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a proposed project's contribution to a regionally significant issue constitutes a significant effect at the proposed project level. In this instance, the proposed project has been found not to have any impact on agricultural resources. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to the regionally significant loss of agricultural resources is not considerable, and its cumulative effect on regional agriculture is insignificant.

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. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) provides oversight on compliance with air quality standards within the County, and is responsible for the preparation of the County's Clean Air Plan. Santa Barbara County is part of the Central South Coast Air Basin, which also includes Ventura and San Luis Obispo Counties. Ambient air quality within the basin is generally good. However, the basin periodically experiences atmospheric temperature inversion layers, generally between May and October, which tend to prevent the rapid dispersion of pollutants. Presently, Santa Barbara County is in attainment of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), sulphates (SO_{4,2}), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), and lead (Pb). The County is in nonattainment of the CAAQS for ozone (O₃, 8-hour) and particulate matter PM₁₀, and is considered unclassified for PM_{2.5}. The major sources of ozone precursor emissions in the County are motor vehicles and marine vessels, the petroleum industry, and solvent use. Sources of

particulate matter include mineral quarries, grading, demolition, agriculture tilling, road dust, and vehicle exhaust.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to changes in air quality than others, depending on the population groups and the activities involved. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) identified the following groups who are most likely to be affected by air pollution, known as sensitive receptors: children under 14 years of age; elderly over 65 years of age; athletes; and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. Land uses typically associated with sensitive receptors include schools, parks, playgrounds, childcare centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and clinics.

County 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 proposed project will:

- emit (from all proposed project sources, mobile and stationary), less than the daily trigger for offsets for any pollutant (currently 240 pounds per day for NO_x and ROC, and 80 pounds per day for PM₁₀);
- emit less than 25 pounds per day of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) 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 proposed 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).

Impact Discussion:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR analyzed impacts that were identified in the OCP EIR, but no site-specific Air Quality impacts were identified for the project. Therefore, none of the OCP EIR mitigations were applied to the church project, and none of them have been incorporated into the proposed Famcon project.

(a.-c.) The proposed project would not result in significant new vehicle emissions because the 84 new vehicular trips to and/or from the site would fall well below the screening threshold of 800 trips. It would not involve new stationary sources (i.e., equipment, machinery, hazardous materials storage, industrial or chemical processing, etc.) that would increase the amount of pollutants released into the atmosphere. The proposed project would not generate additional smoke, ash, odors, or long term dust after construction.

Short-Term Construction Impacts. Proposed project-related construction activities would require grading that has been minimized to the extent possible under the circumstances. Earth moving operations at the proposed project site would not have the potential to result in significant proposed project-specific short-term emissions of fugitive dust and PM₁₀, with the implementation of standard dust control measures that are required for all new development in the County.

Emissions of ozone precursors (NO_x and ROC) during proposed 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 proposed project site, construction-related emissions of NO_x and ROC would not be significant on a proposed project-specific or cumulative basis. However, due to the non-attainment status of the air basin for ozone, the proposed project should implement measures recommended by the APCD to reduce construction-related emissions of ozone precursors to the extent feasible (Attachment 2). Compliance with these measures is routinely required for all new development in the County.

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

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

Mitigation and Residual Impact. The following mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's air quality impacts to an insignificant level:

Implementation of standard conditions placed on the grading plan as implemented through Chapter 14 (Grading Ordinance) of the County Code, along with standard APCD conditions would reduce potential short-term dust impacts to a less than significant level. The proposed project would not result in significant proposed project-specific long-term air quality impacts. No further mitigation measures are required.

MM-AIR-01: Dust Control. The Owner/Applicant shall comply with the following dust control components at all times including weekends and holidays:

1. Dust generated by the development activities shall be kept to a minimum with a goal of retaining dust on the site.
2. During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, use water trucks or sprinkler systems to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.
3. During construction, use water trucks or sprinkler systems to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site.
4. Wet down the construction area after work is completed for the day and whenever wind exceeds 15 mph.
5. When wind exceeds 15 mph, have site watered at least once each day including weekends and/or holidays.
6. Order increased watering as necessary to prevent transport of dust off-site.
7. Cover soil stockpiled for more than two days or treat with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Reapply as needed.
8. If the site is graded and left undeveloped for over four weeks, the Owner/Applicant shall immediately: (i) Seed and water to re-vegetate graded areas; and/or (ii) Spread soil binders; and/or; (iii) Employ any other method(s) deemed appropriate by P&D or APCD.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: These dust control requirements shall be noted on all grading and building plans.

PRE-CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS: The contractor or builder shall provide P&D monitoring staff and APCD with the name and contact information for an assigned onsite dust control monitor(s) who has the responsibility to:

1. Assure all dust control requirements are complied with including those covering weekends and holidays.
2. Order increased watering as necessary to prevent transport of dust offsite.
3. Attend the pre-construction meeting.

TIMING: The dust monitor shall be designated prior to First Grading Permit. The dust control components apply from the beginning of any grading or construction throughout all development activities until Final Building Inspection Clearance is issued and landscaping is successfully installed.

MONITORING: P&D processing planner shall ensure measures are on plans. P&D grading and building inspectors shall spot check; Grading and Building shall ensure compliance onsite. APCD inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.

MM-AIR-02: Emission Reduction.

1. All portable diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 brake horsepower (bhp) shall be registered with the state's portable equipment registration program OR shall obtain an APCD permit.
2. Fleet owners of diesel-powered mobile construction equipment greater than 25 hp are subject to the California Air Resource Board (CARB) In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation (Title 13, California Code of Regulations (CCR), §2449), the purpose of which is to reduce oxides of nitrogen (NOx), diesel particulate matter (DPM), and other criteria pollutant emissions from in-use off-road diesel-fueled vehicles. Off-road heavy-duty trucks shall comply with the State Off-Road Regulation. For more information, see www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/ordiesel.htm.
3. Fleet owners of diesel-fueled heavy-duty trucks and buses are subject to CARB's On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles (In-Use) Regulation (Title 13, CCR, §2025), the purpose of which is to reduce DPM, NOx and other criteria pollutants from in-use (on-road) diesel-fueled vehicles. For more information, see www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/onrdiesel.htm.
4. All commercial off-road and on-road diesel vehicles are subject, respectively, to Title 13, CCR, §2449(d)(3) and §2485, limiting engine idling time. Off-road vehicles subject to the State Off-Road Regulation are limited to idling no more than five minutes. Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes, unless the truck engine meets the optional low-NOx idling emission standard, the truck is labeled with a clean-idle sticker, and it is not operating within 100 feet of a restricted area.
5. Off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment with engines certified to meet U.S. EPA Tier 4 emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible. Please contact the District if alternative strategies for meeting Tier 4 emission standards are considered.
6. On-road heavy-duty equipment with model year 2010 engines or newer should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
7. Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible. Electric auxiliary power units should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
8. Equipment/vehicles using alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or renewable diesel, should be used on-site where feasible.
9. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
10. All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.
11. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.
12. The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
13. Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.
14. Construction truck trips should be scheduled during non-peak hours to reduce peak hour emissions whenever feasible.
15. Proposed truck routes should minimize impacts to residential communities and sensitive receptors.
16. Construction staging areas should be located away from sensitive receptors such that exhaust and other construction emissions do not enter the fresh air intakes to buildings, air conditioners, and windows.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND TIMING: Prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or map recordation, all requirements shall be shown as conditions of approval on grading/building plans, and/or on a separate sheet to be recorded with the map. Conditions shall be adhered to throughout grading and construction periods.

The contractor shall retain onsite the Certificate of Compliance for CARB's In-Use Regulation for Off-Road Diesel Vehicles and have it available for inspection.

MONITORING: The Lead Agency shall ensure measures are on project plans and/or recorded with maps. The Lead Agency staff shall ensure compliance onsite. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.

4.3b AIR QUALITY - GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Will the proposed 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 (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), and nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃) (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 Gasses 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 proposed 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 proposed project’s [GHG] emissions to the effects of climate change.” A proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed projects to tier their GHG emissions analysis off the 2030 CAP Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) if the proposed project is found consistent with the 2030 CAP. To aid in determining a proposed project’s consistency with the 2030 CAP, the County has developed the Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist (Checklist). A proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed projects causing related impacts. A CEQA lead agency may determine that a proposed 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 proposed project’s contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered insignificant if the proposed 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 proposed project type: 2.68 metric tons CO₂ equivalent (MT CO₂e) per year per resident for residential proposed projects; 2.63 MT CO₂e/year per employee for non-residential proposed projects; and 2.67 MT CO₂e/year per service person for mixed-use proposed projects. If the estimated GHG emissions are less than the applicable threshold, staff can conclude that the proposed project will have an insignificant environmental impact, and the proposed project would require no further analysis. For proposed projects that exceed the threshold, mitigation measures are needed.

Impact Discussion:

Proto Updated September 3, 2024

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR analyzed impacts that were identified in the OCP EIR, but GHGs were not yet included in County EIR analyses. Therefore, there were no previous GHG mitigations that could be applied to the Famcon project.

a.-b.) The proposed project has been found consistent with the 2030 Climate Action Plan (CAP), as demonstrated by the completed 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 applied as mitigation measures, the proposed 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.

