



110 S. PINE STREET #101 (ON HERITAGE WALK) • SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA 93458-5082 • 805-925-0951 • TDD 925-4354

PUBLIC NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that a draft Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the below described project in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as set forth in the Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 to 21174, as amended. As a result of this project, the following significant, but mitigable, effects on the environment are anticipated in the areas of: Hazards/Hazardous Materials, Noise and Transportation/Traffic.

1. Environmental Document No's: GPZ2016-0001, TR2016-0002; and PD2016-0003
2. Applicant: Lisa Plowman, RRM Design Group, Incorporated, Applicant for the Housing Authority of Santa Barbara County
3. Project Description: An amendment to the General Plan Land Use Policy Map and the official Zoning Map (GPZ), a Tentative Parcel Map and a Planned Development (PD) Permit with a 35% density bonus to allow an 80-unit affordable apartment complex for low and very low income residents on a 2.7 acre site.
 - A. Project Title: The Residences at Depot Street
 - B. Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 119-261-005 (portion), -007, and a portion of -008
 - C. Location: Near the northwest corner of West Main Street (State Route 166) and North Depot Street, Santa Maria, CA 93458
 - D. Proposed Development: An 80-unit affordable apartment complex for low and very low income residents on a 2.7 acre site.

The draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and all documents referenced in the document may be reviewed at the Community Development Department, 110 S. Pine Street, #101, Santa Maria, CA, 93458, Phone No. (805) 925-0951, ext. 2244, FAX No. 928-7565. The draft Mitigated Negative Declaration is also available for review in the Santa Maria Public Library, located at 421 S. McClelland Street, Santa Maria, CA. Written comments on the draft Negative Declaration will be accepted during the period from **September 21 to October 11, 2016**. Please submit comments on or before 5:00 p.m. on **October 11**, the close of the public comment period.



CITY OF SANTA MARIA
INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
 SEPTEMBER 16, 2016

THE RESIDENCES AT DEPOT STREET, GPZ2016-0001, TR2016-0002, PD2016-0003

Near the northeast corner of North Depot Street and West Main Street

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Description	An amendment to the General Plan Land Use Policy Map and the official Zoning Map (GPZ), a Tentative Parcel Map and a Planned Development (PD) Permit with a 35% density bonus to allow an 80-unit affordable apartment complex for low and very low income residents on a 2.7-acre site.
Location	Near the northwest corner of West Main Street and North Depot Street.
Assessor's Parcel Nos.	119-261-005 (portion), -007, and a portion of -008* <small>*Assessor's Parcel Numbers are described as they currently exist. A Parcel Map Tract 5967 was recently recorded that reconfigured the identified parcels. The new APN's are not yet reflected on the County Assessor's roles.</small>
General Plan Designation	Existing: HCM (Heavy Commercial Manufacturing) Proposed: HDR-22 (High Density Residential, 22 units/acre) <small>*A pending Parcel Map includes a lot line modification that would affect a negligible area designated for general commercial use.</small>
Zoning	Existing: CM (Commercial Manufacturing) district Proposed: PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential) <small>*A pending Parcel Map includes a lot line modification that would affect a Negligible area designated for general commercial use.</small>
Size of Site	Housing Site (GPZ and PD Permit): 2.7 acres Parcel Map Area (Tract 6009): 3.5 acres
Present Use	Existing commercial on 0.85 acres (Parcel 1); and vacant industrial on 2.7 acres (Parcels 2 & 3) <small>*An existing commercial center on the southerly Parcel 1 is proposed to remain. Four industrial buildings were recently removed from the northerly Parcels 2 and 3, the future housing site (Demolition Permit B16-0206).</small>
Proposed Use	80 affordable apartment units for low and very low income residents

Access	Two driveways extending onto North Depot Street
Surrounding Uses/Zoning	
North	Industrial, CM (Commercial Manufacturing)
South	Various commercial, PD/C-2 (Planned Development/General Commercial), of Entrada Specific Plan
East	Apartments and single family residences, R-2 and R-3 (Medium Density and High Density Residential)
West	Various residential and industrial development (CM and R-3)
Parking	<p>Required: 160 parking spaces</p> <p>Provided: 61 parking spaces*</p> <p><small>*The applicant has requested to reduce the required number of parking spaces as a concession in accordance with Government Code Sections 65915 – 65918.</small></p>
Setbacks	
Front	<p>Required: 20 feet</p> <p>Proposed: 21 feet</p>
Rear	<p>Required: 10 feet</p> <p>Proposed: 61 feet</p>
Sides	<p>Required: 10 feet</p> <p>Proposed: 53 feet (north) and 36 feet (south)</p>
Height	35 feet
Building Coverage	33,435 square feet (29%)
Landscape Area	33,494 square feet (30%)
Storm Water Retardation	Low Impact Development (LID) detention facilities on-site, and flood control retention off-site.
Fencing	A six-foot-high block wall along westerly property line. A gated egress driveway on the south side of the property.
Applicant/Agent/Owner	<p>Lisa Plowman, Agent for:</p> <p>The Housing Authority of Santa Barbara County</p> <p>10 East Figueroa Street</p> <p>Santa Barbara, CA 93101</p>

Procedure	Planning Commission consideration of recommendations to City Council regarding a mitigated negative declaration of environmental impact, amendments to the General Plan (Land Use Policy Map) and the official Zoning Map, and Planning Commission consideration of a Tentative Parcel Map and a Planned Development Permit.
------------------	--

GENERAL AREA DESCRIPTION:

The Housing Authority of Santa Barbara County is proposing to construct *The Residences at Depot Street*, an affordable housing development for low and very low income residents on a 2.7-acre site. The project site is located in the Original Four-Square Mile incorporation of the City of Santa Maria, near the northwest corner of West Main Street and North Depot Street (see Exhibit A – Vicinity Map).

To the north are industrial uses including a furniture warehousing facility (Weatherby's) and an automobile dismantler (Rudy's Automobile Dismantling), located in the CM (Commercial Manufacturing) zoning District. To the east are residential neighborhoods consisting of single-family and multiple family dwellings in the R-2 (Medium Density Residential) and R-3 (High Density Residential) zoning districts. To the west are a mixture of residential and industrial uses. The properties to the immediate west are zoned CM (Commercial Manufacturing) zoning district, beyond to the west in the R-2 (Medium Density Residential) zoning district. Immediately to the south is the Depot Square Commercial Center, a five-unit retail center currently containing a small market, a gift shop, a taqueria and a meat market/delicatessen. West Main Street (State Route 166) and the Entrada Specific Plan commercial corridor extend in an east-west direction to the south of the project site.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The future housing site is generally flat. A 60-foot-wide strip that contains a PG&E utility easement traverses north to south at the westerly side of the project site. High voltage overhead utility lines extend in a north-south direction across the westerly portion of the PG&E easement and an underground gas pipeline extends in a north-south direction through the easement (Exhibit - Site Plan). The PG&E Easement is covered by scattered weeds and grasses. Otherwise, virtually the entire 2.7-acre housing site is covered by paved surfaces including the foundation slabs of recently removed buildings.

A Demolition permit (B16-0206), was recently approved by the City of Santa Maria Community Development Department to permit removal of four abandoned industrial buildings on the subject property. The larger of the removed buildings included a 19,500-square-foot warehouse, an 18,700-square-foot building most recently used for various multi-tenant industrial businesses, and a 10,300-square-foot administrative office building.

Historical Context: As previously discussed, the project site is located within the original four square mile boundary of Santa Maria. Reflective of this area's history, development began to occur in the project area around the late 1800s.

Several sources have identified railroad tracks that ran in a north-south direction along the western and eastern sides of the subject property from about 1900 through 1954. The City of Santa Maria Landmarks Committee documents those narrow gauge tracks as part of the Pacific Coast Railway network that carried crops and other freight from Santa Maria nationwide. The property located directly to the south, at the northwest corner of West Main Street and North Depot Street, is identified as the site of the Pacific Coast Railroad depot. The Landmarks Committee recognizes the influence of the Pacific Coast Railway to the development of the Santa Maria valley and commemorates the Main Street/Depot Street corner on its list of City Landmarks. The project would have no effect on the corner location.

The proposed housing site is located approximately 150 feet north of the Main Street corner frontage. Furthermore, the last remnants of the railroad tracks were removed around 1982 and there are no longer any remnants of the old railroad depot on the corner. Yet, in tribute to this railroad history, the project will install a commemorative display in its lobby. The display will include a collection of memorabilia and artifacts to commemorate the old Pacific Coast Railroad. Community Development Department staff recently contacted Mr. Jason Stillwell, the Landmarks Committee's staff representative, to discuss the project and Mr. Stilwell conveyed the Landmarks Committee's endorsement of the commemorative display and expressed support for the Residences at Depot Street housing project.

Furthermore, no structures on the 2.7-acre project site have been identified on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. A cultural resources study entitled: *City of Santa Maria Residences at Depot Street Cultural Resources Study*, and dated May 2016, was prepared by Rincon Consultants, Incorporated. The study concluded that no significant historic structures were present on the project site, and as noted above, a Demolition Permit recently approved the clearing of the project site. *The project would not have a significant adverse effect on any historic or cultural resources.*

A copy of the cultural resources study is available for review at the City of Santa Maria Community Development, 110 South Pine Street, Room 101, Santa Maria, CA 93458 and online at: <http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml>

Soils: In addition to railroad operations, past uses of the property include; a seed and chemical company, a lumberyard, a crude oil pipeline, and an underground storage tank. Additionally, a portion of the PG&E easement has recently been used as a storage yard for an automobile salvage operation. A Phase I site assessment identified the former uses of the property as *Potential Recognized Environmental Conditions*, potentially resulting in contaminated soils on the subject property. Based on the findings of the Phase I study, a Work Plan was prepared to the specifications of the Santa Barbara County Health Department Hazardous Material Division, Site Mitigation Unit.

