

# EXHIBIT C

## CEQA FINDINGS

### PROPOSED COUNTY PROJECT NOS 863011 and 864010 UNION VALLEY PARKWAY EXTENSION/INTERCHANGE PROJECT GP-2008-04, E-2008-053

**A. Findings that with regard to certain project and cumulative effects, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.**

**1. LAND USE**

- a. **Impact LU-1.** Development of the proposed project could potentially create both short- and long-term land use compatibility conflicts with adjacent agricultural, residential, and institutional uses. The Locally Preferred Alignment would result in noise, and air quality impacts, in addition to the removal of mature vegetation, including a stand of eucalyptus trees, which would result in aesthetic impacts. These impacts and the avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures that would reduce land use compatibility conflicts with surrounding uses below a level of significance for the project are fully discussed in Final EIR Sections 2.1.7, *Visual/Aesthetics*, 2.2.4, *Air Quality*, and 2.2.5, *Noise and Vibration*, respectively. A Visual Impact Study prepared in June 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Richard Daulton, a Planning Manager with 12 years of environmental planning experience, identified several mitigation measures that will reduce the visual impacts of the project. In the professional opinion of Mr. Daulton, all of the adverse visual impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of these measures. An Air Quality Study prepared in October 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Richard Daulton, and reviewed by Caltrans Transportation Engineer Wayne Mills, who has 22 years of air quality study experience, identified several mitigation measures that will reduce the construction air quality impacts of the project. In the professional opinion of Mr. Daulton and Mr. Mills, all of the adverse air quality impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of these measures. A Noise Study prepared in October 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Duane Vander Pluym, a Principal Environmental Scientist with 29 years of noise study experience, and reviewed by Caltrans Transportation Engineer Wayne Mills, who has 22 years of noise study experience, identified several mitigation measures that will reduce the construction noise impacts of the project. In the professional opinion of Mr. Vander Pluym and Mr. Mills, all of the adverse construction noise impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of these measures.

- b. **Impact LU-2.** Implementation of the proposed project and interchange could potentially affect oil or gas lines, which could result in exposure to hazards. An Initial Site Assessment prepared in June 2003 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Scott English, a Registered Environmental Assessor with 15 years of hazardous materials assessment experience, and reviewed by Caltrans Transportation Engineer James Tkatch, who has 18 years experience in hazardous waste management, identified mitigation that will reduce the oil and gas line impacts of the project. In the professional opinion of Mr. English and Mr. Tkatch, all of the adverse oil and gas line impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of these measures. Refer to mitigation measure LU-2(b), in Final EIR Section 3.3.2, *Land Use*

## 2. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a. **Project Impact.** Extensive and intensive archaeological surveys were conducted within the boundaries of the archaeological area of potential effect. The archaeological resources investigation was designed to locate previously recorded sites, survey the project vicinity for previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric archaeological sites, and collect archival information from various facilities. None of the research or surveys identified the presence of archaeological resources in the archaeological area of potential effect for the project. No further archaeological work is necessary at this time, unless plans for the build alternatives change to include unsurveyed areas. Although unlikely, if archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work will be discontinued in the area of the find until the material can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is deemed significant, further evaluation, analysis, report preparation, and curation of resources will be required. Mitigation measures CR-1 (a and b) in Final EIR Section 3.3.4 - Cultural Resources address potential cultural resource impacts that could occur as a result of implementation of any of the build alternatives and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Archaeological Survey Reports prepared in April 2000 by Joyce Gerber, a Senior Scientist with 27 years of cultural resources experience and in June 2008 by Applied Earthworks, Inc.'s Barry Price, a Principal Scientist with 32 years of cultural resources experience, and reviewed by Caltrans Associate Environmental Planner Paula Juelke-Carr, who has 25 years of cultural study experience, identified the mitigation measures listed above, which will reduce the archaeological impacts of the project. In the professional opinion of Ms. Gerber, Mr. Price and Ms. Juelke-Carr, all of the adverse archaeological impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of these measures.