The completed CAP Checklist specifies that Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Amendments which result in an equivalent or less GHG-intensive project when compared to the existing designations (item 1b.) could be considered consistent with the CAP – depending on the proposed development. The proposed project involves a land use Designation change and rezone from Commercial Highway to General Commercial. The proposed development is equivalent or less GHG-intensive than what could be allowed under the current designation of Commercial Highway. The use will remain commercial, and therefore the proposed change in land use and zoning designation will not create a more GHG—intensive impact.

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. As indicated in the completed checklist (Attachment 3), County 2030 Climate Action Plan Measure TR-2, Large Employers – Transportation Demand Management/TDM does not apply because the project will have eight employees, which is well below the threshold of 50 or more employees.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The following mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's greenhouse gas impacts to an insignificant level:

MM-GHG-1 Building Electrification: Project construction shall comply with 2030 Climate Action Plan Action CE-1.1 and be all-electric with no natural gas hookup.

MM-GHG-2 Carbon Free Electricity: Project construction and operation shall retain Central Coast Community Energy as the energy provider or otherwise utilize 100% carbon free electricity.

MM-GHG-3 EV Charging Infrastructure: Project construction and operation shall commit to the use of electrified off-road landscaping equipment (e.g. mowers, chippers, tractors) for ongoing operations and maintenance.

MM-GHG-4 Reduce VMT: Project shall demonstrate consistency with the County's Thresholds of Significance for Transportation Impacts in the County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines manual by meeting the screening criteria for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

MM-GHG-5 Landfill Diversion Rate Goal: Project shall meet current legislation and 2030 Climate Action Plan goals to properly sort and collect recyclables and organic waste, as applicable, to reduce communitywide landfilled organics 80% by 2030 and 100% by 2045 by providing dedicated space for organic waste and/or recycling receptacles.

MM-GHG-6- Organics Recycling Requirement: Project shall meet SB 1383 legislation requirements by posting education signage, as applicable, and sorting and collecting organic waste, as applicable, to achieve 0.08 tons per capita compost procurement requirements for the unincorporated County.

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be insignificant.

Cumulative Impacts:

The proposed project's total greenhouse gas emissions would be less than the applicable threshold. Therefore, the proposed project's incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable and the proposed project's greenhouse gas emissions will not have a significant impact on the environment.

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 Gases 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. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial 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:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR analyzed impacts that were identified in the OCP EIR, but no site-specific Biological Resources impacts were identified for the project. Therefore, none of the OCP EIR mitigations for impacts to Biological Resources were applied to the church project, and none of them have been incorporated into the Famcon project.

a.-k.) No natural plant communities exist on the site and no sensitive wildlife species are known to inhabit the premises or use the site for breeding or foraging. The site is within an area mapped as potential range of the Santa Barbara population of California Tiger Salamander. Therefore, P&D consulted with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) staff via email correspondence on November 11, 2024, and no concerns were identified with the proposed project (Attachment 4). Additionally, no native or specimen trees are located in the area of proposed project disturbance. No impacts to biological resources are anticipated.

Mitigation and Residual Impact¹:

No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

Cumulative Impacts:

Since the proposed project would not impact biological resources, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on the County's biological resources.

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: 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 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,

¹ May require payment of fees to the California Department of Fish and Game
Proto Updated September 3, 2024

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 proposed project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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:

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. Cultural sites in this area tend to be along waterways (particularly on adjacent alluvial benches or terraces), near springs, and near rock outcrops. A records search was conducted at the Central Coast Information Center of the University of California, Santa Barbara (CCIC) on November 18, 2024 and no recorded archaeological sites are located within 2,000 feet of the proposed project site. In addition, there are no waterways, alluvial benches, springs or rock outcrops on or nearby the site.

To date, Santa Barbara County has received no requests from tribal groups to participate in government-to-government consultation, pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 21080.3.1 and 65352.3, and in accordance with the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18. On August 22 and November 20, 2024, formal notices of General Plan Amendment (pursuant to SB 18 and AB 52, respectively) for the proposed project were sent to the following tribal contacts:

Sam Cohen, Government and Legal Affairs Director of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians

Gabe Frausto, Chairman of the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation

Crystal Mendoza, Elder's Council Administrative Assistant for the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians

Julio Quair, Chairperson of the Chumash Council of Bakersfield

Wendy Teeter, Cultural Resources Archaeologist for the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians

Violet Walker, Chairperson of the Northern Chumash Tribal Council

Nakia Zavalla, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians

The notices provided opportunity for consultation under SB 18 and AB 52, and included a description of the proposed project. The consultation period under SB 18 ended on November 26, 2024 and the consultation period under AB 54 ended on January 6, 2025. One reply was received from the Tribal Elders' Council for the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians with no concerns expressed and no tribal cultural resources (TCRs) were identified on the subject parcel.

As indicated in the Orcutt Community Plan, the property was owned by Dr. Roger Ikola and he moved three historic structures (The Pleasant Valley Schoolhouse, The Newlove Residence, and The Paulding Residence) from the East Battles Road area of Santa Maria to the site to save them from demolition. Dr. Ikola had hoped to create "Heritage Park" (a historical park), but the park never came to fruition and the buildings fell into disrepair. The Paulding Schoolhouse was moved to another site in Buellton and restored, The Newlove Residence was moved to the Foxen Canyon Road area and restored, and The Paulding Residence was demolished.

Impact Discussion:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR did not analyze impacts to Archaeological and Historical Resources because no significant impacts to those resources were identified during evaluation of the proposed church project and site, and none of the OCP EIR mitigations for impacts to Archaeological and Historical Resources have been applied to the Famcon project.

a.- d.) As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline and the Cultural Resources Existing Setting above, no cultural resources were identified within or adjacent to the proposed project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any historical resource, cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric or historic archaeological resource, disturb any human remains, or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. In order to comply with cultural resource policies, the development proposed project would be conditioned with a standard archaeological discovery clause which requires that any previously unidentified cultural resources discovered during site development are treated in accordance with the County's Cultural Resources Guidelines [Chapter 8 of the County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (rev.2/2018)]. Impacts would be insignificant.

Cumulative Impacts:

Since the proposed project would not impact cultural resources, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on the County's cultural resources.

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:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR did not analyze impacts to electrical facilities within the OCP area because no significant impacts to Public Services were identified during evaluation of the proposed project and project site. Therefore, none of the OCP EIR mitigations were applied to the church project.

a.-b.) 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 pipe and supply sales warehouse for wet and dry utility installations, and energy use is estimated in the following table:

Energy Use

Multiplier	Proposed project Demand
Natural Gas (13.7 million BTU per capita ²)	Not applicable/No natural gas use proposed
Electricity (7.4MWh/yr/home PG&E; 6.9 MWh/yr/home SCE) ³	0.5 megawatt hours per year

The building would need a daily supply of 455 amps at 120/208V, resulting in 164 kW used per day. The total usage would be approximately 500 kWh/yr, or 0.5 MWh/yr. As indicated in the table above, the building demand would represent a much lower portion of total demand when compared with the average annual electricity demand of the typical residence in California. The proposed demand would be a fraction (seven percent) of the annual energy usage of the typical residence in California.

In summary, the proposed project would have minimal long-term energy requirements. No adverse impacts would result.

Cumulative Impacts:

The proposed 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.

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

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

4.7 FIRE PROTECTION

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous 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. Proposed 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		

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 proposed 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:

Predictions about the long-term effects of global climate change in California include increased incidence of wildfires and a longer fire season, due to drier conditions and warmer temperatures. Any increase in the number or severity of wildfires has the potential to impact resources to fight fires when they occur, particularly when the state experiences several wildfires simultaneously. Such circumstances place greater risk on development in high fire hazard areas.

Impact Discussion:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR did not analyze impacts to Fire Protection because no significant impacts to Public Services were identified during initial evaluation of the proposed project and project site. Therefore, none of the OCP EIR mitigations were applied to the church project.

a.) The proposed project is located within the mapped boundaries of the High Fire Hazard Area of Santa Barbara County. Therefore, the proposed project will cause **significant but mitigable impacts** with regard to wildfire risk to structures and people (Impacts FIRE-1, FIRE-2, FIRE-3, and FIRE-4). Special provisions of the Building Code will apply regarding fire safety, including requirements for structural design, sprinkler system requirements, and fire-resistant building materials with implementation of mitigations MM-FIRE-1 and MM-FIRE-3. In addition, Defensible Space Guidelines will apply to the design and maintenance of the site and associated landscaping with implementation of mitigation MM-FIRE-2. The project applicant will also be required to pay Development Impact Mitigation Fees to the Fire Department with implementation of mitigation MM-FIRE-4.

b.-f.) The proposed project would not cause a high fire hazard because it will be within an urbanized area that contains very little fuel for wildland fire. The vacant property contains mostly grassland that is mowed to reduce fuel load. There is an existing water main adjacent to the site along the northern boundary and adequate water resources for fighting wildland fire are available. Fire hydrants and building sprinklers will be installed as part of the proposed project. The proposed project will not require installation or maintenance of other infrastructure associated with wildland fire. The proposed development will not 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. The proposed project would be within the service area of Santa Barbara County Fire Station # 26 at 1596 Tiffany Park Ct in Orcutt. Emergency response times are estimated to be within 5-7 minutes. Proposed project impacts will be insignificant for these items.