The Work Plan required a series of soil samplings be conducted on the project site. A supplemental Phase II study provided the results of the site testing. The Phase II report identified elevated residuals of lead at shallow depths on the subject property, *a potentially significant impact*. Based on required mitigation measures, potentially contaminated soils would be remediated to the specifications of the Santa Barbara County Health Department, Environmental Services Division Hazardous Materials Unit. More discussion on possible soil remediation actions is provided below in this Initial Study.

Currently, there is little exposed soil on the subject property. According to the *Soil Survey of Northern Santa Barbara Area California*, dated July 1972, and prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, the primary soil type underlying the project site is Sorrento sandy Loam (StA); 0 to 2 percent slope. This soil is described as a nearly level soil occurring on smooth flood plains in the Santa Maria Valley. Permeability is described as moderately rapid. Surface runoff is very slow, and erosion hazard is described as none to slight.

Biological Resources: The Resources Management Element of the Santa Maria General Plan does not identify any significant habitat areas in the project vicinity. As discussed in the General Area Description above, the surrounding area, has been developed for many years. Over 90 percent of the subject property is covered by paved surfaces. There are currently no trees on the subject property and vegetation is generally limited to the common grasses scattered within the PG&E easement. The potential for protected wildlife occurring on the subject property are considered to be negligible.

Noise: A Noise Report prepared for the project indicates that the outdoor patios and balconies facing North Depot Street would exceed the City's 60 dBA maximum exterior noise standard, resulting in a *potentially significant impact*. The City of Santa Maria's Noise Element offers an exception for exterior living areas in multi-family residential projects located in urban neighborhoods where elevated noise levels exist. The development would comply with the City of Santa Maria General Plan Noise Element by implementing this exception. More discussion on project noise impacts is provided below in this Initial Study.

Transportation/Traffic: A traffic study indicated the Depot Street/Fesler Avenue intersection currently operates at Level of Service (LOS) E, below the City's threshold of LOS D. The traffic study analyzed a worst case of 50 pm peak hour traffic trips resulting from the project and concluded that the project traffic would further exacerbate traffic operations at the Fesler/Depot street intersection. *Resulting in a potentially significant impact*. The traffic study identified measures to mitigate potential traffic impacts of a less than significant level. More discussion on potential traffic impacts is provided below in this Initial Study.

Requisite services and facilities are readily available to serve the project. The site receives water, sewer, and trash service from the City of Santa Maria.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Project Objectives: The Housing Authority of Santa Barbara County is proposing to construct an 80-unit apartment complex for low and very low income residents. The 80 apartment units would be contained in two buildings located on two separate but contiguous building sites. The two building sites would be designed to function as one cohesive project. Each building would be three-stories and would contain 40 apartment units. The apartment buildings have common entries and the dwelling units would be accessed through interior corridors. The living units would range from studio, to one and two-bedroom apartments. Supporting facilities including on-site vocational counseling offices, a computer room, a clinic, and laundry facilities would be provided. Approximately 20,000 square feet of

recreational open space would be provided for residents (Exhibit B – Site Plan). Decorative landscaped areas would be provided within the project site and around the site perimeters. The applicant is proposing 61 parking spaces to accommodate the parking needs of the residents. Two vehicle ingress/egress driveways would extend from North Depot Street. For the site plan details, see Exhibit B.

The following discretionary approvals are necessary to complete the project:

- 1a. **General Plan Map Amendment:** A General Plan (Land Use Policy Map) amendment **from** HCM (Heavy Commercial Manufacturing) **to** HDR – 22 High Density Residential 22 dwelling units per acre) on 2.7 acres.
- 1b. **Zone Change:** Concurrently, the project would amend the official Zoning Map **from** CM (Commercial Manufacturing) zoning district **to** PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential) district on 2.7 acres. An area of negligible size currently designated for commercial use would be modified to reflect a realignment of the common property line between the high density residential site and an adjoining commercial property to the south.
2. **Parcel Map:** A Parcel Map (Tract 6009) would subdivide two parcels totaling approximately 3.5 acres into three lots. The three resulting lots would be reflective of the future residential site and an existing commercial site to the south. To accommodate the housing site, the commercial site (Parcel 1), would be reduced in size from 1.5 acres to 0.85 acres. No change in use would occur on the southerly commercial site. The smaller commercial parcel would still be of adequate size to accommodate the existing commercial development. The smaller commercial site, would create the 2.7 acres needed to accommodate the housing project. For phasing purposes, the applicant is proposing to subdivide the 2.7 acre housing site into two separate parcels, a 1.32 acre site (Parcel 2) would contain one apartment building, and a 1.38 acre site (Parcel 3) would contain the other apartment building. A copy of Preliminary Parcel Pat is attached for reference.
3. **Planned Development Permit:** A Planned Development Permit (PD2016-0003) would allow construction of the 80-unit apartment complex. Under the provisions of Government Code 65915 (g), a 35% density bonus is requested to increase the project density to 29.7 units per acre. In addition, the applicant is proposing a parking reduction and a small ground floor office component as concessions allowed under Government Code 65915.

PROJECT REVIEW:

The environmental impacts associated with the development of the site were determined using the City of Santa Maria Staff Project Environmental Checklist (attached); on-site inspections, various computer models, supplemental reports and studies, and information provided by the applicant. Potentially significant adverse environmental impacts were identified in the area of hazards/hazardous materials, noise and traffic.

Based on the above mentioned sources, no adverse impacts are associated with aesthetics/visual resources, agriculture and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soil, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems.

IMPACT SUMMARY TABLE

Proposed Project	
Size of Site	GPZ2016-0001 and PD2016-0003: 2.7 acres Tract 6009: (3-Lot Parcel Map): 3.5 acres See exhibits for site layout and lot configurations
Size of Buildings (total proposed)	94,000 square feet
Water Demand ⁽¹⁾	24.5 acre-feet per year
Sewage Generation ⁽¹⁾	20,398 gallons per day
Average Daily Trips ⁽²⁾	*532 trips per day
P.M. Peak Trips ⁽²⁾	*50 peak trips per day
<u>Unmitigated</u> Long Term Emissions: ⁽³⁾ Reactive Hydrocarbons Nitrogen Oxides Total Net CO ₂ e	 Negligible Negligible Negligible

(1) PAM 2002-04

(2) Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip generation manual Depot Square and Traffic and Circulation Study, dated July 13, 2016.

(3) Air Quality Source - City of Santa Maria Community Development staff; and based on the relatively low vehicle trip generation data and the operations of the proposed use.

*Traffic Projections are based on a worst case scenario applied to a typical 80-unit market rate apartment project. The affordable housing development will substantially limit car ownership and will promote alternative transportation modes resulting in fewer actual vehicle trips.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), entitled: *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 123 North Depot Street, Santa Maria California*, dated November 19, 2015, was prepared by Rincon Environmental Consultants, Incorporated. The Phase 1 site assessment identified five potential sources of hazardous materials, or Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) and potential RECs, as follows:

1. Historical railroad tracks formerly located on the subject property.
2. Historic underground storage tank (UST) located on the subject property.

3. Former agricultural chemical and seed companies located on the subject property from 1968 through 2003.
4. Historic lumberyard present on the southern portion of the subject property from 1900 through 1906.
5. One crude oil pipeline and associated release located on the subject property.

Based on the above, a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared to evaluate the cited RECs. The ESA identified elevated levels of lead at shallow depths in the subject property. The elevated levels of lead contaminants are identified as *a potentially significant impact*.

Haz-1: Under the supervision of the Santa Barbara County Department of Health, Department, Environmental Health Services division, LUFT Program & Site Mitigation Unit (SMU), contaminated soils shall be removed from the project site to the standards and specifications of the County Site Mitigation Unit.

Mitigation Requirements: The project shall be required to excavate, remove and dispose of contaminated soils accordingly. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit for apartment construction, the applicant shall obtain a *No Further Action* letter from the Hazardous Materials Unit to demonstrate the site has been remediated to County Health Department residential occupancy standards. The project design shall incorporate any measures as recommended by the SMU.

Timing: The applicant shall implement the above-cited measure prior to issuance of a building permit for the two residential structures.

Haz-2: Upon removal of the concrete slabs covering the site a subsequent Phase 1 site assessment shall be performed. If the potential for hazardous materials exists in those areas, the applicant shall implement measures as specified in mitigation measure Haz-1.

Haz-3: The following directive shall be placed on the Cover Sheet of the Grading Plans and shall be implemented during all phases of earth moving, construction and grading.

Stop work immediately and contact the County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services Division, Hazardous Materials Unit (HMU) at (805) 346-8460 if visual contamination or chemical odors are detected while implementing the approved work at this site. Resumption of work shall require approval of the HMU.

Timing: The applicant shall implement the above-cited measure prior to issuance of a building permit for the residential structures.