### 3. VISUAL/AESTHETICS

- a. **Impact AES-1.** Implementation of the proposed project and interchange would alter public views of the study area through the removal of existing vegetation, and introduction of pavement, light, and glare sources, and other improvements. Soundwalls constructed within the study area would impact visual resources by creating a monolithic effect. This is a significant but mitigable impact. A detailed evaluation of the significant but mitigable aesthetic effects of each of the project is provided in Final EIR Section 2.1.7, *Visual/Aesthetics*. With the implementation of mitigation measures AES-1(a through c) in Final EIR Section 3.3.3, *Aesthetics*, visual effects of the project would be mitigated to a less than significant level and would be consistent with the City of Santa Maria policies pertaining to the protection of visual resources. A visual impact study prepared in June 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Richard Daulton, a Planning Manager with 12 years of environmental planning experience, identified the mitigation measures listed above, which will reduce the visual impacts of the project. In the professional opinion of Mr. Daulton, all of the adverse visual impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of these measures.

### 4. WATER QUALITY AND STORM WATER RUNOFF

- a. **Impact HWQ-1.** Implementation of the proposed project and interchange could reduce the quality of surface water flowing to offsite drainage channels. A detailed evaluation of the significant but mitigable effects of each of the build alternatives related to water quality is provided in Final EIR Section 2.2.1, *Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff*. Mitigation measures HWQ-2 (a through c), in Section 3.3.5, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of the EIR would reduce the level of this impact to a less than significant level. The EIR/EA hydrology and water quality assessment prepared in February 2009 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Planning Manager Richard Daulton, who has 12 years of environmental planning experience, and a Water Quality Study prepared in February 2004 by Caltrans Engineering Geologist Isaac Leyva, who has 20 years of experience in environmental and geotechnical design, identified the mitigation measures listed above, which will reduce the water quality impacts of the project. In the professional opinion of Mr. Daulton and Mr. Leyva, all of the adverse water quality impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of these measures.

### 5. GEOLOGY/SOILS/SEISMIC/TOPOGRAPHY

- a. **Impact GS-1.** There is a potential for liquefaction of soils beneath the proposed project west of State Route 135. A detailed evaluation of the significant but mitigable effects of the Locally Preferred Alignment alternative related to liquefaction hazards is provided in Final EIR Section

2.2.2, *Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography*. Mitigation measure GS-1(a) in Section 3.3.6, *Geology and Soils*, of the Final EIR would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The EIR/EA hydrology and geologic hazards assessment prepared in February 2009 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Planning Manager Richard Daulton, who has 12 years of environmental planning experience identified the above mitigation measures that will reduce the liquefaction impacts of the project. In the professional opinion of Mr. Daulton, all of the adverse liquefaction impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of these measures.

## 6. HAZARDOUS WASTE/MATERIALS

- a. **Impact HM-1.** The Initial Site Assessment for the proposed project identified a sand-tar mixture and tank bottoms within the study area. Improper handling of these materials and/or discovery of unanticipated contamination during construction could expose construction workers to adverse health conditions. A detailed evaluation of the significant but mitigable effects related to hazardous materials is provided in Section 2.2.3, *Hazardous Waste/Materials*. Mitigation measures HM-3(a and b) in Section 3.3.7 *Hazards and Hazardous Materials* on the Final EIR would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. An Initial Site Assessment prepared in June 2003 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Scott English, a Registered Environmental Assessor with 15 years of hazardous materials assessment experience, and reviewed by Caltrans Transportation Engineer James Tkatch, who has 18 years experience in hazardous waste management, identified the above mitigation measures that will reduce the hazardous materials exposure impacts of the project. In the professional opinion of Mr. English and Mr. Tkatch, all of the adverse hazardous materials exposure impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of these measures.

## 7. NOISE AND VIBRATION (CONSTRUCTION)

- a. **Impact N-1.** Development of the proposed project would create temporary short-term noise levels that could affect nearby residences and other sensitive receptors. Mitigation measure N-1(a) in Section 3.3.8, *Noise*, of the Final EIR is recommended to reduce construction noise impacts along the Union Valley Parkway corridor and interchange area to less than significant levels. A Noise Study prepared in October 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Duane Vander Pluym, a Principal Environmental Scientist with 29 years of noise study experience, and reviewed by Caltrans Transportation Engineer Wayne Mills, who has 22 years of noise study experience, identified several mitigation measures that will reduce the construction noise impacts of the project. In the professional opinion of Mr. Vander Pluym and Mr. Mills, all of the adverse construction noise impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of this measure.