Cumulative Impacts:

The proposed project includes mitigation measures that will reduce fire hazards to less than significant, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on fire safety within the County.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The following mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's fire hazard impacts to an insignificant level:

MM-FIRE-1: The proposed project shall include the use of fire-resistant building materials, pursuant to Chapters 10 and 15 of the Santa Barbara County Municipal Code.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND TIMING: The Owner/Applicant shall include building materials on applicable plans for building permits prior to BDP issuance.

MONITORING: The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to County Fire staff and/or P&D Building and Safety staff, as applicable, that the project has been built with the use of fire-resistant building materials, pursuant

to Chapters 10 and 15 of the Santa Barbara County Municipal Code, prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance.

MM-FIRE-2: The proposed project shall include the maintenance of defensible space around structures, pursuant to Chapters 10 and 15 of the Santa Barbara County Municipal Code.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND TIMING: The Owner/Applicant shall provide a defensible space plan to the P&D case processing planner and County Fire staff for review prior to Zoning Clearance issuance. The defensible space plan shall be maintained for the life of the project.

MONITORING: The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate implementation of the defensible space plan to County Fire and/or P&D Building and Safety staff, as applicable, prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance.

MM-FIRE-3: The proposed project applicant shall be required to obtain a Fire Protection Certificate (FPC) prior to building occupancy and ensure adequate access to properties for emergency vehicles, pursuant to the County Fire Department requirements and Chapters 15 and 49 of the Santa Barbara County Municipal Code. These requirements also include the installation of fire sprinklers and a monitored alarm system.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND TIMING: The Owner/Applicant shall obtain an FPC prior to building occupancy. Adequate access for emergency vehicles shall be maintained for the life of the project.

MONITORING: The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to County Fire staff that the FPC has been obtained prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance.

MM-FIRE-4: The proposed project applicant shall be required to pay Development Impact Mitigation Fees for Fire Suppression services.

TIMING: Fire DIMFs shall be paid to the County Fire Department prior to Final Building Permit Inspection and shall be based on the fee schedules in effect when paid, which may increase at the beginning of each fiscal year (July 1st).

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would insignificant.

4.8 GEOLOGIC PROCESSES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous 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			

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
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 Geologic Conditions:

The project is located within an area called the Ineffective Watershed Area⁴ (IFA), which does not discharge storm water runoff to the surrounding watersheds because of sumps (natural dunes and valleys) that retain storm water temporarily until it infiltrates. Nearby sites have been observed to have a hardpan soil layer that can prevent vertical groundwater infiltration during wet years.

In a Geotechnical Investigation Report dated from June of 2023, Pacific Coast Testing provided geotechnical recommendations for project site preparation, foundations, slabs-on-grade, retaining walls, and pavement sections. As discussed in the report, the primary geotechnical concerns are the loose condition of the near surface soils and the potential for differential settlements. Pacific Coast Testing recommended that the proposed building pad area be overexcavated for a building supported on conventional footings.

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 proposed project site or any part of the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed project proposes construction of a cut slope over 15 feet in height as measured from the lowest finished grade.
4. The proposed project is located on slopes exceeding 20% grade.

⁴ Plate 2 of the Flood Insurance Study of the City of Santa Maria dated December 1976: Ineffective Watershed Area (IFA), as referenced in the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Standard Conditions of Project Plan Approval, Dated January 2011.
Proto Updated September 3, 2024

Impact Discussion:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR did analyze impacts to Geologic Processes because site-specific impacts to Geology and Soils were identified during initial evaluation of the proposed project and project site. Therefore, several OCP EIR mitigations were applied to the church project, with expanded language to reflect project-specific details. These revised mitigations are discussed and incorporated below.

The northeastern portion of the site would be graded and the existing ground elevations will be lowered 1-2 feet to provide a development pad for the proposed warehouse/office building. The northwestern and southern portion of the site would be filled with approximately 16,000 cubic yards of imported fill for construction of the proposed outdoor storage of pipe materials and storm water retention basin. The existing elevation of the southwest corner of the site (currently shaped like a drainage basin) would be raised to match the elevation of the rest of the site and allow a level outdoor storage area located on top of the proposed installation of the proposed storm water retention system. The existing elevation would be raised from the 412 feet above sea level (asl) to 429 feet asl, with a maximum fill depth of 17 feet.

a., c.-d., f.-l.) The proposed project site is not underlain by any known fault. Compliance with existing building regulations would reduce potential ground shaking impacts caused by movement along a distant fault to a less than significant level. Liquefaction potential in the area has been determined to be low. Any potential for expansive soils would be mitigated by the use of non-expansive engineered fill. All soils-related hazards would be less than significant through the normal building permit review and inspection process. The proposed project site is located inland and there are no surface waters or water bodies located nearby. Therefore, the project would not be subject to bluff retreat or sea level rise, nor would the project alter any geomorphology of rivers, streams, lakes, or ocean. The proposed cut for grading of the building pad is not substantial and would not destroy any unique paleontological resources or geologic features, nor would there be grading on slopes of over 20%. The project would not require septic because it will connect to the Laguna County Sanitation District for wastewater services. The proposed project would not involve mining, the loss of topsoil, or construction-related vibrations. The proposed project would not result in impacts related to the geological resources listed above in items a., c.-d., and f.-l.

b.) The proposed grading would involve a moderate amount of fill and have the potential to cause **significant but mitigable impacts** due to the development proposed at the southwest portion of the site, including installation of a storm water retention basin and creation of outdoor storage area above the basin (Impact GEO-1). The previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR stated that the amount and type of grading proposed was within the scope that was analyzed in the OCP EIR for Key Site 33; and that no new mitigation measures would be required to reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, no previous mitigation measures for the grading will be incorporated into the Famcon project. The applicant provided several studies to support the proposed site drainage and storm water retention basin design, including a Drainage Study, Preliminary Storm Water Control Plan (SWCP), and Geotechnical Investigation Report (Attachments 5-7). The Preliminary SWCP and basin design was reviewed by Public Works Flood Control Staff and determined to be adequate for preliminary approval, pending review and approval of final design plans. Impacts will be mitigated with implementation of MM-GEO-1 and MM-GEO-2.

e.) The proposed project has the potential to cause **significant but mitigable impacts** to geologic resources because the proposed grading operations on the proposed project site would remove vegetative cover and disturb the ground surface, thereby increasing the potential for erosion and sedimentation impacts. The previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR stated that impacts from the OCP EIR included blowing sand as a result of future development on the project site (OCP EIR Impact

GEO-2), increased storm flows from impervious surfaces (OCP EIR Impact FLD-3), inadequate storm drain/retention basin capacity (OCP EIR Impact FLD-6), and increased storm flows, erosion and sedimentation, flooding, personal injury and property damage (OCP EIR Impact FLD-11). In addition, the OCP EIR site-specific analysis of Key Site 33 concluded there could be possible impacts from water erosion (OCP EIR Impact KS33-GEO-1), soil blowing hazards along the Highway 101 corridor (OCP EIR KS33-GEO-2) and increased runoff (OCP EIR Impact KS33-FLD-3). The Preliminary SWCP and basin design was reviewed by Public Works Project Clean Water Staff and determined to be adequate for preliminary approval, pending review and approval of final design plans. Project Clean Water Staff provided a letter with comments and conditions (Attachment 8), and impacts will be mitigated with implementation of MM-GEO-1 and MM-GEO-2.

Cumulative Impacts:

Since the proposed project would not result in significant geologic impacts after mitigation, and geologic impacts are typically localized in nature, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on Geologic Resources within the County.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The following mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's geologic impacts to an insignificant level:

MM-GEO-01b Soils Engineering Study: The Owner/Applicant shall submit a soils engineering study addressing structure site, access roads and outdoor storage area with underlying fill and storm water retention basin to determine structural design criteria.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The Owner/Applicant shall submit the study for P&D and Public Works review and approval. Elements of the approved study shall be reflected on grading and building plans as required.

TIMING: The Owner/Applicant shall submit the study prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance.

MONITORING: P&D permit processing planner shall review the study. The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate that the submitted plans conform to required study components. Grading and building inspectors shall ensure compliance in the field.

MM-GEO-02 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan: Where required by the latest edition of the California Green Code and/or Chapter 14 of the Santa Barbara County Code, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) and an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) shall be implemented as part of the project. Grading and erosion and sediment control plans shall be designed to minimize erosion during construction and shall be implemented for the duration of the grading period and until re-graded areas have been stabilized by structures, long-term erosion control measures or permanent landscaping. The Owner/Applicant shall submit the SWPPP, SWMP and ESCP using Best Management Practices (BMP) designed to stabilize the site, protect natural watercourses/creeks, prevent erosion, convey storm water runoff to existing drainage systems keeping contaminants and sediments onsite. The SWPPP and ESCP shall be a part of the Grading Plan submittal and will be reviewed for its technical merits by P&D. Information on Erosion Control requirements can be found on the County web site re: Grading Ordinance Chapter 14 (<http://sbcountyplanning.org/building/grading.cfm>) refer to Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Requirements; and in the California Green Code for SWPPP (projects < 1 acre) and/or SWMP requirements. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** The grading and SWPPP, SWMP and/or ESCP shall be submitted for review and approved by P&D prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance. The plan shall be designed to address erosion, sediment and pollution control during all phases of development of the site until all disturbed areas are permanently stabilized.