NOISE

A Noise Report entitled: *The Residences at Depot Street Project, Santa Maria California*, and dated May 12, 2016, was prepared by Dudek Associates, Incorporated. The Noise Report was conducted in conformance with the City of Santa Maria's General Plan Community Noise Element standards and assessed potential noise impacts upon future project residents. The conclusions of which are summarized as follows:

Exterior Noise: The Noise Report assessed potential impacts on the private patios and the balcony areas, the tot lots, sport court and the community garden space. The Noise Study predicted exterior noise levels at the Depot Street frontage would reach 64 dBA CNEL and would therefore, exceed the City's maximum acceptable 60 dBA range, particularly for the outdoor patios and balconies facing North Depot Street. The 64 dBA CNEL outdoor noise level in those areas would be considered a *potentially significant impact*.

Interior Noise: For interior noise, the Noise Study projected the maximum exterior noise exposure would not exceed 64 dB CNEL and recognized that standard materials and construction techniques would be expected to result in a minimum noise attenuation of 20 dB. Therefore, the 20 dB reduction would result in interior noise levels at 44 dB CNEL or less. *Interior noise impacts would be less than significant*.

Exterior Noise Mitigation Measures: The Noise Study identified two methods to mitigate outdoor noise impacts. The first method would require the construction of solid barriers around the perimeter of the balconies and decks facing North Depot Street. The sound barriers would reduce the noise impacts to the easterly outdoor patios and decks to acceptable levels. However, from an urban design and an aesthetic standpoint, the provision of solid sound barriers around the open space areas would not be a preferred alternative.

Disclosure Statement: The City of Santa Maria's Noise Element offers an exception for exterior living areas in multi-family residential projects located in urban neighborhoods where elevated noise levels exist. Exterior living areas may be located in an area with CNL not exceeding 75 dBA, without the need for sound barriers if a notice is given to prospective tenants advising them of the potential for elevated noise disturbance in the area.

NOISE-1: The following disclosure statement would be provided to notify prospective tenants of the potential for elevated outdoor noise:

This property is presently located in an urban area which is periodically and regularly experiences elevated noise levels. Potential sources of this noise may be automobile traffic, railroad operations, flying aircraft, industrial/commercial uses and general human activity in an urban environment. You may wish to consider what noise level annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your rental agreement and determine whether they are acceptable to you.

The development would comply with the City of Santa Maria General Plan Noise Element by employing the above-cited exception and providing the above-stated notice to prospective tenants of the residences with patios or balconies on the easterly (Depot Street) façade. The project would then achieve compliance with the City of Santa Maria 60 dBA CNEL exterior noise criterion.

Mitigation Requirements: The project shall provide a disclosure statement to prospective tenants of those apartment units with easterly facing balconies and decks as a part of its lease agreement. The form and content of the disclosure shall be to the satisfaction of the City and shall be submitted for review and approval as a part of the Density Bonus Agreement, or other recordable documentation.

Timing: The noise disclosure would be approved by the City prior to issuance of a Building Permit for occupancy of the first building and would be implemented by the project owner for the life of the project. Disclosures shall be provided to the tenants at the time they sign the lease.

Construction Noise: The City of Santa Maria enforces noise level restrictions for construction activities proposed within 500 feet of existing residences. The City's construction schedule restrictions would be implemented in order to avoid significant construction noise annoyances for residential neighbors to the east and west.

A copy of the noise report is available for review at the City of Santa Maria Community Development, 110 South Pine Street, Room 101; Santa Maria, CA 93458 and online at: [/http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml](http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Potential traffic impacts were analyzed in the Traffic Report entitled: *Depot Square, Traffic and Circulation Study – City of Santa Maria California*, prepared by Stantec Transportation Engineers, Incorporated, and dated, July 13, 2016. The background information and analysis contained in the Traffic Study has been summarized as follows:

Level of Service (LOS): The City of Santa Maria considers level of service (LOS) D or better as acceptable for intersections and roadways, with mitigation required for LOS E/F. Using a worst case scenario, the Traffic Study, projected the project would generate 532 Average Daily Trips (ADT); and 50 P.M. peak hour trips.

Levels of Service were calculated for the study area intersections assuming the Existing + Project traffic volumes. The Traffic Study found that, under existing pre-project conditions the Depot Street/Fesler Street intersection currently operates at Level of Service E, below acceptable levels. The Traffic Study projected that under existing plus project conditions, the project would increase delay on the northbound approach and thereby generating a project specific impact. Therefore, *a potentially significant LOS impact would result at the Depot Street/Fesler Street intersection*. All of the other intersections within the study area would operate at LOS C or better under project conditions.

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative forecasts were developed using the City of Santa Maria Major Project list (July 2015) and the list of approved and pending projects contained in the City of Guadalupe Housing Element (October 2015). The Traffic Study concluded that the Fesler Street/Depot Street intersection would continue to operate below the City's LOS D standard during the PM peak hour. *Therefore, a potentially significant cumulative impact would result.* The remaining intersections in the study area would operate at LOS C or better under cumulative conditions.

Site Access: Access to the project site is proposed from one full access driveway on Depot Street opposite Mill Street, and one egress only driveway south of Chapel Street. Vehicle ownership will be restricted by the project. Based on low project driveway volumes on Depot

Street, the driveway connections are projected to operate acceptably. The driveways will be controlled by stop signs and adequate sight distance would be provided from the driveways to vehicles on Depot Street. *Therefore, no impact would result from site ingress/egress.*

Queueing Analysis: The distance from Main Street to the southern project egress driveway would be 315 feet. The peak queue on Depot Street would extend a maximum of 250 feet from Main Street, which would not obstruct the driveway under project conditions. The distance from Fesler Street to the northern driveway would be 350 feet. The peak queue of 475 feet would extend beyond the northern driveway and would potentially block ingress and egress at the northerly driveway. *Therefore, a potentially significant impact would result.*

Congestion Management Program (CMP): The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG), has developed a set of traffic impact thresholds to assess the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on the regional transportation facilities located within the Congestion Management Program (CMP) program roadway system. The CMP considers LOS D acceptable for CMP roadways and intersections, with deficiency plans required when operations degrade to LOS E or F. The Traffic Study concluded that all of the CMP intersections are forecast to operate at LOS D or better with Project traffic volumes. The project would therefore not impact the CMP network under Existing + Project conditions. *Less than significant impacts would result to the CMP program roadway system.*

PROJECT SPECIFIC MITIGATIONS

TRAFFIC-1: The project would implement the following improvements to achieve compliance with the City of Santa Maria Level of Service Standards:

Mitigation Requirements: To improve the Levels of Service, the Fesler Road/Depot Street intersection would have to be converted by the project from a two-way stop to an all-way stop. The intersection would then operate at a LOS B/C range.

Timing: The all-way stop improvements would be made, to the satisfaction of the City's Department of Public Works, prior to occupancy of the Residences at Depot Street housing development.

Monitoring: The traffic improvements would be designed to the specifications of the City and installed to the satisfaction for the Department of Public Works. The Department of Public Works would monitor the function of the intersection to ensure appropriate traffic movements and LOS standards are met.

A copy of the traffic study is available for review at the City of Santa Maria Community Development, 110 South Pine Street, Room 101, Santa Maria, CA 93458 and online at: [/http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml](http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml)

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The environmental impacts associated with the proposed project were determined using the City of Santa Maria environmental checklist, on-site inspections and visits, aerial photographs and information on file with the City of Santa Maria. After this review, it was concluded that, based on the project design and with inclusion of the described mitigation measures to address hazardous materials, noise and traffic, the project would cause no significant adverse impacts to the environment.

ENVIRONMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the information available at the time of the preparation of this report and, without benefit of additional information which may come to light at the public hearing, the Environmental Officer recommends that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be filed for the Residences at Depot Street project based upon information contained in GPZ2016-0001, PD2016-0002 and TR2016-0002.

PREPARED BY:



City of Santa Maria
Community Development Department
110 South Pine Street, #101
Santa Maria, CA 93458

Bill Scott
Bill Scott, Environmental Analyst

9/19/16
Date

Lawrence W. Appel
Lawrence W. Appel, Environmental Officer

9-19-16
Date

S:\Community Development\Planning\DISCRETIONARY\General Plan Amendments\GPZ\2016\0001 - Depot Square\Environmental\Initial Study.doc.docx

An aerial photograph of an industrial area. A large yellow rectangle is overlaid on the image, highlighting a specific area. The rectangle is labeled "PROJECT SITE". The surrounding area includes various industrial buildings, parking lots, and streets. The streets are labeled "WEST MILL STREET", "WEST CHAPEL STREET", and "NORTH DEPOT STREET".

PROJECT
SITE

WEST MILL
STREET

NORTH DEPOT
STREET

WEST CHAPEL
STREET



VICINITY MAP
EXHIBIT A



CITY OF SANTA MARIA
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST / INITIAL STUDY
The Residences at Depot Street

1. **Project No**
GPZ2016-0001, TR2016-0002, PD2016-0003
2. **Project Location**
Near the northeast corner of West Main Street and North Depot Street
3. **Lead Agency, Contact and Preparer**
Bill Scott, Planner III
Community Development Department
110 South Pine Street, Suite 101
Santa Maria, CA 93458
805-925-0951, x 2378
bscott@cityofsantamaria.org
4. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address**
Lisa Plowman, Agent for:

The Housing Authority of Santa Barbara County
10 East Figueroa Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
5. **General Plan Designation**
Existing: HCM (Heavy Commercial manufacturing)
Proposed: HDR-22 (High Density Residential – 22 units/acre)
6. **Zoning Designation**
Existing: CM (Commercial Manufacturing)
Proposed: PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential)

Brief Description of Project

An amendment to the General Plan (Land Use Policy Map) **from** HCM (Heavy Commercial Manufacturing) **to** HDR-22 (High Density Residential – 22 units/acre); an amendment to the Official Zoning Map **from** CM (Commercial Manufacturing) district **to** PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential) zoning district on 2.7 acres; a Tentative Parcel Map on 3.5 acres to subdivide two parcels into three lots for high density residential use on 2.7 acres and general commercial purposes on 0.83 acres; and a Planned Development Permit allow construction of 80 affordable apartment units on a 2.7 acre site.

7. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting**
Industrial uses in a CM (Commercial Manufacturing) zoning district are to the north; a social club and residential neighborhoods in the R-2 (Medium Density Residential) and R-3 (High Density Residential) zoning districts are to the east.

Single family, multiple-family residences and various industrial uses are to the west in the CM (Commercial Manufacturing) zoning district; and commercial businesses along the West Main Street corridor (in the PD/C-2) zoning district are to the south.

8. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required

None

1. AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

Discussion:

- a.b. There are no unique or important scenic vistas in the immediate area and the site is surrounded on all sides by urban development. There are no trees and very limited vegetation on the subject property. No rock outcroppings or any other natural features are existing on the project site. A historic site assessment prepared for the project concluded no historic buildings, or potentially historic buildings were present on the subject property. West Main Street (State Route 166) to the south, is not listed on the California Department of Transportation (Cal Trans) list of officially designated or eligible scenic highways. *No impact to a scenic vista or any scenic resources would occur.*

- c. The immediate area is most typified by residential neighborhoods consisting of older single-family and multiple-family residential structures, small scale industrial facilities and a major commercial corridor (along West Main Street) is to the south. The nearby industrial operations are exemplified by outdoor storage uses and trucking operations to the west, a furniture warehouse is to the north, and an automobile dismantler is further to the north near the Depot Street/Fesler Street intersection.

Consistent with the current industrial zoning on the subject property, the property has historically been used for a variety of industrial purposes. Since the conclusion of the railroad operations that once served the project area, industrial opportunities on the property have become much more limited. As a result, the visual appearance of the subject property has progressively diminished. The uses which have most recently occupied the property have varied from small industrial tenants (e.g. small construction material suppliers), to outdoor automobile storage yards.

In 2010 the project site was a part of a Subdivision (Tract 5967). During the review of Tract 5967, members of the Planning Commission expressed concerns about the visual appearance of the property, particularly as viewed from North Depot Street.

The Planning Commission conditioned Tract 5967 to make interim visual improvements. As an example, the Planning Commission required the planting of climbing vines to mask the appearance of a large blank building wall extending along the Depot Street frontage. Tract 5907 was recorded in December of 2015, and the required visual improvements have not yet been implemented.

The current project would significantly revitalize this underutilized infill site. The apartment buildings would exhibit well-articulated building exteriors, and includes a variety of quality materials, colors and textures. The housing project would implement a landscape planting plan that would add substantial tree plantings, both within the project site, and along the West Depot Street frontage. Thus, substantial visual improvements would occur as a result of the current project. The project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. *No impact would occur.*

- d. In accordance with Santa Maria Municipal Code Section 12-33.307 (Glare), any outdoor lighting would be designed and shielded to direct the lighting downward, and outdoor lighting fixtures would be located to minimize light and glare and spillover onto adjacent properties. The project would not result in, or create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. *No impact would occur.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X	
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

Discussion:

- a. Figure RME-2 of the City of Santa Maria's General Plan Resources Management Element, identifies the general area as containing Class I and II Prime Agricultural soils. As discussed, the project site is an infill site within a fully urbanized portion of the City. The 2.7 acre site is too small for any viable agricultural production and is not in proximity of any agricultural lands. The property has historically been designated and zoned for urban land uses. The project would not convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to non-agricultural use. *A less than significant impact would result to agricultural resources.*
- b. According to Santa Barbara County Assessor's records, there is no Williamson Act contract that affects the subject property. There are no agricultural land use or zoning designations in the project area. *No impact would occur.*
- c. There is no timberland in proximity to the project site. The project site is currently zoned CM (Commercial Manufacturing) district, and would be rezoned to the PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential) district. The southerly commercial property would remain within the PD/C-2 (Planned Development/General Commercial) zoning district. The proposed project would not be in conflict with a forest or timberland zoning. *No impact would occur.*
- d.e. The project site is located in an urbanized area and proposes a new residential development within this urban setting. There are no forest lands or farmland in the area. *No impact to farmland or forestland would occur.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

3. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Discussion:

- a-c. The project would change the General Plan land use designation on the 2.7 acre property from its current HCM (Heavy Commercial Manufacturing) land use designation to the HDR (High Density Residential) designation. In conjunction with this change in the General Plan land use designation, the project would change the zoning on the 2.7 acres, from the CM (Commercial Manufacturing) zoning district to PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential) zoning district.

The Housing Authority of Santa Barbara County envisions an 80-unit affordable apartment development for low income and very low income residents on the 2.7 acres. The proposed residential zoning and the resulting housing development would potentially result in an improvement to air quality over the baseline industrial condition.

The current Heavy Commercial Manufacturing (HCM) land use designation is applied generally for those kinds of industrial operations that could potentially involve the burning of fossil fuels, use of hazardous materials and/or involve diesel truck operations. Therefore, the current zoning permits those uses that may be more likely to release higher levels of airborne pollutants as a part of their routine operations.

The proposed residential land use designations would completely remove that potential. Moreover, the Housing Authority has indicated the vast majority of its residents would not own or operate motor vehicles. Thus, traffic trips would be substantially reduced. In anticipation of the reduced motor vehicle usage, the project is proposing only 61 parking spaces, a 66% reduction from the 160 parking spaces that would normally be required for a comparable 80-unit market-rate apartment project.

Instead, the project would facilitate several alternative measures to accommodate the transportation needs project residents. The project site was selected in part, because of its *central City* location, within easily walkable proximity to the many goods and services available within the nearby West Main Street commercial corridor. The project design incorporates, direct pedestrian connections to the vast network of sidewalks existing along the neighborhood streets in the project vicinity. Additionally, the project site is served

directly by major Santa Maria Area Transit (SMAT) bus routes. A bus pull-out and bike lanes are programmed to be installed in front of the project site on North Depot Street. Moreover, the project would provide on-site offices, including social and vocational services, recreational and laundry facilities for the convenience of its residents. Therefore, walking, bicycling, ridesharing and the use of public transit would be the primary transportation modes for the majority of the residents.

The proposed land use and zone change and the resulting housing development would support applicable air quality plans and as a result, the project is anticipated to support an incremental improvement in air quality. In addition, standard APCD dust and construction emission conditions are applied to all development permits to mitigate any construction related impacts. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, would not violate any air quality standard. *Therefore, potential air quality impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.*

- d. Some existing industrial businesses would remain in close proximity to the project site and the future project residents could potentially be exposed to any pollutants associated with the nearby industrial operations. Given the generally small scale of these industrial operations, exposure to substantial amounts of toxic materials is considered to be unlikely. Since the vast majority of the surrounding area is typified by residential neighborhoods, the proposed housing project is anticipated to increase land use compatibility for the surrounding neighborhoods. Therefore, the project is anticipated to result in an overall improvement in the living conditions for the prevailing land use, the residential neighborhoods in the project vicinity. The project is not anticipated to substantially increase exposure for residents to airborne pollutants or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. *A less than significant impact would occur.*
- e. As discussed above, the project would replace the current industrial land use and zoning designations with the high density residential designation, and as a result, the project would reduce if not eliminate the potential for the types of operations that would generate objectionable odors on the subject property. *No impact would occur.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Discussion:

- a-f. As discussed, the 2.7-acre project site is within an inner City portion of the City of Santa Maria which was fully developed as part of the original four square miles. Several site visits were conducted between March 2016 and August 2016. No conditions to support any potential candidate or sensitive species, or special status species appear to exist at the site. There are no trees on the subject property and project site is substantially covered by paved surfaces. The Resources Management Element of the Santa Maria General Plan (Figure RME-3) also concludes that no rare or threatened species are expected to occur in the project vicinity. There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans, for or near, the project site. *No impact to endangered or protected biological resources would occur.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

Discussion: A Cultural Resource study entitled: *Residences at North Depot Street*, and dated May 2016, assessed the potential impacts to cultural and historical resources as a result of the project. A copy of the historical and cultural resources assessment is available for review at the City of Santa Maria Community Development, 110 South Pine Street, Room 101, Santa Maria, CA 93458, and online at: <http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml>

- a. As previously discussed, the project site is located in the City's original four square miles. Several sources identify development occurring in the project vicinity beginning in the late 1800's. However, impacts to any historic or cultural resources are anticipated.

Historical documentation identifies railroad tracks that ran in a north-south direction along the western and eastern sides of the subject property from about 1900 through 1954. The City of Santa Maria Landmarks Committee documents those railroad tracks as part of a rail network that carried crops and other freight nationwide from Santa Maria. To the south, the property at the northwest corner of West Main Street and North Depot Street is identified as the site of the Pacific Coast Railroad depot. The Landmarks Committee recognizes the influence of the Pacific Coast Railway on the development of the Santa Maria Valley and has designated the Main Street/Depot Street corner on its list of City Landmarks. A plaque just south of the neighboring commercial center recognizes the railroad and depot.