## 8. BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

### *Natural Communities*

- a. **Impact BIO-1.** Implementation of the proposed project and interchange would affect special concern natural communities. The Locally Preferred Alignment Alternative would permanently and temporarily affect a total of 1.67 acres of coast live oak woodland, 8.96 acres of eucalyptus woodland, 1.70 acres of wetland, and 11.31 acres of central dune scrub habitat. Mitigation measures BIO-1(a) and BIO-3(a) in Final EIR Section 3.3.10 *Natural Communities/Woodlands* are required to minimize project impacts to natural communities. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts on the project site to a less than significant level. The Natural Environment Study prepared in June 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Susan Christopher, Ph.D, a Senior Biologist with 13 years of biological resources experience, identified the above mitigation measures, which will reduce the impacts of the project on special concern natural communities. In the professional opinion of Ms. Christopher, all of the adverse special concern natural communities impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of these measures.

### *Wetlands and Other Waters*

- a. **Impact BIO-2.** Implementation of the proposed project would result in temporary and permanent losses of wetland habitat in the study area. This habitat would satisfy Corps requirements for jurisdiction as a tributary to Waters of the U.S., and is a wetland habitat under the Cowardin Classification System as recognized by the County of Santa Barbara. A detailed evaluation of the significant but mitigable effects of the project on wetlands and other waters is provided in Final EIR Section 2.3.2, *Wetlands and Other Waters*. Mitigation measure BIO-2(a) in Final EIR Section 3.3.11 *Biological Resources—Wetlands* of the EIR is required to reduce the impact to wetlands to a less than significant level. The Natural Environment Study prepared in June 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Susan Christopher, Ph.D, a Senior Biologist with 13 years of biological resources experience, identified this mitigation measure as one that will reduce the impacts of the project on wetlands. In the professional opinion of Ms. Christopher, all of the wetlands impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of this measure.

### *Plant Species*

- a. **Impact BIO-4.** Implementation of the project would reduce the amount of a rare plant species that occurs within the study area. A detailed evaluation of the significant but mitigable effects of the project on rare plant species is provided in Final EIR Section 2.3.3, *Plant Species*. As described there, a

population of curly-leaved monardella (*Monardella undulata*), which is a California Native Plant Society List 4.2 plant species, would be directly affected by the project. The project would permanently affect a 0.08-acre occurrence of curly-leaved monardella. Implementation of the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measure BIO-4(a) in Section 3.3.13 *Biological Resources—Plant Species*) would reduce impacts to plant species that are rare and/or species of special concern to a less than significant level. The Natural Environment Study prepared in June 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Susan Christopher, Ph.D, a Senior Biologist with 13 years of biological resources experience, identified mitigation that will reduce the impacts of the project on rare plant species. In the professional opinion of Ms. Christopher, all of the rare plant impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of this measure.

### ***Animal Species***

- a. **Impact BIO-5.** Implementation of the proposed project could affect animal species that are rare and/or species of special concern that are known to use or potentially use habitats within the potential alignments. A total of approximately 15.20 acres of potential nesting and roosting (eucalyptus, ornamental and oak woodland) habitat for birds occurs on the Locally Preferred Alignment Alternative and could be disturbed by project construction and operations. In addition, 6.11 acres of central (Lucian) coastal scrub, 11.31 acres of central dune scrub, and 27.59 acres of non-native grassland, which can be used by species such as the horned lark, loggerhead shrike, and various special-status mammal and reptile species, would be affected. The California legless lizard, California horned lizard, southern Pacific pond turtle, two-striped garter snake, and American badger have the potential to use habitats within this alignment. Compensatory mitigation for eucalyptus woodland, oak woodland, and other plant communities of special concern, which is described in Final EIR Section 2.3.1, *Natural Communities* would benefit several special-status animal species. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-5(a through h) in Final EIR Section 3.3.14 *Biological Resources—Animal Species* would reduce impacts to wildlife species that are rare and/or a species of special concern and their habitat to a less than significant level. The Natural Environment Study prepared in June 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Susan Christopher, Ph.D, a Senior Biologist with 13 years of biological resources experience, identified several mitigation measures that will reduce the impacts of the project on rare animal species. In the professional opinion of Ms. Christopher, all of the rare animal impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of the above measures.