TIMING: The SWPPP requirements shall be implemented prior to the commencement of grading and throughout the year. The ESCP/SWMP requirements shall be implemented between November 1st and April 15th of each year, except pollution control measures shall be implemented year-round.

MONITORING: P&D staff shall perform site inspections throughout the construction phase.

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be insignificant.

4.9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/RISK OF UPSET

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial 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	

Existing Setting:

The southern portion of Orcutt is an area which has previously been used for oil exploration and drilling. There are a large number of abandoned oil wells, not all of which have been accurately mapped. Where well sites are known, additional difficulty exists in precisely locating abandoned pipelines, site dumpings, and other hazardous anomalies related to the production of oil. Key Site 33 has two known previous oil well sites; one dry and one abandoned. Shell-Standard Blackenberg Well #01 was installed in the late 1960s or early 1970s approximately 300 feet east of the proposed site. The well is listed as a "completed and water-flooded well: that was plugged and abandoned. Well #42-1 was drilled in 1974 and listed as a "plugged and abandoned dry hole." Although the likelihood of soil or groundwater contamination is low for property abandoned wells, sumps adjacent to wells invariably result in near surface soil contamination.

Impact Discussion:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR analyzed hazards posed by risk of upset during handling of hazardous materials and the site's potential for presence of former oil production operations. The OCP EIR identified a potentially significant impact (OCP EIR Impact OIL-1), which might expose future building occupants to hazardous substances due to known prior oil activities on within Key Site 33. Therefore, an Oil Activity Overlay was placed on Key Site 33 (OCP EIR Mitigation-OIL-1), and the mitigation was modified in the Addendum to specify in the event that any unexpected wells, sumps, piping, or dump areas were encountered during normal grading operations, all grading operations should cease until the Division of

Oil and Gas had been notified and appropriate actions had been taken (Addendum Mitigation-HAZMAT-1).

a., f.) An Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I) was conducted for the Hope Community Church project by GSI Soils, Inc., dated July 26, 2005. The Phase I revealed no past evidence of hazardous materials use, storage, or spillage on the proposed site. No areas of soil discoloration or releases of chemicals were observed on site, and no agency records of hazardous substance releases were found. No further investigation was recommended. Due to the potential for sumps adjacent to oil wells to result in near surface soil contamination, the proposed Famcon project has potential to cause **significant but mitigable impacts** (Impact HAZMAT-1). Therefore, potential impacts will be mitigated with MM-HAZMAT-1 Hazmat Discovery.

b.-e., g.-h.) 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.

Cumulative Impacts:

Since the proposed project would not result in any hazardous material/risk of upset impacts it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on hazardous materials/risk of upset within the County.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The following mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's aesthetic impacts to an insignificant level:

MM-HAZMAT-1 Haz Mat Discovery: Haz Mat Discovery. In the event that visual contamination or chemical odors are detected while implementing the approved work on the project site all work shall cease immediately. The property owner or appointed agent shall Contact the County Fire Department's Hazardous Materials Unit (HMU); the resumption of work requires the approval of the HMU.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: This requirement shall be noted on all grading and building plans.

MONITORING: P&D compliance monitoring staff shall perform periodic inspections.

4.10 LAND USE

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous 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	

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
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 proposed project site is located within an area designated as Key Site 33 in the Orcutt Community Plan, in an area outside the boundary which divides Urban Lands from Rural Lands (the site is within the Rural Lands designation). The site is zoned Highway Commercial (CH) and designated as Highway Commercial in the Comprehensive Plan. Allowed uses within the CH Zoning District include development such as motels, convenience stores, gas stations, and restaurants.

The site is bounded by vacant property on the north and east, a driveway and the Elks Event Center on the south, and an existing pet grooming business, Morningside Drive and Highway 101 on the west. As discussed in Section 3.0 Environmental Setting, the Santa Maria Joint Union High School Mark Richardson Career Technical Education Center and Agricultural Farm (CTECAP) is located on a parcel to the east, with access from an easement along Founders Avenue (driveway located immediately north of the site). Generally, onsite resources are characterized by a relatively flat and vacant lot with sandy soils and thinly-scattered grassland vegetation.

As discussed in Section 3.0 Environmental Setting and Section 4.5 Cultural Resources, the vacant site contains no structures. Historically, the site contained agricultural operations such as a Christmas tree farm and may have been utilized for livestock grazing, but it has not been under any agricultural production for at least 20 years. As discussed in Section 4.5 Cultural Resources, the site briefly contained historic structures which had been relocated from other locations in Santa Maria. The previous property owner had proposed a historic park but the structures were removed after they fell into disrepair and the owner's hopes of establishing a historical park did not come to fruition.

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, a 30,000 sf church (Hope Community) was approved under a Development Plan (Case No. 06DVP-00000-00012) and Conditional Use Permit (Case No. 06CUP-00000-00012), but the project proponent allowed the permits to expire and the church development was not built.

Environmental Threshold:

The Thresholds and Guidelines Manual contains no specific thresholds for land use. Generally, a potentially significant impact can occur if a proposed 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:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR did not analyze impacts to Land Use because no significant impacts were identified during initial evaluation of the proposed project and project site. Therefore, none of the OCP EIR mitigations were applied to the church project.

a.-b.) The proposed urban land use designation change from Highway Commercial to General Commercial, modification of Comprehensive Plan text, adjustment of the Urban/Rural Lands Boundary, rezone from Highway Commercial (CH) to General Commercial (C-3), and construction of the pipe supply and outdoor storage site would cause **insignificant** impacts related to land use compatibility and applicable land use policy. As discussed in Section 1.0 Request/Proposed Project Description, and pursuant to LUDC Section 35.24.030, a Development Plan is required for site development that exceeds the 20,000 sf threshold in the General Commercial C-3 Zone District. The site is located within the Commercial Highway (CH) Zone District and Keysite 33 (designated in the Orcutt Community Plan) and the Applicant proposes to store large utility pipe materials outside without enclosing them in a structure. This use is not allowed in the Highway Commercial Zone District, but it is allowed in the General Commercial C-3 Zone District. Highway Commercial is primarily intended for uses that serve the highway traveler and Key Site 33 was specifically designated as such to serve the adjacent Elks Rodeo Events Center, as well as general highway traffic.

This proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan require a General Plan Amendment (Comprehensive Plan Amendment). Pursuant to LUDC Section 35.104.030, the applicant requested that the County Planning Commission determine whether the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendments (rezone) should be initiated. The County Planning Commission reviewed the proposed project at a hearing on April 12, 2023 and voted to accept the General Plan Amendment and rezone applications for processing, and therefore Amendments were initiated. Pursuant to LUDC Section 35.80.020, the Comprehensive Plan Amendment must return to a Planning Commission hearing for the Commission's recommendation the Board of Supervisors. During deliberations of the initiation hearing, Commissioners commented that in the years since the Orcutt Community Plan was adopted, there has been no demand to develop the site with Highway Commercial uses because the anticipated traffic associated with the Elks Rodeo never materialized. Commissioners also commented that several other sites in the County had been rezoned from Highway Commercial to other designations; indicating that the CH Zone District may have been outdated due to low demand for the uses allowed in the District. The Planning Commission recommended the applicant gather the support of surrounding landowners (within the CH Zone District) in their effort to pursue a General Plan Amendment and Rezone. The applicant provided correspondence indicating that two out of three surrounding landowners supported the effort.

As discussed above, the proposed change in land use and zoning will change the designation from Highway Commercial to General Commercial. Since commercial uses are allowed in both designations, there will

not be a drastic change in the compatibility of uses. The proposed use will not result in incompatibility with either the existing uses or the uses allowed in the existing land use and zoning designations.

Therefore, the Applicant proposes to change the Land Use and Zoning District designations of the site, adjust the Urban/Rural Lands boundary, and update the associated Land Use and Zoning maps and language for Key Site 33 in the Orcutt Community Plan.

c.-j.) The proposed project is not growth inducing, and does not result in the loss of affordable housing, loss of open space, or a significant displacement of people. The proposed project does not involve the extension of a sewer trunk line, cause the division of an existing community, or conflict with any airport safety zones. As mentioned in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, water and sewer utilities are available immediately adjacent to the site. In addition, the applicant has obtained preliminary can and will serve letters from Golden State Water Company and Laguna County Sanitation District (Attachment 9).

Cumulative Impacts:

The implementation of the proposed 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. Land use incompatibility and conflict with land use policy will be insignificant, because the project includes a Rezone and General Plan Amendment to ensure conformance with land use regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a cumulatively considerable effect on land use.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be insignificant.

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be insignificant.

4.11 NOISE

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial 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. Proposed project-generated substantial increase in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas (either day or night)?				X	

Existing Setting: The OCP EIR analyzed the existing conditions of the OCP area based in part from the Technical Noise Analysis for Orcutt Community Plan, prepared by Impact Sciences, Inc. Based on that analysis, the western edge of the property is exposed to noise levels in excess of 65 dB from traffic on Highway 101. Most of the site is exposed to noise levels between 60-65 dB.