However, the Landmarks Committee designation is largely symbolic. There are no longer any remnants of the old railroad depot on the Main Street/Depot Street corner. In 1963 a Conditional Use Permit (U657) permitted a small office building to occupy the Main Street/Depot Street corner, and in 1990 a Planned Development Permit was approved to allow the current Depot Square commercial center on the corner site. The remainder of the railroad tracks were removed from the project area around 1982. Additionally, the proposed housing site is located approximately 150-feet north of the corner location. Therefore, the current housing project would have no effect on the Main Street/Depot Street corner.

In recognition of this railroad history, the project would install a commemorative display in its lobby. The display will include a collection of memorabilia and artifacts to commemorate the old Pacific Coast railroad history. A representative of the Landmarks Committee has recently endorsed the commemorative display and expressed Landmark Committee support the Residences at Depot Street housing project.

Furthermore, no structures located within the future housing site have been identified on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. A Cultural Resources Study entitled: *Residences at North Depot Street, Cultural Resources Study*, dated May 2016 was prepared by Rincon Consultants, Incorporated. The study concluded that no significant historic structures were present on the project site and the project would have no adverse effect any historic or cultural resources. Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. *A less than significant impact would occur.*

A copy of the cultural resources study is available for review at the City of Santa Maria Community Development, 110 South Pine Street, Room 101, Santa Maria, CA 93458 and online at:

[/http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml](http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml)

- b-d. The project site is within Archaeological Sensitivity Area 2 (Low Sensitivity) as identified by the City of Santa Maria's General Plan Resources Management Element, Figure RME-5. The Santa Maria Valley is not considered to be a major archaeological or paleontological resource area as only a few sites have been recorded or discovered (City of Santa Maria General Plan Resources Management Element, 1996). Based on Figure RME-5, the project site falls within areas of low sensitivity. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 stipulates that no further disturbances shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. With adherence to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, which stipulates the process to be followed when human remains are encountered, no mitigation measures are necessary. As a part of the project, standard protocols shall be established in the unlikely event that any potential historical resource is discovered during the construction and excavation stages. *No impacts to an archaeological resource would result from the project*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv. Landslides?				X
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the most recent Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

Discussion:

a.

- i. *Alquist-Priolo Zone:* Based on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Maps and related information that are available from the California Department of Conservation website, the City of Santa Maria is located in close proximity to an identified Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazard Zone.

The City of Santa Maria uses the standard California Building Code (CBC) specifications to engineer buildings to withstand the magnitude range of earthquakes that could be expected to occur in that zone. *Impacts are considered less than significant.*

- ii. *Seismic Ground Shaking:* Seismic ground shaking is influenced by the proximity of the site to an earthquake fault, the intensity of the seismic event, and the underlying soil composition. The Seismic Hazard Maps on the California Department of Conservation website show that the entire Santa Maria Valley is located in a lower hazard area.

Figure SE-2 of the City of Santa Maria's General Plan Safety Element (1995) identifies the project site as being near an area of identified expansive soils.

The effect of seismic ground shaking would be minimized by implementing the seismic requirements specified by the CBC and applicable City standards for earthquake resistant construction. *Impacts are considered less than significant.*

- iii. *Seismic Ground Failure (Liquefaction):* Based on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Maps and related information that are available from the California Department of Conservation website the City of Santa Maria is not in a location of liquefaction.

Figure SE-2 in the City of Santa Maria's General Plan Safety Element, the project soil conditions are not considered to be highly susceptible to liquefaction and there is no perched groundwater under the project site. Impacts from liquefaction are less

than significant. Regardless, the project would be required to comply with applicable provisions of the most recently adopted version of the CBC and the City's building regulations. *Impacts would be less than significant.*

- iv. *Landslide:* The City of Santa Maria is not located in a landslide zone. The site is relatively flat and is not near slopes that would be susceptible to landslides. *Therefore, no impact would result from landslides.*
- b. According to the *Soil Survey of Northern Santa Barbara Area California*, dated according to the *Soil Survey of Northern Santa Barbara Area California*, dated July 1972, and prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, the primary soil type underlying the project site is Sorrento sandy Loam (StA); 0 to 2 percent slope. This soil is described as a nearly level soil occurring on smooth flood plains in the Santa Maria Valley. Permeability is described as moderately rapid. Surface runoff is very slow, and erosion hazard is described as none to slight.

In the short term, construction activity associated with project development may result in wind and water driven soil erosion and loss of topsoil due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed.

The applicant will be required to adhere to conditions under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be administered throughout project construction. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will incorporate Best Management Practices to ensure that potential water quality impacts during construction from soil erosion would be reduced to *less than significant levels*.

In the long-term, pavement and new landscaping, including trees installed, as part of the project will reinforce soil stability. *Therefore, erosion impacts would be less than significant.*

- c. The following analysis is based on Figure SE-2 of the City of Santa Maria's General Plan Safety Element (1995):

Liquefaction or Collapse: The soil conditions at the site are not considered susceptible to liquefaction. Impacts from liquefaction are *less than significant*.

Landslide: The site is relatively flat and is not in the vicinity of slopes that would be susceptible to landslides. *No impact would result from landslide susceptibility.*

Lateral Spreading: As discussed in the response to landslides (see above), the site is not located in an identified landslide hazard area, is relatively flat, and is not in the vicinity of slopes that would be susceptible to landslides. *Impacts from lateral spreading are less than significant.*

Subsidence: The soil conditions at the site are not considered susceptible to subsidence. There are no clay or expansive soils underlying the project site. *Impacts from land subsidence are less than significant.*

- d. According to Figure SE-2 of the City of Santa Maria's General Plan Safety Element (1995), there are expansive soils on or near the project site. However, all future developments will be required to comply with the most recent CBC requirements which would ensure protection of structures and occupants from geo-seismic hazards, such as expansive soils. *Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.*

- e. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be used for this project. The City of Santa Maria requires sewer connections to the City's wastewater treatment system, by ordinance, in Title 8 of the Municipal Code. *No impact would occur.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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	

Discussion:

- a-b. As discussed in the Air Quality Section above, the proposed project would remove the current industrial land use designations and would eliminate the potential for the types of industrial operations that would have a higher probability to result in air quality impacts. Moreover, the vast majority of the project residents would not own or operate motor vehicles. Thus, the air quality impacts associated with vehicle trips are anticipated to be substantially reduced. Consistent with applicable air quality plans, the project would implement several measures to encourage walking, bicycling, ridesharing and the use of public transit as the primary transportation modes for its residents. Furthermore, the project would establish over 100 canopy trees onto a former industrial site that has virtually no vegetation and is currently covered with concrete paving.

The proposed land use and zone change and the resulting housing development would support applicable air quality plans, and as a result, the project is anticipated to promote an incremental reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. The project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of an applicable air quality plan. The project would not violate any air quality standard. *Therefore, potential greenhouse gas emission impacts are anticipated to be less than significant both directly and indirectly.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		X		
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Discussion:

- a-c. Based on the proposed residential use, there would be no circumstances in which hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials or substances would occur. As previously discussed in the Air Quality section, some existing industrial businesses are in close proximity to the project site and the future project residents could potentially be exposed to materials associated with the nearby industrial operations. Given the generally small scale nature of the nearby industrial operations, exposure to substantial amounts of toxic materials is considered to be unlikely. Additionally, since the predominant land use in the project vicinity is typified by residential neighborhoods, the project is anticipated to improve the overall livability for area residents.

High-voltage PG&E transmission lines traverse the westerly portion of the project site, and the apartment project would place its residents in relatively close proximity to those transmission lines. The General Plan Safety Element (Safety Element Pages S-10 through S-12), notes that no conclusive evidence has been found to link exposure to high-voltage utility lines to any adverse health effects. Furthermore, these findings are exemplified practically. Along the 2-mile segment of Railroad Avenue, between the Fesler/Depot Street intersection and the Santa Maria River to the north, there are currently over 200 residences located in similar proximity to this PG&E easement, and no known health or *cluster* effects have been identified.

The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. The project would not significantly increase the risk of exposure of people to substantially hazardous materials in the environment. *A less than significant impact would occur as a result of the project.*

- d. Based on research of the California Environmental Protection Agency's website the project site is not identified State's Cortese List of contaminated sites. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), entitled: *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 123 North Depot Street, Santa Maria California*, dated November 19, 2015 was prepared by Rincon Environmental Consultants, Incorporated. The Phase 1 site assessment identified five potential sources of hazardous materials, or Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) and potential RECs, as follows:

1. Historical railroad tracks formerly located on the subject property.
2. Historic underground storage tank (UST) located on the subject property.
3. Former agricultural chemical and seed companies located on the subject property from 1968 through 2003.
4. Historic lumberyard present on the southern portion of the subject property from 1900 through 1906.
5. One crude oil pipeline and associated release located on the subject property.

Based on the above, a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared to evaluate the RECs described above. The ESA identified elevated levels of lead at shallow depths in the subject property. The elevated levels of lead contaminants are identified *as a potentially significant impact.*

Haz-1: Under the supervision of the Santa Barbara County Department of Health, Department, Environmental Health Services division, LUFT Program & Site Mitigation Unit (SMU), contaminated soils shall be removed from the project site to the standards and specifications of the County Site Mitigation Unit.

Mitigation Requirements: The project shall be required to excavate, remove and dispose of contaminated soils accordingly. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit for apartment construction the applicant shall obtain a *No Further Action* letter, or equivalent documentation from the Hazardous Materials Unit to demonstrate the site has been remediated to County Health Department residential occupancy standards. The project design shall incorporate any measures as recommended by the SMU.