## ***Threatened and Endangered Animal Species***

- a. **Impact BIO-6.** Implementation of the project could affect threatened and endangered animal species, such as California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander that are known to use or potentially use habitats within the potential alignments. A detailed evaluation of the effects of each of the build alternatives on Threatened or Endangered species is provided in Final EIR Section 2.3.5, *Threatened and Endangered Species*. Mitigation Measures BIO-6(a-c) in Final EIR Section 3.3.15, Biological Resources – Threatened and Endangered Species, would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The Biological Assessment prepared in June 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Susan Christopher, Ph.D, a Senior Biologist with 13 years of biological resources experience, identified several mitigation measures that will reduce the impacts of the project on threatened and endangered species. In the professional opinion of Ms. Christopher, all of the threatened and endangered species impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of the above measures.

In addition, through issuance of a Biological Opinion, take authorization of California red-legged frogs and California tiger salamander pursuant to Section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act was issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on December 17, 2008. With compliance with the Biological Opinion and implementation of required mitigation measures, impacts on threatened and endangered animal species would be reduced to a less than significant level, in the opinion of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

It should be noted that the Final EIR for the Santa Maria Airport Business Park Specific Plan concluded that impacts of the plan on threatened and endangered species, including California tiger salamander and California red-legged frog, were significant and unavoidable because although a program of mitigation measures were proposed, it was not certain that they will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level, since the City has no control over the outcome of the state and federal permitting process. The conclusion for the Union Valley Parkway project differs because a Biological Opinion has been issued by USFWS prior to certification of the EIR, and because the Union Valley Parkway EIR evaluates a project-specific infrastructure proposal with a high level of certainty with regard to compliance with the conditions of the Biological Opinion, rather than a long-term Specific Plan at a programmatic level of detail, where compliance is more difficult to assure.

## ***Invasive Species***

- a. **Impact BIO-7.** Landscaping associated with implementation of the proposed project and interchange could potentially introduce invasive plant species. To eliminate invasive species, a qualified biologist would review the landscape palette before implementation. However, the potential introduction of invasive species would require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. This is a significant but mitigable, impact. A detailed evaluation of the significant but mitigable effects of each of the build alternatives on invasive species is provided in Final EIR Section 2.3.6, *Invasive Species*. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-7(a) in Final EIR Section 3.3.16, *Biological Resources — Invasive Species*, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The Natural Environment Study prepared in June 2008 by Rincon Consultants, Inc.'s Susan Christopher, Ph.D, a Senior Biologist with 13 years of biological resources experience, identified mitigation measures that will reduce the impacts of the project related to invasive species. In the professional opinion of Ms. Christopher, all of the invasive species impacts of the proposed project will be mitigated to insignificance by implementation of the above measure.

- B. Findings that with regard to certain project and cumulative effects, those changes or alterations which mitigate those effects, are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.**

There are no changes or alterations which mitigate certain project and cumulative effects that are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency that have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

- C. Findings that with regard to certain project and cumulative effects, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.**

The FEIR identified one (1) significant, unavoidable, adverse project and/or cumulative related environmental impact associated with the proposed project that cannot be mitigated to levels of insignificance by the adoption of mitigation measures. The City Council finds that this impact will be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible as follows:

**1. OPERATIONAL NOISE (ALL BUILD ALTERNATIVES)**

- a. **Impact N-2.** Traffic traveling on the proposed project and interchange would generate noise level increases that would exceed 12 decibels at homes and private recreational areas in the study area. This increase is significant according to a noise threshold established by the California Department of Transportation because the change is detectable by the



human ear. However, exterior noise levels in certain areas projected to experience a 12 decibel increase, including at Receptors 3 and 4, west of California Boulevard, would not exceed the City's exterior residential noise level standard of 60 decibels with the project. Since noise mitigation would not be feasible (as set out below) in certain noise-impacted locations, this is a significant and unavoidable impact.

Final EIR Table 3-4 summarizes the existing and post-project noise conditions at representative noise sensitive receptors for the Locally-Preferred Alternative.