County Environmental 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.

Impact Discussion:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR did not analyze impacts associated with Noise because no significant impacts were identified during initial evaluation of the proposed project and project site. Therefore, none of the OCP EIR mitigations were applied to the church project.

a.- c.) The proposed project consists of construction and operation of a new pipe supply and outdoor storage site. The project would not result in: 1) the generation of any noise exceeding County thresholds; 2) substantially increase ambient noise levels in adjoining areas; or 3) exposure of noise sensitive uses on the proposed project site to off-site noise levels exceeding County thresholds. No noise-related impacts would result.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

4.12 PUBLIC FACILITIES

Will the proposal require or result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial 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 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		

Existing Setting:

Police protection is provided by the County Sheriff. The site is within the Orcutt Union and Santa Maria Joint Union High School Districts. Solid waste collection services are offered by Waste Management and

disposal is handled at the Santa Maria Regional Landfill. Sewer services are provided by the Laguna County Sanitation District.

County Environmental Thresholds:

Solid Waste. The County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual states that a proposed project would cause significant impacts to landfill capacity if it generates 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 proposed 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.

Impact Discussion:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR analyzed impacts to Public Facilities, but no site-specific impacts were identified during initial evaluation of the proposed project and project site. Therefore, none of the OCP EIR mitigations were applied to the church project.

d.) The proposed project would have no impact on wastewater treatment facilities. The proposed project will not cause the need for new or altered sewer system facilities as it is already in the Laguna County Sanitation District service area, and the District has adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. The applicant has obtained a preliminary can and will serve letter from the Laguna County Sanitation District (Attachment 9).

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No impacts are identified for item d. No mitigation is necessary.

Impact Discussion:

a.-b.) The proposed project would result in the construction of a new 11,000 sf warehouse structure with 40,000 sf outdoor storage area and associated commercial use within the area. This level of new development would not have a significant impact on existing police protection, health care services, or school capacities. Existing service levels would be sufficient to serve the proposed project.

c.) The proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of County thresholds. The general guidelines in the County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual indicate that construction of a new commercial development would generate approximately 25 pounds per square foot (sf) of structure, and operation would generate 0.0016 tons of solid waste per square foot. The proposed construction of the 11,000 sf structure would generate an estimated 275,000 pounds of solid waste (or 138 tons; one ton being equivalent to 2,000 pounds), which would not exceed the thresholds of 350 tons. The propose operation of the 11,000 sf structure would generate an estimated 18 tons of solid waste, which would not exceed the threshold of 196 tons. Therefore, the proposed project's construction and operation would have less than significant impacts to recycling facilities and existing landfill capacity.

e.) The proposed project is located within the Ineffective Watershed Area (IFA), as shown on Plate 2 of the Flood Insurance Study of the City of Santa Maria, dated December 1976⁵. The IFA designation is due to

⁵ Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Standard Conditions of Project Plan Approval, dated January 2011, accessed on March 14, 2025 <https://content.civicplus.com/api/assets/1076b7b8-f860-4131-a24e-f93a66f4fb0e>

the enormous volume of sumps located in the area. The IFA is considered to contribute no surface runoff to the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed project will be required to maintain pre-development runoff levels (currently 0 cubic feet per second). The proposed project will incorporate an underground detention basin to maintain pre-development runoff levels. The applicant provided a Drainage Study and Storm Water Control Plan to address post construction stormwater and runoff (Attachment 5). There are no sensitive biological or cultural resources on the site and construction of the basin would not result in significant impacts to any environmental resources.

Cumulative Impacts:

The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a proposed project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the proposed project level. In this instance, the proposed project has been found not to exceed the cumulative thresholds of significance for public services, including the cumulative solid waste threshold of 40 tons per operational year. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to the regionally significant demand for public services is not considerable, and is insignificant. However, the property was annexed into the Orcutt Community Facilities District No. 2002-1 in 2008; and the applicant will be required to pay special taxes to finance a broad range of facilities which have a special benefit such as streets, water, sewer, and drainage facilities as well as facilities with a general benefit such as parks, schools, libraries, childcare facilities, jails and administration facilities located within designated Orcutt Community Plan.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

4.13 RECREATION

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial 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:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR analyzed impacts to Recreation, but no site-specific impacts were identified during initial evaluation of the proposed project and project site. Therefore, none of the OCP EIR mitigations were applied to the church project.

a.-b.) The proposed project site is not located on or near any established recreational uses, including biking, equestrian or hiking trails. No adverse impacts would result.

c.) The proposed project would not result in any population increase and would have no adverse impacts on the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities, either in the proposed project vicinity or County-wide.

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

Cumulative Impacts:

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

4.14 TRANSPORTATION

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous 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 site is located within the northwestern portion of the Orcutt Planning Area and is generally bounded by Founders Avenue and vacant property on the north, Morningside Drive and Highway 101 on the west, driveways to the Elks' Event Center and neighboring farming operations on the south, and vacant property and CTECAF technical school on the east. The site has approximately 413 linear feet of road frontage along Founders Avenue to the north, and approximately 433 linear feet of frontage along Morningside Drive (approximately 157' on the northern portion and 276' on the southern portion – with the intervening frontage occupied by the adjacent pet grooming business property that is partially encompassed by the western boundary of the site). Key roadways in the area include Santa Maria Way and Morningside Drive, and key intersections include Santa Maria Way at the Highway 101 north and southbound ramps and Morningside Drive. The proposed project site is served by a network of highways, arterial roadways, and collector streets. Santa Maria Way extends as a four-lane arterial roadway from Route 135 on the north to the full-access interchange at Highway 101 on the south. The interchange is currently controlled by stop signs. Morningside Drive is a two-lane local frontage road that extends from north of Santa Maria Way to its terminus adjacent to the Union Valley Parkway. Morningside Drive would provide access to the proposed project site via a new driveway on the northern property boundary along Founders Avenue. Founders Avenue is a two-lane local roadway that extends east from Morningside Drive to its terminus at the CTECAF technical school. Founders Avenue was constructed in 2021 to provide access to the new CTECAF. A Traffic, Circulation and VMT Study for the proposed project was prepared by Associated Traffic Engineers on August 9, 2023 (Attachment 10). The study indicated that all roadway segments currently carry volumes within the Acceptable Capacity ratings outlined in the Orcutt Community Plan. The study also indicated that the study-area intersections currently operate in the LOS A-C range, which is also within acceptable ratings outlined in the Orcutt Community Plan.

County Environmental Thresholds:

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

- a.) **Potential Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy.** The Santa Barbara County Association of Government's (SBCAG's) 2040 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities

Strategy (SBCAG, 2013) and the County's Comprehensive Plan, zoning ordinances, capital improvement programs, and other planning documents contain transportation and circulation programs, plans, ordinances, and policies. Threshold question "a" considers a proposed project in relation to those programs, plans, ordinances, and policies that specifically address multimodal transportation, complete streets, transportation demand management (TDM), and other VMT-related topics. The County and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(a) no longer consider automobile delay or congestion an environmental impact. Therefore, threshold question "a" does not apply to provisions that address LOS or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion. A transportation impact occurs if a proposed 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.

The County uses the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments' (SBCAG) Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) to estimate VMT. The RTDM (TransCAD Version 6.0) is a four-step travel demand model that performs the following classical modeling steps:

Each trip forecasted in the RTDM has a purpose, type, origin, and destination. The RTDM estimates and forecasts travel by traffic analysis zones (TAZ) for a 24-hour period 1 on a typical weekday. Approximately 360 TAZs have significant portions within the unincorporated areas of the county.

The SBCAG RTDM requires a geographic boundary to define the extent of data to select and analyze. The County's VMT metrics, described in the subsection below, use the unincorporated areas of the county (entire Santa Barbara County, excluding incorporated cities) as the geographic boundary for estimating VMT. This chapter refers to VMT for the unincorporated areas as "county VMT." County VMT reflects all vehicle-trips that start and/or end in the unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County. SBCAG periodically updates the RTDM's data and functions, such as when it prepares a new regional transportation plan/sustainable community strategy (RTP/SCS). The County uses the most up-to-date version of the RTDM to estimate VMT and evaluate transportation impacts.

The County's VMT thresholds (Section E in the Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual) lists screening criteria to help identify projects that would result in less than significant VMT impacts without conducting detailed VMT analyses and studies. Table 2 indicates that a single component project (e.g. a pipe supply warehouse) might only be required to meet one screening criteria if it generates 110 or fewer average daily trips and can be categorized as a small project.

c. Design Features and Hazards. Threshold "c" considers whether a proposed project would increase roadway hazards. An increase could result from existing or proposed uses or geometric design features. In part, the analysis should review these and other relevant factors and identify results that conflict with the County's Engineering Design Standards or other applicable roadway standards. For example, the analysis may consider the following criteria:

Proposed project requires a driveway that would not meet site distance requirements, including vehicle queueing and visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists.

- Proposed project adds a new traffic signal or results in a major revision to an existing intersection that would not meet the County's Engineering Design Standards.
- Proposed project adds substantial traffic to a roadway with poor design features (e.g., narrow width, roadside ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure).