Timing: The applicant shall implement the above-cited measure prior to issuance of building building permits for the two residential structures.

Haz-2: Upon removal of the concrete slabs covering the site, a subsequent Phase 1 site assessment shall be performed by a qualified soils engineer. If the potential for hazardous materials exists in those areas, the applicant shall implement measures as specified in mitigation measure Haz-1.

Haz-3: The following directive shall be placed on the Cover Sheet of the Grading Plans and shall be implemented during all phases of earth moving, construction and grading.

Stop work immediately and contact the County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services Division, Hazardous Materials Unit (HMU) at (805) 346-8460 if visual contamination or chemical odors are detected while implementing the approved work at this site. Resumption of work shall require approval of the HMU.

Timing: The applicant shall implement the above-cited measure prior to issuance of a building permit for the residential structures.

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: See mitigation measures listed under hazards and Hazardous Materials above

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? -			X	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Discussion:

- a-f. *Impervious Surfaces and Stormwater Runoff:* Impervious surfaces resulting from buildings, parking and driveways, roads and other hardscape areas are known to increase runoff rates, duration and intensity, potentially resulting in adverse impacts to beneficial uses downstream.

Approximately 95% (2.3 acres) of the 2.7 acre housing site is already covered by impervious surfaces. The project would replace a former industrial site that is substantially covered with paved surfaces, with a new apartment project. The housing development would provide landscaped areas, tree plantings and on-site stormwater detention facilities.

A Technical Guide was established by Santa Barbara County's Project Cleanwater. The Project Cleanwater Technical Guide provides the procedures, guidelines and tools necessary to in accordance with Water Board Resolution R-32013-032. The project has prepared, and shall implement, a Stormwater Control Plan in accordance with the format established by the Project Cleanwater Technical Guide. The Project design shall incorporate the following:

- Based on specified Drainage Management Areas (DMA's), Stormwater from rooftops, parking areas and other impervious surfaces shall be, directed into a series on-site stormwater bio-retention facilities;
- The on-site bio-retention basins shall be sized to Water Board specifications, to detain and infiltrate the project's stormwater to the 95th percentile event (based on the approved Stormwater Control Plan and aligned with the Project's Site Plan, Grading Plan, and Landscape Plan);
- On site basins shall control peak flows not to exceed pre-project flows for the two-year through ten-year events;
- The Project landscape plan shall incorporate approximately 100 canopy trees into the landscape scheme. The canopy trees will support evapo-transpiration of stormwater.

The project will bring the site closer to its historic (pre-development) condition as it existed before urban development occurred and surface paving covered most of the 2.7

acres. Redevelopment of the project site is anticipated to result in substantial water quality improvement over the current site condition.

Construction Measures: In accordance with the City's Municipal Code standards, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be implemented by the project developer during all phases of project construction.

Based on the above, the proposed project would meet all applicable established water quality standards during all phases of development. The project would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge; or substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. The project would not contribute runoff water to exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff downstream. The project would not substantially degrade water quality. *A less than significant impact would occur to ground water, surface water or downstream hydrologic functions.*

- g-h. National Flood Insurance Program Community Panel 180, September 30, 2005, shows the project site is designated as Flood Zone(s) X. As shown, the majority of the project site is located outside of the 2% annual chance floodplain. The very northernmost portion of the property is located in the area described as: *Area of 0.2% annual chance flood; areas of 1% flood with average depths of less than one foot or with drainage areas less than one square mile; and areas protected by levees from 1% annual chance of flood.* Therefore, based on the Flood Rate Map, only small portion of the project site would be exposed a 1% (100-year) flood, in that case only at very shallow depths of one foot or less.

In 2014, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, the County of Santa Barbara and the City of Santa Maria completed the Santa Maria River Levee Improvement Project. The project was intended to strengthen nearly seven miles of levee from Blosser Road to the Bradley Canyon Levee, east of the city's landfill. Thus, potential flooding impacts have been further reduced. The project site is not located within a designated flood hazard area in which structures which would impede or redirect flood flows or an area considered susceptible to significant inundation at substantial depths. *A less than significant flood impact would occur.*

- i. Twitchell Dam is the closest potential source of dam inundation in the Planning Area. However, Twitchell Dam is not used for perennial water storage. The dam was constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1958, and is primarily used for groundwater recharge and flood control. It is an earthfill dam, 216 feet in height, with a storage capacity of over 240,000 acre-feet. If Twitchell Dam is filled to capacity and the dam and the Santa Maria Levee fail, a significant portion of the City would be inundated by flood waters. However, the probability of dam failure and levee failure is remote. In addition, the dam holds water only periodically and is not a reservoir. The project site is not within a *Flood Hazard* area or a *Dam Inundation* area as shown on Safety Element Figure SE-3 of the General Plan.

As discussed above, the National Flood Insurance Program Community Panel 180 shows the project site to be located in Flood Zone X, with a portion of the site having a worst case potential for flooding at depths of less than one foot and this designation generally marks potential flood inundation before construction of Twitchell Reservoir and the Santa Maria River Levee. Therefore, the project would not be at a significant risk from flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or a dam. *Impacts would be less than significant.*

- j. The project site is approximately ten miles from the coast and therefore it is not at risk of inundation by tsunamis. There are no bodies of water in the vicinity of the project site that are large enough to produce a seiche that could impact the project. The project site is not located in an area prone to landslides, mudslides, soil slips, or slumps. *Therefore, no impacts would occur.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?				X
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Discussion:

- a. The HCM Heavy Commercial land use designation is important to provide the land needed for the production of industrial goods and services and the jobs they create. However, since the end of railroad operations in the area the viability of industrial businesses in the project area has become limited. As importantly, the project area is predominated by residential neighborhoods.

The General Plan specifies the current Heavy Commercial Manufacturing (HCM) land use designation is: *intended for those industrial uses which may be land extensive, require transport of materials by heavy truck, requires large loading and docking areas, and where the possibilities of heavy noise generation exist.*

The General Plan states: *The proposed High Density Residential (HDR) land use designation is intended to provide for an urban residential environment, close to shopping facilities, and as well provide an incentive for investment on older established areas.*

The proposed General Plan land use and zoning map amendment is fully aligned with the High Density Residential land use designation. The Residences at Depot Street housing project is anticipated to support neighborhood revitalization and would be consistent with, and compatible, to the predominant residential uses in the project vicinity. Thus, the project is expected to further integrate the surrounding residential community. *The proposed project would not physically divide an established community and therefore, no impact would result.*

- b. The project would not be in conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project. The proposed project would support the following General Plan goals and objectives:

OBJECTIVE L.U.1a

Residential: Establish residential areas for 1) the provision of a variety of home sites, housing types, and lifestyles; 2) the promotion of neighborhood integrity; and 3) the protection of individual property values by encouraging compatible uses and proper standards for design and development.

OBJECTIVE L.U.5c

Undertake an infill program which will promote new development within the City on undeveloped or underdeveloped parcels.

L.U.6h

Promote the use of alternate modes of transit to reduce traffic, improve air quality and reduce noise impacts (refer to the Circulation Element for similar policies).

GOAL L.U.3 -- URBAN DESIGN

The City will promote quality urban design enhancing Santa Maria's character.

The project would be consistent with and supportive of the above-cited General Plan Goals and Objectives. The housing project would revitalize an underutilized industrial site and establish a needed residential use that would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. *The proposed project would not conflict with existing plans or policies, and therefore no impact would result from the project.*

- c. Based on a survey of Federal, State, and County agencies that are responsible for regulating habitat conservation, the project site does not occur within the boundaries of any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. *Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

11. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Discussion:

- a,b. Within the City, the primary resources suitable for mining and conservation are sand, rock, and oil (City of Santa Maria's Resources Management Element of the General Plan, 1996). According to Figure RME-4 of the City of Santa Maria's Resource Management Element

(RME) of the General Plan, the project site is located within the areas of operational, existing, or abandoned oil facilities. *No impacts to oil or gravel mining would occur as a result of this project.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

12. NOISE

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

A Noise Report entitled: *The Residences at Depot Street Project, Santa Maria California*, and dated May 12, 2016, was prepared by Dudek Associates Incorporated. A copy of the Noise Report is available for review at the City of Santa Maria Community Development, 110 South Pine Street, Room 101, Santa Maria, CA 93458 and online at:
[/http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml](http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml)

Discussion:

- a. The applicable noise regulations are contained in the City's General Plan Noise Element and Municipal Code.

Long Term Impacts

Exterior Noise: The Noise Report assessed potential impacts on the private patios and the balcony areas, the tot lots, sport court and the community garden space. The Noise Study predicted exterior noise levels at the Depot Street frontage would reach 64 dBA CNEL and would therefore, exceed the City's maximum acceptable 60 dBA range,

particularly for the outdoor patios and balconies facing North Depot Street. The 64 dBA CNEL outdoor noise level in those areas would be considered a *potentially significant impact*.

Interior Noise: For interior noise, the Noise Study projected the maximum exterior noise exposure would not exceed 64 dB CNEL and recognized that standard construction materials and techniques would be expected to result in a minimum noise attenuation of 20 dB. Therefore, the 20 dB reduction would result in interior noise levels at 44 dB CNEL or less. *Interior noise impacts would be less than significant.*

e Mitigation Measures: The Noise Study identified two methods to mitigate outdoor noise impacts. The first method would require the construction of solid barriers around the perimeter of the balconies and decks facing North Depot Street. The sound barriers would reduce the noise impacts to the easterly outdoor patios and decks to acceptable levels. However, from an urban design and an aesthetic standpoint, the provision of solid sound barriers around the open space areas would not be a preferred alternative.