Noise abatement is not proposed in certain locations, such as residential and private recreational receptors in the Foxenwood Subdivision, west of California Boulevard, because the implementation of noise barriers would not be feasible in these locations, or is unnecessary to reduce impacts.

Receptors 3, 4 and 5 are located west of California Boulevard, as illustrated on Final EIR Figures 22A through 22D. Final EIR Tables 2-17 through 2-20 summarize the existing and future noise levels at these locations. As stated, sound barriers would be necessary to reduce future noise increases to acceptable levels at Receptors 3 and 4. However, constructing such walls would far exceed the economic parameters for reasonableness developed by Caltrans in its *Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*. In order to achieve a noise reduction discernable to the human ear, sound barriers at Receptors 3 and 4 would need to be 16 feet tall. As shown on Table 2-22, a 17,600 square foot soundwall at this location would have an estimated cost of \$633,600, while the reasonable cost allowance was only \$377,000. In addition, the construction of sound walls at Receptors 3 and 4 would not be feasible in accordance with CEQA. Section 15364 of the CEQA Guidelines defines "feasible" as "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors." It is also important to state that noise levels at these receptors with the project would not degrade below City outdoor noise standards for residential uses, which is 60 decibels. In addition, construction of these walls is unnecessary to meet the standards for ambient noise set in the City's general plan, a legal document, as the level that is socially acceptable for residential use. Consequently, construction of these sound walls would be infeasible within the meaning of Section 15364.

**D. Findings that with regard to certain project and cumulative effects, those effects found to be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.**

**1. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

- a. Project Impact.** The Union Valley Parkway extension portion of the project would not occur on lands designated for agriculture. However, up to approximately 16 acres of right-of-way in the proposed Union Valley

Parkway/Highway 101 interchange area would be taken from land zoned for agricultural or resource management. None of the 16 acres of right-of-way to be converted from agriculture to highway use contain prime soils. These agricultural areas are located at the extreme western perimeter of larger agricultural areas. The conversion of this relatively small area of agricultural land would not compromise the sustainability of, fragment, or restrict access to other adjacent agricultural operations. In addition, no Williamson Act contract lands would be affected through implementation of any of the build alternatives, as no such land is located in the project area. Consequently, the project would create no significant impact on agricultural resources.

- b. **Cumulative Impact.** Cumulative development throughout the greater Santa Barbara County and City of Santa Maria area would gradually convert prime agricultural areas. The project would incrementally contribute to this change. Individual development projects in the region would have the potential to create compatibility conflicts between historic agricultural uses and new urban development. Such conflicts are expected to be addressed on a case-by-case basis. As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to agricultural resources. From a cumulative perspective, implementation of the proposed project would contribute to a less than significant cumulative impact because the project would not convert areas containing prime agricultural soils, or lands under Williamson Act contract to urban use, nor would the project facilitate the conversion of any such land in the County.

## 2. HYDROLOGY AND FLOODPLAIN

- a. **Project Impact.** The project area is in Flood Zone C, an area of no flood hazard. The project did not show a predicted increase in the base flood elevation, and does not include development that conflicts with the function of the natural floodplain. Due to design features aimed at retaining water within the vicinity, drainage facilities outside the project area would not be indirectly affected. Therefore, the project would result in no significant impacts related to flooding.

3. **PALEONTOLOGY a. Project Impact.** The project area is entirely underlain by Quaternary Dune Sand, which has no potential to contain paleontological resources (Worts, 1951). Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

## 4. RECREATION

- a. The proposed project and interchange would not include the implementation of residential land uses that would increase demand for parks and recreational facilities. No impacts to such facilities or services would result. In addition, in the Locally Preferred Alignment, the proposed improvements would be designed to avoid encroachment onto any

parklands, including Pioneer Park. Furthermore, the proposed project would include sidewalks, multi-use paths, and bike lanes, and would therefore improve recreational trail opportunities in the area.

## 5. UTILITIES

- a. **Project Impact U-1.** The Proposed project and interchange would not necessitate additional wastewater or storm drainage improvements, beyond those described as part of the project. No additional impacts related to utility services or infrastructure would result.
- b. **Project Impact U-2.** The Proposed project and interchange would generate short-term construction solid waste that would not exceed the capacity of existing landfills serving the area. Solid waste generated during construction of the project would be disposed of at the Santa Maria Regional Landfill. This landfill maintains a remaining capacity of 1,238,000 cubic yards and a permitted throughput of 740 tons per day of solid waste, which would be sufficient to accommodate project-generated solid waste. Less than significant impacts would result.