- Proposed project introduces a new use and substantial traffic that would create potential safety problems on an existing road network (e.g., rural roads with use by farm equipment, livestock, horseback riding, or residential roads with heavy pedestrian or recreational use).

If a proposed project would result in potential roadway hazards, the applicant would need to modify the proposed project or identify mitigation measures that would eliminate or reduce the potential hazards.

d.) Emergency Access. Threshold “d” considers any changes to emergency access resulting from a proposed project. To identify potential impacts, the analysis must review any proposed roadway design changes and determine if they would potentially impede emergency access vehicles. A proposed project that would result in inadequate emergency vehicle access would have a significant transportation impact and, as a result, would require proposed project modifications or mitigation measures. For example, a proposed project that modifies a street and, as a result, impairs fire truck access, would require modifications or redesign to comply with County and fire department road development standards.

Impact Discussion:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR analyzed impacts to Traffic, but no site-specific impacts were identified during initial evaluation of the proposed project and project site. Therefore, none of the OCP EIR mitigations were applied to the church project.

a.) The proposed project would not preclude implementation of or interfere with SBCAG’s major proposed projects shown in Figure 1-3 of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SBCAG 2021). Policy CIRC-O-3 of the Orcutt Community Plan states:

The County shall maintain a minimum Level of Service C or better on roadways and intersections within the Orcutt Planning Area, except that Minimum LOS shall be “D” for the following roadway segments and intersections:

- *Foster Road and Highway 135 intersection*
- *Lakeview Road and Skyway Drive intersection*
- *Stillwell Road and Lakeview Road intersection*
- *All Clark Avenue roadway segments and intersections between Blosser Road on the west and Foxenwood Lane on the east.*

The ATE Traffic, Circulation and VMT Study for the proposed project indicated that the roadway and intersection operations after implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with SBCAG’s Sustainable Community Strategies and CIRC-O-3.

There are no transit, bicycle, or pedestrian networks adjacent to the proposed project site. The proposed project would not conflict with or cause a significant impact to a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system.

b.) The trip generation estimates from the ATE Traffic, Circulation and VMT Study for the proposed project indicated that there would be a total of 84 ADT, including 56 ADT generated by employees and customers and 28 ADT generated by delivery trucks. This level of traffic generation would not exceed the County’s “Project Size” screening criteria of 110 ADT. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact to VMT, based on the County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual VMT screening criteria for Land Use projects.

c.) The proposed project would not increase road hazards. The proposed driveway design does not meet the County Department of Public Works Transportation Division Engineering Design Standards with regard to location and combined width of driveways (commercial). Therefore, the applicant applied for a design exception to allow placement of the egress driveway at 16 feet from property line rather than the required 75 feet; and to allow a width of 25 feet for each driveway – exceeding the maximum combined width of 40 feet. The Public Works Traffic Section, Transportation Permits, and Roads Coordination Committee reviewed and approved the design exception request because the road is low volume and sight distance for the conditions is adequate (Attachment 11).

d.) The proposed project would not result in any temporary or permanent road closures or otherwise cause a substantial interference in roadways. The existing road network provides adequate access to the proposed project site. The proposed project would not result in the construction of new or altered roads. Proposed operations associated with customer, delivery, and employee vehicles would be accommodated by the proposed driveways and parking area, and impacts to emergency vehicle access would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts:

The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a proposed project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the proposed project level. As discussed in the ATE Traffic, Circulation, and VMT Study, the proposed project does not exceed the thresholds of significance for transportation. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to the regionally significant transportation impacts is not considerable, and is insignificant. However, the applicant will be required to pay transportation impact mitigation fees (Development Impact Mitigation Fees/DIMFs) based on the number of PM peak hour trips generated by the proposed project; and the applicant will be required to implement frontage improvements along Morningside Drive and Founders Avenue pursuant to County Ordinance standards. The frontage improvement requirements will be determined by County staff as part of the proposed project approval process.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be insignificant.

4.15 WATER RESOURCES/FLOODING

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial 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.1) or alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, or thermal water pollution?				X	

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
e. Alterations to the course or flow of flood water or need for private or public flood control proposed projects?				X	
f. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding (placement of proposed 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 vacant project site is not located in a flood hazard area as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA 2024). As discussed in Section 3.0 Environmental Setting, the nearest blue line stream is an unnamed intermittent stream located approximately one mile directly east of the site. Storm water runoff from the site generally flows west towards Morningside Drive and Highway 101. The project site overlies the Santa Maria River Valley Groundwater Basin (SMRVGB). The California Department of Water Resources has defined the SMRVGB as very low-priority; or not mandatorily subject to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. The SMRVGB is not an overdrafted basin. Water supply sources for water users in the SMRVGB within Santa Barbara County include groundwater and imports from the California State Water Project.

Water Resources Thresholds

A proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed project's impacts on water resources are considered significant. A proposed 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 proposed project:

- Is located within an urbanized area of the county and the proposed 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 proposed 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 uses⁶ 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:

As discussed in Section 3.2 Environmental Baseline, the previously-proposed Hope Community Church project Addendum to the OCP EIR analyzed impacts to Water Resources. Although the current checklist for Water Resources requires analyses of multiple issues like impacts to surface waters and pollution of storm water, the OCP EIR analysis of Water Resources was limited to impacts of proposed projects upon availability of water supply and proposed water demand. The Addendum identified several changes in project impacts (specifically with regard to water demand) that had occurred subsequent to the OCP EIR impact analysis. The OCP EIR was drafted at a time when significant over drafting of the Santa Maria River Valley Groundwater Basin was suspected. Thus, OCP policies directed that new development in Orcutt may not be served by additional drafts from groundwater. Therefore, proponents of new development would need to secure supplemental water from a source outside the Santa Maria Water Basin (such as the State Water Project via the City of Santa Maria). The Addendum incorporated general mitigation measures from the OCP EIR (Mitigations WAT-1 through WAT-4) and modified a site-specific mitigation measure (for Impact KS33-WAT-1) to reflect updated language and the project-specific details for the Church project impact upon Water Resources. These impacts and measures have been incorporated into the analysis of the Famcon project.

a., c.-f., h.-j., l.) The proposed project would not result in impacts on the course or direction of water movements or flood water in marine or fresh waters, the amount of surface water in any water body, surface water quality, discharge into surface waters, alterations to the course or flow of flood water, exposure of people or property to water related hazards, change in quantity of groundwater, overdraft of the Santa Maria

⁶ 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.

River Valley groundwater basin, degradation of groundwater quality, or introduction of storm water pollutants.

The proposed project could adversely affect surface water quality by increasing the volume and decreasing the quality of stormwater runoff. Runoff from driveways and/or parking lots could introduce oil and other hydrocarbons into drainage facilities. However, the proposed project would be expected to generate only minor amounts of storm water pollutants. Minor amounts of such hazardous material would not present a significant potential for release of waterborne pollutants and would be highly unlikely to create a public health hazard because a hydrodynamic separator will treat runoff prior to entering the proposed underground detention chamber system. Per the Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan prepared by Bethel Engineering, dated October 2023 (Attachment 5), the proposed stormwater treatment system and other stormwater pollution control measures in the proposed project have been designed in accordance with the current edition of the Santa Barbara County Project Clean Water's Stormwater Technical Guide.

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

Impact Discussion

b., g., k.) The proposed project would create minor amounts of additional storm water runoff as a result of newly constructed impermeable surfaces (i.e. structures, driveways, etc.) Construction activities such as grading could also potentially create temporary runoff and erosion problems. Application of standard County grading, erosion, and drainage-control measures would ensure that no significant increase of erosion or storm water runoff would occur. The applicant provided a Storm Water Control Plan and Preliminary Drainage Study (Attachments 5 and 6). The applicant will construct an underground stormwater detention basin to capture runoff and prevent runoff from leaving the site via surface flows. Detained runoff will slowly infiltrate into groundwater from the underground basin. County Public Works Flood Control reviewed the proposed Storm Water Control Plan and Preliminary Drainage Study and found them to meet Flood Control requirements (Attachment 8). The proposed new connection to Golden State Water Company's existing main line in Founders will require the applicant to obtain a final "can and will serve letter". Therefore, the project will not result in a substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies.

Cumulative Impacts:

The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a proposed project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, the cumulative impact to water resources identified in the OCP EIR remains significant and unavoidable. This impact was overridden by the Board of Supervisors upon adoption of the OCP. No new impacts associated with the proposed development would occur and no new mitigation measures would be required. Select OCP EIR mitigation measures have been applied to the project, consistent with OCP EIR and development standards.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The following mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's water resource impacts to an insignificant level:

MM-WATSERV-1 Can and Will Serve: The Owner/Applicant shall provide a can and will serve letter from the Golden State Water Company, indicating that adequate water is available to serve the project.

TIMING: Can and will serve letters shall be submitted to P&D prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance.