Disclosure Statement: The City of Santa Maria's Noise Element offers an exception for exterior living areas in multi-family residential projects located in urban neighborhoods where elevated noise levels exist. Exterior living areas may be located in an area with CNL not exceeding 75 dBA, without the need for sound barriers if a notice is given to prospective tenants advising them of the potential for elevated noise disturbance in the area.

NOISE-1: The following disclosure statement would be provided to notify prospective tenants of the potential for elevated outdoor noise:

This property is presently located in an urban area which is periodically and regularly experiences elevated noise levels. Potential sources of this noise may be automobile traffic, railroad operations, flying aircraft, industrial/commercial uses and general human activity in an urban environment. You may wish to consider what noise level annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your rental agreement and determine whether they are acceptable to you.

The development would comply with the City of Santa Maria General Plan Noise Element by employing the above-cited exception and providing the above-stated notice to prospective tenants of the residences with patios or balconies on the easterly (Depot Street) façade. The project would then achieve compliance with the City of Santa Maria 60 dBA CNEL exterior noise criterion.

Mitigation Requirements: The project shall provide a disclosure statement to prospective tenants of those apartment units with easterly facing balconies and decks as a part of its lease agreement. The form and content of the disclosure shall be to the satisfaction of the City and shall be submitted for review and approval as a part of the Density Bonus Agreement, or other recordable documentation.

Timing: The noise disclosure would be approved by the City prior to issuance of a Building Permit for occupancy of the first building and would be implemented by the project owner for the life of the project. Disclosures shall be provided to prospective tenants at the time they sign the lease.

Short-Term Impacts

The City's threshold of significance for noise impacts is sound levels that reach 60 dBA for exterior and 45 dBA for interior locations for residential uses such as single-family, duplexes, multi-family, and mobile homes. Construction noise could exceed these levels.

Pursuant to the City's Noise Ordinance, construction activity is limited to daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays, and prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays. Because of the short duration of the construction noise and the fact the project has to comply with mandatory requirements in the City's Noise Ordinance, *impacts are considered less than significant.*

A copy of the noise study is available for review at the City of Santa Maria Community Development, 110 South Pine Street, Room 101; Santa Maria, CA 93458 and online at: <http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml>

- b. The project would not result in or increase activities that would expose persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. Some industrial uses are abutting portions of the subject property, and the project would expose its residents to the potential effects of those industrial operations. However, given the small scale and limited scope of the nearby industrial business impacts are anticipated to be limited. *Impacts would be less than significant.*
- c-d. The project would not result in a substantial temporary, periodic or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels. *No impact would occur.*
- e. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan and is approximately three miles from the outer limits of the Santa Maria Airport. *No impact would occur.*
- f. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would therefore not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. *No impact would occur.*

Mitigation Measure(s) See mitigation measures listed under Noise above.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would construct 80-new affordable housing units. The proposed project would fulfill some of the need in the community to provide high-quality affordable housing. The project would redevelop an underutilized infill site where municipal services and facilities are already in place. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. *Impacts to population growth would be less than significant.*
- b.c. The project site is currently underutilized land designated for HCM (Heavy Commercial Manufacturing) use. The proposed high density residential land use designation would accommodate more housing to fill an important need for an underserved segment of the community. The project would not displace any existing housing units or people. *There would be no impact related to the displacement of housing or people.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

14. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?			X	
ii. Police protection?			X	
iii. Schools?			X	
iv. Parks?			X	
v. Other public facilities?			X	

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is an 80-unit unit affordable housing development. The project would redevelop an underutilized infill site where municipal services and facilities are already in place:
- i. The proposed project would be served by the Fire Department. The nearest fire station is Fire Station #1, located at 300 West Cook Street approximately 1,800 feet southeast of the project site. The Fire Department has reviewed the project and has determined that adequate facilities exist in the vicinity of the project site (and if needed in conjunction with other fire facilities in the city) to maintain the required service ratios and response times mandated by the General Plan. No new or altered fire facilities are required to meet the required service ratio or response times. There are no other performance standards required for the project in addition to service ratios or response times. In addition, Development Impact

Fees are collected for the provision of capital facilities for fire services which will provide for future facilities as the City develops. Based on the above analysis, *impacts to fire services are considered less than significant.*

- ii. The proposed project would be served by the Police Department, located at 1111 West Betteravia Road, approximately two miles southwest of the project site. There are no required response times or other performance standards applicable to the project for police services. A review of the project by the Police Department determined that new or altered facilities are not required to maintain this service ratio and that existing facilities/ personnel can adequately respond to calls for service and to periodically monitor the project site. In addition, Development Impact Fees are collected for the provision of capital facilities for police facilities which will provide for future facilities as the City's population increases. Based on the above analysis, *impacts to police services are considered less than significant.*
- iii. The proposed project will not add additional students to the School District. However, impacts on schools will be mitigated by the payment of mandatory school impact fees. Based on the above analysis, *impacts to schools are considered less than significant.*
- iv. The nearest parks are the Veterans Memorial Community Center and park, approximately 2,500 feet northeasterly, and Rosalind Pearlman Park which is approximately 2,500 feet southeast of the project site. Other community facilities including Simas Park, the Abel Maldonado Community Youth Center and the Paul Nelson Aquatics Center, are less than one-mile from the project site to the east. No new or altered parks are required to provide park services to the project. In addition, the City requires the payment of mandatory park fees to continue to provide park and recreation facilities as population increases. Based on the above analysis, *impacts to parks are considered less than significant.*
- v. The City's library system includes a main library located within the civic center complex on McClelland Street and three branch libraries located at various locations. Based on library usage, the existing system can adequately provide library services for the City including the addition of the proposed project. No new or altered library facilities are needed. In addition, Development Impact Fees are collected for the provision of capital facilities for library facilities which will provide for future facilities as the city's population increases. Based on the above analysis, *impacts to other public facilities are considered less than significant.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

15. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Discussion:

- a.b. The 80-unit housing development would not result in the need for new recreational facilities (i.e., parkland) because the overall ratio of parkland per person according to the General Plan is maintained even with the construction of the project. The project will still be required to pay growth mitigation fees for Recreation and Parks. Additionally, the project will provide over 20,000 square feet of on-site recreational amenities for its residents. Furthermore, as discussed in if the Public Services discussion above, this inner City location is adequately served by parklands. *No impact would occur.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None required

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?		X		
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X		
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X	
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X		
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?		X		

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X

Discussion: Potential traffic impacts were analyzed in the Traffic Report entitled: *Depot Square, Traffic and Circulation Study, City of Santa Maria*, prepared by Stantec Transportation Engineers, Incorporated and dated, July 13, 2016. A copy of the Traffic Report is available for review at the City of Santa Maria Community Development, 110 South Pine Street, Room 101, Santa Maria, CA 93458 and online at:

[/http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml](http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml)

The background information and analysis contained in the traffic report has been summarized in this Initial Study/Checklist, as follows:

- a-b. *Would the project cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections), or conflict with an applicable congestion management program?*

Potential traffic impacts were analyzed in the Traffic Report entitled: *Depot Square, Traffic and Circulation Study – City of Santa Maria California*, prepared by Stantec Transportation Engineers, Incorporated, and dated, July 13, 2016. The background information and analysis contained in the Traffic Study has been summarized as follows:

Level of Service (LOS): The City of Santa Maria considers level of service (LOS) D or better as acceptable for intersections and roadways, with mitigation required for LOS E/F. Using a worst case scenario, the Traffic Study, projected the project would generate 532 Average Daily Trips (ADT); and 50 P.M. peak hour trips.

Levels of Service were calculated for the study area intersections assuming the Existing + Project traffic volumes. The Traffic Study found that, under existing pre-project conditions the Depot Street/Fesler Street intersection currently operates at Level of Service E, below acceptable levels. The Traffic Study projected that under existing plus project conditions, the project would increase delay on the northbound approach and thereby generating a project specific impact. Therefore, *a potentially significant LOS impact would result at the Depot Street/Fesler Street intersection*. All of the other intersections within the study area would operate at LOS C or better under project conditions.

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative forecasts were developed using the City of Santa Maria Major Project list (July 2015) and the list of approved and pending projects contained in the City of Guadalupe Housing Element (October 2015). The Traffic Study concluded that the Fesler Street/Depot Street intersection would continue to operate below the City's LOS D standard during the PM peak hour. *Therefore, a potentially significant cumulative impact would result*. The remaining intersections in the study area would operate at LOS C or better under cumulative conditions.