## 6. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- a. **Project and Cumulative Impact.** The proposed project and interchange would result in roadway and intersection operations that meet or exceed the City and County Level of Service standards with the project. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant [or no] adverse impact on traffic. Operational impacts at specific roadway segments and intersections are described in detail in Final EIR Section 2.1.6, *Traffic and Transportation/ Pedestrian and Bikeway Facilities*.

## 7. AIR QUALITY

- a. **Project Impact.** A discussion of the regional and project conformity with the Clean Air Act is provided in Final EIR Section 2.2.4, *Air Quality*. As described in that section, regional air quality impacts have previously been analyzed and found to not be significant. In fact, long-term impacts of the proposed project/Interchange Project would be beneficial related to air quality. The project would improve regional circulation, with resulting reductions in air contaminant emissions, and would therefore result in beneficial cumulative impacts on air quality.
- b. **Cumulative Impact.** The project would not contribute cumulatively to long-term air quality impacts in the air basin for three reasons: 1) construction impacts are of short-term duration; 2) there is no expected generation of travel demand or other direct sources of air pollutants; and 3) air quality is expected to improve via the improvement of traffic congestion in the vicinity.

## 8. MINERAL RESOURCES

- a. **Project Impact.** The project would not have a significant effect on the demand for aggregate resources because according to staff there is estimated to be a sufficient amount of aggregate resources to meet local demand for the next 50 years. Similarly, the project would not have a significant effect on the demand for petroleum resources because petroleum is considered a worldwide, national, and statewide resource, which is beyond the scope of local governments to effectively manage or control. This is a less than significant impact.

## 9. HAZARDOUS AIR TRAFFIC

- a. **Project Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project and interchange would not impede air traffic or expose people to significant impacts related to airport safety. The project would not construct occupied structures along the corridor, and would feature a low vertical profile that would not influence air traffic patterns. This is a less than significant impact.

## 10. PHYSICAL DIVISION OF ESTABLISHED COMMUNITIES

- a. **Project Impact.** The proposed project would be located north and east of the Foxenwood Estates residential subdivision, and would not cross or divide this subdivision or physically separate it from any adjacent subdivisions. In addition, the State Route 101/Union Valley Parkway interchange portion of the project would be located adjacent to the Creekside and Edgewood residential subdivisions, but would not cross or divide these neighborhoods. The project would be located north and east of the Foxenwood Estates residential subdivision, and would not cross or divide this subdivision or physically separate it from any adjacent subdivisions. In addition, the project would provide improved access to community facilities in the area, such as Pioneer Park and the County Government Center.

## 11. GROWTH INDUCEMENT

- a. **Project Impact.** An interchange and road extension project can induce growth by removing existing constraints to growth (such as, eliminating congestion) or by directly promoting growth (for example, providing access to previously inaccessible commercial or residential development sites). The relationship between the proposed project and growth in the Santa Maria and Orcutt areas is expected to be one of accommodating planned growth, rather than growth inducement. For the last 40 years, this major east-west route has been shown on every planning effort for the County and the City. Over the years, the City and County have reserved right-of-way for the proposed Union Valley Parkway as development has occurred along the route. As projects have been built in Orcutt, segments of this road have been constructed. Overall growth pressure in the region is expected to decline due to the downturn in the local real estate market and the substantial decrease in the City's and County's Regional Housing Needs Allocation for housing production compared to the previous General Plan Housing Element update cycle.

## 12. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a. **Project and Cumulative Impact.** The project and other cumulative projects in the vicinity would use a portion of the City's water supply surplus, but a substantial water supply surplus would remain subsequent to implementation of cumulative projects; therefore, the project would not result in a significant cumulative water supply impact. The project would not require individual sewage disposal systems, or generate sewage or operational solid waste. No communication facilities are needed for, or would be disrupted by, the project and no electrical service or gas supplies are needed. Roadway extension improvements would reduce traffic congestion in the long term and improve overall vehicle access and response times, which would be a long-term beneficial impact. No impacts to emergency services personnel, equipment, or facilities are anticipated.