MM-WATCONS-1 Water Conservation-Outdoor: To improve water conservation, the Owner/Applicant shall include the following in Landscape and Irrigation Plans to be approved by P&D:

a. Landscaping that reduces water use:

- i. Landscape with native and/or drought-tolerant species.
- ii. Group plant material by water needs.
- iii. Turf shall constitute less than 20% of the total landscaped area.
- iv. No turf shall be allowed on slopes of over 4%.
- v. Extensive mulching (2" minimum) shall be used in all landscaped areas to reduce evaporation.
- b. Irrigation that reduces water use:
- c. Install drip irrigation or other water-conserving irrigation.
 - i. Install soil moisture sensing devices to prevent unnecessary irrigation.
 - ii. Plumb each lot for a grey water system. Each dwelling shall contain a grey water system plumbed to front and rear yard irrigation systems.
 - iii. Install separate landscape meters (plumbing permit required).
 - iv. Use reclaimed water for all irrigation; and/or
 - v. The Owner/Applicant shall contract with an agency that sells reclaimed water to provide water for all exterior landscaping
- d. Hardscape to retain water:
 - i. Permeable surfaces such as decomposed granite, porous pavement or unit pavers on sand or intermittent permeable surfaces such as French drains shall be used for all parking areas, pathways, sidewalks, driveways.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The Owner/Applicant shall submit a Final landscape and irrigation plan to P&D for review and approval prior to Issuance of Zoning Clearance.

TIMING: The Owner/Applicant shall implement all aspects of the landscape and irrigation plan in accordance with the Landscape and Performance Security Conditions.

MONITORING: The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to P&D compliance monitoring staff that all required conserving landscape and irrigation features are installed prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance and landscape and irrigation are maintained per approved landscape plans. Any part of irrigation plan requiring a plumbing permit shall be inspected by building inspectors.

WATCONS-02 Water Conservation-Indoor: Indoor water use shall be limited through the use of the following measures:

- a. Re-circulating, point-of-use, or on-demand water heaters shall be installed.
- b. Water efficient clothes washers and dishwaters shall be installed.
- c. Self-regenerating water softening shall be prohibited in all structures.
- d. Lavatories and drinking fountains shall be equipped with self-closing valves.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The Owner/Applicant shall include all indoor water conservation measures on plans, including plumbing and electrical plans, as needed subject to P&D review and approval.

TIMING: Indoor water-conserving measures shall be implemented prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance.

MONITORING: The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all required indoor water conservation measures to P&D compliance monitoring staff prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance.

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be insignificant.

5.0 INFORMATION SOURCES

5.1 County Departments Consulted

Fire, Public Works, Flood Control, Parks, Environmental Health, Special Districts,
Regional Programs, Other : _____

5.2 Comprehensive Plan

Seismic Safety/Safety Element

Conservation Element

<input type="checkbox"/>	Open Space Element	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise Element
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coastal Plan and Maps	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Circulation Element
<input type="checkbox"/>	ERME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Land Use Element
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Orcutt Community Plan		

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other technical references (reports, survey, etc.)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Traffic studies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning files, maps, reports
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning maps
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Grading plans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Soils maps/reports
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Elevation, architectural renderings		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Published geological map/reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Plant maps
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Topographical maps	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Archaeological maps and reports
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Caltrans		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District		

- Santa Barbara County. 2021. Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. Amended August 24. <https://cosantabarbara.app.box.com/s/vtxutffe2n52jme97lgm66os7pp3lm5> (accessed December 2024).
- County of Santa Barbara Public Works Department Flood Control District FEMA Revised Mapping of the Special Flood Hazard Areas, [FEMA Revised Mapping of the Special Flood Hazard Area | Santa Barbara County, CA - Official Website](#), accessed on March 19, 2025.
- County of Santa Barbara Public Works Department Water Resources Division, Water Agency, Santa Barbara County 2024 Groundwater Basins Summary Report, <https://content.civicplus.com/api/assets/29ac08e3-0b04-47d1-ae56-8113fdf3b851>, dated October 2024.

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: **Aesthetics, Air Quality, Fire Protection, Geologic Processes, Transportation, and Water 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		
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. The proposed project would not include components which would impact wildlife habitats or cause wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable goals and policies of the County's Energy and Climate Action Plan. The proposed project would not contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emission or significantly increase energy consumption. The proposed project would not alter any identified historical resources.

2. There are no short-term environmental goals that would be achieved by the proposed project to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

3. As discussed within each environmental issue area identified in this document, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

4. Impacts to human beings are typically associated with air quality, hazardous materials, and noise impacts. These impacts are addressed in Sections 4.3a and 4.3b Air Quality, Section 4.9 Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset, and Section 4.11 Noise. As discussed in these sections, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects to human beings

due to the release of pollutants which would violate ambient air quality standards, creation of public safety hazards due to exposure to hazardous materials and exposure of people to noise levels exceeding County thresholds. Mitigation Measures MM-AIR-01 and MM-AIR-02 will reduce the potential for the proposed project to result in short- and long-term exposure of people to dust from construction and operational emissions.

5. The proposed project would be consistent with the County's Land Use and Development Code which permits the proposed use with a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Development Plan. There is no disagreement among County planners or other related experts over the significance of the effects analyzed in this document which would warrant investigation in an EIR.

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

Zoning

With an approved rezone, the proposed project is consistent with the requirements of the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code. The C3 rezoning of the site allows for the proposed use and outdoor storage of materials with a Development Plan in accordance with Santa Barbara County Land Use Development Code Section 35.24.020.(C).

Comprehensive Plan

With an approved General Plan Amendment, the proposed project will be subject to all applicable requirements and policies in accordance with the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code and the County's Comprehensive Plan, including applicable policies from the Orcutt Community Plan. This analysis will be provided in the forthcoming Staff Report. Comprehensive Plan and Orcutt Community Plan policies that pertain to the proposed project include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Comprehensive Plan
 - a. Land Use Development Policy #3: No urban development shall be permitted beyond boundaries of land designated for urban uses except in neighborhoods in rural areas.
 - b. Land Use Development 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.
 - c. Land Use Development Policy #5: 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.
 - d. Land Use Development Policy #8: Proposed development of parcels, including changes of zone, subdivisions, and lot splits, which are divided by a Comprehensive Plan boundary line, i.e. Urban, Inner-Rural, Rural, or Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood, may be

found consistent with the Comprehensive Plan provided that the resulting density on one side of the boundary line complies with the designated density, notwithstanding that the resulting density on the remainder portion of the parcel, which shall not be further divided, exceeds the designated density.

2. Orcutt Community Plan

- a. Policy LU-O-6: The Orcutt Urban/Rural Boundary shall separate principally urban land uses and those which are rural and/or agricultural in nature. This boundary shall represent the maximum extent of the Orcutt urban area and the Urban/Rural Boundary shall not be extended until existing inventories of vacant land within the urban area are nearing buildout. Boundary adjustments shall be approved only as part of a Major Community Plan update.
- b. Action LUC-O-1.1: Planning and Development shall coordinate with property owners and developers to encourage buildout of Commercial and Industrial designated parcels.
- c. Policy LUC-O-5: All commercial and industrial projects shall minimize impacts to adjoining residences, businesses and open space areas.
- d. DevStd LUC-O-5.1: Rooftop mechanical structures shall be minimized. Where they cannot be avoided (e.g. vents, air conditioning, etc.), they shall be shielded from view from surrounding roadways and residences through architectural design, camouflage housing, or other appropriate methods.
- e. Policy FIRE-O-2: Fire hazards in Orcutt shall be minimized in order to reduce the cost of/need for increased fire protection services and to protect the natural resources in undeveloped open space areas.
- f. DevStd FIRE-O-2.1: Development within or adjacent to high fire hazard areas should include the use of fire prevention measures such as perimeter roads, trails, Class A or B roofs, adequate access to the urban/rural interface and inclusion of structural setbacks per DevStd BIO-1.7 Fencing within the structural setback shall be comprised of fire-resistant material to minimize fire hazards.
- g. DevStd FIRE-2.2: The County shall require two routes of ingress and egress for development unless waived by the Fire Department.
- h. DevStd RR-O-1.3: All multi-family residential areas and commercial/industrial projects shall establish a recyclable material pickup area (i.e. recycling bins, loading dock) where collection of currently accepted recyclable materials could be accommodated.
- i. DevStd RR-O-1.4: Developers shall provide recycling bins at all construction sites, where collection of currently accepted construction materials could be accommodated.
- j. Action RR-O-1.5: The County shall encourage developers to use recycled building materials such as composites, metals, and plastics, to the greatest extent feasible.
- k. Policy WW-O-2: Prior to discretionary approval of new development, the County shall make a finding that there will be adequate capacity and availability for LCSD to serve the new development.
- l. DevStd WW-O-2.3: A "Can and Will Serve Letter" from LCSD will be found adequate for recording of maps or issuance of land use permits (including permits for development of preexisting lots) if the letter demonstrates: LCSD's effluent, including the effluent from the proposed project, will not exceed the discharge standards established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board; Adequate disposal capabilities exist at the plant or through agreement with the City of Santa Maria (providing that treatment and disposal by the City does not further degrade the underlying groundwater quality) to serve the project(s); and existing or planned and funded transmission lines have available capacity to serve the project.
- m. DevStd WW-O-2.4: Prior to final inspection, adequate collection, transmission, treatment and disposal facilities to serve the development must be operational.