Site Access: Access to the project site is proposed from one full access driveway on Depot Street opposite Mill Street, and one egress only driveway south of Chapel Street. Vehicle ownership will be restricted by the project. Based on low project driveway volumes on Depot Street, the driveway connections are projected to operate acceptably. The driveways will be controlled by stop signs and adequate sight distance would be provided from the driveways to vehicles on Depot Street. *Therefore, no impact would result from site ingress/egress.*

Queueing Analysis: The distance from Main Street to the southern project egress driveway would be 315 feet. The peak queue on Depot Street would extend a maximum of 250 feet from Main Street, which would not obstruct the driveway under project conditions. The distance from Fesler Street to the northern driveway would be 350 feet. The peak queue of 475 feet would extend beyond the northern driveway and would potentially block ingress and egress at the northerly driveway. *Therefore, a potentially significant impact would result.*

Congestion Management Program (CMP): The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG), has developed a set of traffic impact thresholds to assess the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on the regional transportation facilities located within the Congestion Management Program (CMP) program roadway system. The CMP considers LOS D acceptable for CMP roadways and intersections, with deficiency plans required when operations degrade to LOS E or F. The Traffic Study concluded that all of the CMP intersections are forecast to operate at LOS D or better with Project traffic volumes. The project would therefore not impact the CMP network under Existing + Project conditions. *Less than significant impacts would result to the CMP program roadway system.*

PROJECT SPECIFIC MITIGATIONS

TRAFFIC-1: The project would implement the following improvements to achieve compliance with the City of Santa Maria Level of Service Standards:

Mitigation Requirements: To improve the Levels of Service, the Fesler Road/Depot Street intersection would have to be converted by the project from a two-way stop to an all-way stop. The intersection would then operate at a LOS B/C range.

Timing: The all-way stop improvements would be made, to the satisfaction of the City's Department of Public Works, prior to occupancy of the Residences at Depot Street housing development.

Monitoring: The traffic improvements would be designed to the specifications of the City and installed to the satisfaction for the Department of Public Works. The Department of Public Works would monitor the function of the intersection to ensure appropriate traffic movements and LOS standards are met.

A copy of the traffic study is available for review at the City of Santa Maria Community Development, 110 South Pine Street, Room 101, Santa Maria, CA 93458 and online at: <http://www.cityofsantamaria.org/207-DocumentsOutForPublicReview.shtml>

- c. *Result in a change in air traffic patterns?* The change from the industrial land use and zoning designations to the high density residential designation would have no impact on airport facilities or operations. The closest airport to the project site is the Santa Maria

Public Airport (SMX) which is approximately four miles from the project site. The project would not directly impact any airport facilities, and thus would not affect the directional patterns of aircraft. *Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to air traffic patterns.*

- d. *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature?* The project would not create, involve or result in any design features that would substantially increase a hazard condition. As discussed, traffic improvements associated with the project are anticipated to improve traffic Levels of Service and improve overall safety conditions at the Depot Street/Fesler Street intersection. *A less than significant impact.*
- e. *Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?* As discussed above the unmitigated project would result in an impact to the northbound Depot Street/Fesler Street intersection. Unmitigated peak-hour queuing would be projected to block the northerly ingress/egress driveway onto the project site. The project would implement mitigation measures (a four-way stop) that are projected to improve safety at that intersection and access into the project site. Implementation of the above-cited improvements would result in a *less than significant impact would result.*
- f. *Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?* As discussed, the Residences at Depot Street housing project shall incorporate measures to promote alternative modes of transportation, including, but not limited to the provision a walkable environment with enhanced pedestrian connections; the provision of bicycle facilities, and direct connections to the Santa Maria Area Transit (SMAT) bus facilities. Additionally, the project shall contribute its fair share to construct roadway and infrastructure improvements. Bicycle lanes and bus pull-out are programmed to be installed along North Depot Street. The project and its residents would provide supporting usage of those facilities. *The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No impact would occur*

Mitigation Measure(s) See mitigation measures listed under Transportation and Traffic above.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Discussion:

- a. The proposed use would generate typical wastewater. All wastewater generated by the project would be domestic sewage. The City is required to adhere to the requirements of Chapter 8-12 of the Municipal Code, which requires pretreatment to prevent the introduction of pollutants into the regional sewerage system. Any surface runoff from the project is addressed in the Hydrology/Water Quality section of this Initial Study. Therefore, the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board would not be exceeded, and *no impact would occur with development of this project.*
- b. The existing water and wastewater infrastructure has excess capacity to accommodate the proposed project and is adequately sized according to a review of the project plans by the City's Public Works Department. The only water and wastewater improvements required for the project are onsite pipelines and unit connections to the existing water and wastewater infrastructure systems. The project will not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site. *Therefore, there are no impacts associated with respect to water and wastewater facilities.*
- c. The project is an infill project located in an urbanized portion of the City where municipal services and facilities are already in place. The project would construct on-site detention. In accordance with the Region 3 Water Board stormwater permit the project would install facilities to detain and infiltrate stormwater on-site. The project would not require construction of new stormwater infrastructure. *Impacts would be less than significant.*
- d. The City derives its water supply from two sources: groundwater production from wells operated by the City's Utilities Department and from water entitlements from the State Water Project. The Urban Water Management Plan evaluated the City's existing and

planned water sources, and water distribution systems with respect to their ability to meet projected demands. The Urban Water Management Plan considered the City's General Plan Land Use Plan in determining future water demand. The maximum daily demand water supply capacity requirement for 2015 is 17.5 million gallons per day whereas the capacity available is 41 million gallons per day. Annual water demand is estimated to be 13,000 acre feet per year (approximately 19,200 gallons per day).

For 2020, a maximum capacity of 18.0 million gallons per day is required with 43 million gallons per day available. At ultimate buildout in 2025, the capacity requirement will be 18.5 million gallons per day with 43 million gallons per day available. Based on the aforementioned information, the City, with its present and imminent mix of water sources, possesses a significant surplus of capacity. *Therefore, the proposed project impact would be less than significant.*

- e. Based on per capita generation factors for wastewater being 65% of water usage (1983 Project Assessment Manual), the proposed project is projected to generate 20,398 gallons per day of wastewater. The Wastewater Facilities Master Plan for the service area in which the project is located indicated that treatment capacity expansions needed to accommodate the forecasted future flows for growth in the service area through 2025 have been constructed and are in operation.
- f. According to the City's Project Assessment Model, 2015, the proposed project would generate approximately 82.4 tons of solid waste per year. The primary receptor of the City's solid waste is the Santa Maria Landfill. The Santa Maria Landfill has a total capacity of 1.3 million cubic yards and is permitted through the year 2018. This permitted capacity was established considering future growth in the service area including growth based on the City's General Plan buildout projections. Therefore, the project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs until the Los Flores Ranch Landfill is permitted and operational. *Therefore, the proposed project impact would be less than significant.*
- g. The California Integrated Waste Management Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50% or better diversion rate for solid waste. The City implements this requirement through its Chapter 8-11 Refuse Collection and Recycling of the City's Municipal Code. Chapter 8-11 of the City's Municipal Code establishes the policies for "Collection Agreements" between the City and waste disposal contractors. This section requires agreements between the City and the contracted waste disposal companies to establish procedures for complying with all state and federal laws, rules and regulations pertaining to solid waste handling services, and for implementing state-mandated programs including the City's Source Reduction and Recycling and Household Hazardous Waste programs. Therefore, the project would not cause any significant impacts from conflicts with statutes or regulations related to solid waste, *and no impacts would occur.*

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None Required

CONSULTATION AND DATA SOURCES

CONSULTATION SOURCES

City Departments Consulted

<input type="checkbox"/>	Administrative Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attorney
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire
<input type="checkbox"/>	Library
<input type="checkbox"/>	City Manager
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Police
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Works
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Utilities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Recreation and Parks

County Agencies/Departments Consulted

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Pollution Control District
<input type="checkbox"/>	Association of Governments
<input type="checkbox"/>	Flood Control District
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Environmental Health
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire (Hazardous Materials)
<input type="checkbox"/>	LAFCO
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Works
<input type="checkbox"/>	Planning and Development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (list)

Special Districts Consulted

<input type="checkbox"/>	Santa Maria Public Airport
<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport Land Use Commission
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cemetery
<input type="checkbox"/>	Santa-Maria Bonita School District
<input type="checkbox"/>	Santa Maria Joint Union High School
<input type="checkbox"/>	Laguna County Sanitation District
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cal Cities Water Company

State/Federal Agencies Consulted

<input type="checkbox"/>	Army Corps of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Caltrans
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Fish and Game
<input type="checkbox"/>	Federal Fish and Wildlife
<input type="checkbox"/>	FAA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Regional Water Quality Control Bd.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Integrated Waste Management Bd.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (list)

DATA SOURCES

General Plan

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Land Use Element
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Circulation Element
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Element
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise Element
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Housing Element
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Resources Management Element

Other

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural Preserve Maps
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Archaeological Maps/Reports
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Architectural Elevations
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biology Reports
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Oil and Gas Maps
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FEMA Maps (Flood)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Grading Plans
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Site Plan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Topographic Maps
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aerial Photos
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Traffic Studies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Trip Generation Manual (ITE)
<input type="checkbox"/>	URBEMIS Air Quality Model
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zoning Maps
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (list)

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
2. 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	
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics/Visual Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use and Planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forest Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	X	Noise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population and Housing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology and Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	X	Transportation/Traffic
X	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities and Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology and Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	

DETERMINATION

On the basis of the Initial Study, the staff of the Community Development Department:

- ____ Finds that the proposed project is a Class ____ **CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION** and no further environmental review is required.
- ____ Finds that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- X** 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ____ Finds that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- ____ Finds that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to acceptable standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)/SUBSEQUENT EIR/SUPPLEMENTAL EIR/ADDENDUM** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ____ Finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to acceptable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Bill Scott

Bill Scott
Environmental Analyst

9/19/16

Date

Lawrence W. Appel

Lawrence W. Appel
Environmental Officer

9-19-16

Date



City of Santa Maria
Community Development Department
110 South Pine Street, #101
Santa Maria, CA 93458
805-925-0951, Ex. 244