- n. DevStd WW-O-3.1: All new commercial and industrial development which will contribute grease, oils, and/or chemicals to wastewater flows shall be fitted with onsite filtration consisting of charcoal filters or other methods approved by the LCSD to reduce site-specific discharge of these substances.
- o. Policy CIRC-O-3: The County shall maintain a minimum Level of Service (LOS) C or better on roadways and intersections within the Orcutt Planning Area, except that Minimum LOS shall be "D" for the following roadway segments and intersections:
 - i. Foster Road and Highway 135 intersections
 - ii. Lakeview Road and Skyway Drive intersection
 - iii. Stillwell Road and Lakeview Road intersection
 - iv. All the Clark Avenue roadway segments and intersections between Blosser Road on the west and Foxenwood Lane on the east.
- p. Policy CIRC-O-4: A determination of project consistency with the standards and policies of the Orcutt Community Plan Circulation Section shall constitute a determination of consistency with LUDP#4 with regard to roadway and intersection capacity.
- q. Policy WAT-O-2: In order to be found consistent with the Land Use Development Policy No. 4 (LUPD#4), the water demand of new discretionary development must be offset by long-term supplemental water supplies that do not result in further overdraft of the local groundwater basin and that are adequate to meet the project's net water demand as determined by the County considering appropriate reliability factors as determined by County Water Agency. To demonstrate an adequate long-term supplemental water supply, projects must comply with the following development standards:
- r. DevStd WAT-O-2.1: Prior to discretionary action by any County decision-maker on new development, the applicant shall provide one of the following:
 - i. A "Can and Will Serve" letter from California Cities Water Company dated before July 1997;
 - ii. An "Intent to Serve" letter from California Cities Water Company or other water purveyor(s) including draft contract(s), if any, demonstrating to the County's satisfaction that the development's net water demand will be offset by a long-term supplemental water supply and that the development will have a continuing right to obtain water equal to that of the water purveyor's other customers. Contract(s), if any, must include terms consistent with the requirements of DevStd WAT-O-2.2.
- s. DevStd WAT-O-2.2: Prior to discretionary action on new development, the applicant must demonstrate adequacy of the water supply proposed to serve the project, unless the applicant has satisfied DevStd WAT-O-2.1 #1 above. This demonstration shall be based on the following information, which must be provided prior to application completeness:
 - i. Resources
 - 1. Provide information on project's projected gross and net demand for water. The supplemental water supply must offset the project's net water demand.
 - 2. Documentation of the reliability of the proposed water supply as projected by the Department of Water Resources (for State Water) and confirmed by the County Water Agency.
 - 3. A description of how the project will be served during drought periods. If conjunctive use of the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin is planned, demonstration that the use of the basin will not contribute to long-term groundwater overdraft considering drought periods. The factual determination of overdraft contribution shall be made by the Planning & Development Department and County Water Agency.

4. Provide a factual demonstration that the water purveyor has available, firm, long-term reliable water supplies which equal or exceed present demand from existing customers, projects approved for new service, and the proposed project under County review. The demonstration should also show that the project use would not contribute to overdraft of the basin. The factual determination of no additional overdraft shall be made by Planning and Development and County Water Agency.
 5. Provide draft contract(s) with water purveyor(s), which demonstrate(s) to the satisfaction of the County that the development will be served by a long-term supplemental water source and will have a continuing right to obtain water equal to that of the water purveyor's other customers.
 6. Provide information on the water purveyor's existing and projected range of potential State Water and/or other supplemental water delivery amounts needed for full buildout under the water purveyor's management plan, status of conservation programs, drought buffers, and groundwater pumpage consistent with applicable state government code requirements on water reporting. Provide information on the most recent annual water deliveries from various sources in the purveyor's service area, as available from existing reports.
- t. Policy WAT-O-2.3: Prior to map recordation or land use clearance, the developer must provide a Can and Will Serve letter and necessary final contract(s) consistent with the conditions of the discretionary permits and terms of the draft contract(s).
 - u. Policy WAT-O-2.4: Development in Orcutt shall incorporate water efficient design and technology.
 - v. Policy WAT-O-2.5: To reduce overall TDS levels in the wastewater in Orcutt, and thereby reduce the level of potential groundwater contamination from disposal of this wastewater, water used to serve new development in Orcutt must have a TDS level of no greater than 425 mg/L. This may either be provided through direct deliveries of 425mg/L or less water to new development or through the delivery of offsetting 425mg/L or less water to the water system serving Orcutt. An exception to this standard is allowed only when the TDS level of State Water delivered to Santa Maria exceeds 425mg/L; in that case, the TDS level of water serving Orcutt may not exceed the TDS level of State Water. However, in "drought years" (as determined by the County Water Agency) water demand may be satisfied by groundwater pumpage in compliance with the adopted groundwater management agreement between the City of Santa Maria and the SMV Water Conservation District.
 - w. Policy AQ-O-2: Significant fugitive dust and PM10 emissions shall be reduced through implementation of appropriate construction restrictions and control measures, consistent with standards adopted by the Board.
 - x. Policy AQ-O-3: The County should promote the use of alternative fuels, solar energy systems, and the use of construction techniques which are designed to conserve energy and minimize pollution in Orcutt, consistent with, but not limited to the provisions of the CA Building Code.
 - y. Policy FLD-O-2: Off-site runoff associated with development should be minimized.
 - z. DevStd FLD-O-2.1: Pervious construction materials, such as turf block, non-grouted brick, and gravel, shall be used where feasible.
 - aa. Policy FLD-O-4: All applications for development within the Orcutt Community Plan area shall comply with applicable County development standards regarding drainage, floodplain management, and stream setbacks.
 - bb. DevStd FLD-O-4.1: The Santa Barbara Flood Control and Water Conservation District shall

- cc. review all site and grading plans that are subject to County Floodplain Management and Stream Setback ordinances and verify conformance to all applicable County development requirements to ensure proposed drainage and water conveyance systems are designed to meet District standards and are directed into a District approved watercourse or drainage facility. Quality Best Management Practices that meet or exceed current County of Santa Barbara Project Clean Water and Drainage Ordinance standards.
- dd. Policy KS33-1: The Ikola parcels (APN 107-150-19 and -18), the Blackenburg parcel (APN 107-150-13), and the Armstrong parcels (APN 107-150-07, -15, -16) are designated Highway Commercial/CH. All other parcels are designated Agriculture II and zoned AG-II-100. Any proposed development on Key Site 33 shall comply with the following development standards.
- ee. DevStd KS33-1: Development and/or a change in agricultural uses on Key Site 33 should not increase storm runoff to basins off-site. If storm runoff cannot be entirely contained onsite, the amount and method of conveying such runoff to other basins shall be reviewed and approved by the County Flood Control District under agreement with the owners of those basins. If runoff is contributed to other basins, the owners of responsible parcels on Site 33 shall pay a proportional share of the maintenance costs of the basin(s) to the owners.
- ff. DevStd KS33-2: Onsite retention basin(s) and adequate downstream conveyance systems as specified by SBCFCD shall be required to reduce flooding impacts from non-agricultural development of the site.
- gg. DevStd KS33-3: Any new non-agricultural development in close proximity to Highway 101 or the frontage road shall include a 50 foot wide landscaped buffer along the western boundary. The buffer shall include sufficient plantings of drought tolerant and/or native trees and shrubs to screen parking areas and "break up" building masses. The landscaping shall incorporate trees reaching a minimum height of 35 feet at maturity.

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 PROPOSED 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: N/A

PROPOSED PROJECT EVALUATOR: Steve Conner

DATE: March 31, 2025

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: Gwen Bugeler

INITIAL STUDY DATE: March 31, 2025

SIGNATURE: Gwen Bugeler

NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE: April 1, 2025

SIGNATURE: _____

REVISION DATE: _____

SIGNATURE: Gwen Bugeler

FINAL NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE: May 6, 2025

11.0 ATTACHMENTS

1. Plan sets
2. Email from Carly Barham/APCD, RE: Project review for Famcon Pipe Supply in Santa Maria, dated December 20, 2024.
3. Completed GHG Checklist.
4. Correspondence with USFWS regarding CTS range, dated November 27, 2024.
5. Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan for Famcon Pipe and Supply, Inc. 1350 Founders Ave Santa Maria, CA, dated October 18, 2023. Bethel Engineering.
6. Flood Control: Drainage Study (Preliminary) for Famcon Pipe and Supply, Inc. 1350 Founders Ave Santa Maria, CA, dated October 18, 2023. Bethel Engineering.
7. Geotechnical Investigation Report Proposed Building 1350 Founders Ave (APN 107-150-022), dated June 12, 2023.
8. Public Works Water Resources Division review letter, dated October 19, 2023.
9. Can and Will Serve Letters: Golden State Water Company, dated February 24, 2025; Laguna County Sanitation District, dated February 21, 2025.
10. Famcon Pipe and Supply Proposed project Traffic, Circulation, and VMT Study, dated August 9, 2023. Associated Transportation Engineers.
11. Encroachment Permit for Design Exception – 0 Frontage Road #5593 (aka Morningside Dr) – Famcon, dated September 4, 2024. Chris Sneddon, County Public Works Director.

Proto Updated May 2023

G:\GROUP\PERMITTING\Case Files\GPA\23 Cases\23GPA-00001 Penza\500 CEQA\01 Draft MND\24NGD-11_031925.docx