



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Planning and Development

[www.sbcountyplanning.org](http://www.sbcountyplanning.org)

## Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration Cosmoledo Trust New Residence

**Case Numbers: 19NGD-00000-00008, 18APL-00000-00008, 18APL-00000-00009, 17CDH-00000-00014**



### Owner/Applicant

Cosmoledo Trust  
1910 Outpost Drive  
Los Angeles, CA 90068  
(310) 552-0960

### Agent

Laurel Fisher Perez  
SEPPS, Inc.  
1625 State Street, Suite #1  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
(805) 966-2758

For More Information Contact Sean Stewart, Development Review Division, Planner (805) 568-2517

## 1.0 REQUEST/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is for a Coastal Development Permit with hearing to allow the demolition of a 2,634 square foot residence, a 384 square foot attached carport, and 794 square feet of wooden decking. New construction to be permitted would include a 7,683 gross square foot single family dwelling, a 2,403 gross square foot basement garage, a 14' x 64' pool, and associated grading, retaining walls, hardscaping and landscaping. Grading would include approximately 470 cubic yards of cut, 380 cubic yards of import, and 850 cubic yards of fill. The project has been designed to maintain the 12" DBH Norfolk Island pine tree in place. Seven Myoporum trees and two peach trees are proposed for removal. The parcel would continue to be served by the Carpinteria Valley Water District, the Carpinteria Sanitary District, and the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District. Access would continue to be provided off of Sand Point Road. The property is a 6.3-acre parcel with split zoning. The northern 3.95 acres of the parcel (Carpinteria salt marsh) is zoned RES-100 and the southern 2.35 acres of the parcel is zoned 10-R-1. The property is shown as Assessor's Parcel Number 005-460-046, located at 711 Sand Point Road in the Carpinteria Area, 1st Supervisorial District.

## 2.0 PROJECT LOCATION

The project is located at 711 Sand Point Road in the Carpinteria area, APN: 005-460-046, First Supervisorial District.

<b>2.1 Site Information</b>	
Comprehensive Plan Designation	Coastal, Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood (EDRN), RES-3.3, Residential, 3.3 units per acre; Open Lands
Zoning District, Ordinance	Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance, 10-R-1 (Minimum Parcel Size: 10,000 square feet); RES-100 (Minimum Parcel Size 100 Acres); California Coastal Commission Appeals Jurisdiction
Site Size	0.92 acres located south of Sand Point Road (a portion of the 6.3 acre total legal lot, which includes 5.38 acres north of Sand Point Road including El Estero)
Present Use & Development	Existing single family dwelling
Surrounding Uses/Zoning	North: El Estero – RES-100 South: Pacific Ocean East: Single-Family Residential – 10-R-1 West: Single-Family Residential – 10-R-1
Access	Sand Point Road
Public Services	Water Supply: Carpinteria Valley Water District Sewage: Carpinteria Sanitary District Fire: Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District Law Enforcement: County Sheriff

## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

### 3.1 PHYSICAL SETTING

The subject property consists of 0.92 acres located south of Sand Point Road (a portion of a 6.3 acre total legal lot, which includes 5.38 acres north of Sand Point Road) and is developed with a 2,634 square foot, partial two story, single family residence, driveway, and utilities. The subject parcel abuts the El Estero

(Carpinteria) Slough to the north, the Pacific Ocean to the south, and residentially developed properties to the east and west. Soils on-site are mapped as “fill (aquents)” and “beaches.”

### 3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

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

## 4.0 METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluates the cumulative impacts of the project by considering the incremental effects of the proposed project in connection with the effects of past, present, or probable future projects causing impacts related to those impacts caused by the proposed project. As discussed in Sections 5.1-5.15 of this document, the incremental effect of the proposed project is not cumulatively considerable for any issue area. For the purposes of CEQA analysis, reasonably foreseeable projects include those that have submitted a permit application or are currently in the permitting process. When determining whether to include a related project, the following factors have been considered: the nature of each environmental resource being examined, the location of the project, and the type of project. The geographic scope of the cumulative analysis has been limited to projects within the vicinity of the proposed project, and particularly along Sand Point Road. This geographic scope has been chosen because it defines the neighborhood where the project is located, and includes projects such as 501 Sand Point Road (Case No. 18CDH-00000-00007, proposed construction of a new 2,800 SF residence, located 1,600 feet away), 607 Sand Point Road (Case No. 18CDH-00000-00013, demolition of an existing 4,275 square foot residence and construction of a new 4,412 gross square foot residence with 2,984 gross square feet of understory storage and garage space, located 900 feet away), 755 Sand Point Road (Case No. 13CDH-00000-00001, demolition of an existing 1,774 square foot dwelling and the construction of a new 5,995 square foot dwelling, with 5,800 square feet of lower level storage area, a 1,335 square foot attached garage, pool, and hot tub, located 362 feet away), and 721 Sand Point Road (Case No. 16CDH-00000-00031, construction of a new two-story structure consisting of a 507 square foot detached garage as the ground floor and a 462 square foot accessory structure above, located adjacent to the subject parcel).

## 5.0 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS CHECKLIST

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

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

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

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

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

**Reviewed Under Previous Document:** The analysis contained in a previously adopted/certified environmental document addresses this issue adequately for use in the current case and is summarized in the discussion below. The discussion should include reference to the previous documents, a citation of the

page(s) where the information is found, and identification of mitigation measures incorporated from the previous documents.

### 5.1 AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public or the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?			X		
b. Change to the visual character of an area?			X		
c. Glare or night lighting which may affect adjoining areas?				X	
d. Visually incompatible structures?			X		

**Existing Setting:**

The project site is located on Sand Point Road, a private roadway which extends along a sandspit which is bordered on the north by Carpinteria Slough (El Estero) and on the south by the Pacific Ocean. Views of this site are primarily limited to the immediate neighboring properties and Sand Point Road and from the beach. However, distant views of the property are available from Highway 101 and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) (both located approximately ¼ mile away) and from public walking paths located on the southeastern edge of Carpinteria Slough, approximately one mile away.

**County Environmental Thresholds:**

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

**Impact Discussion:**

(a) Views of the project site are primarily limited to viewing areas in the immediate neighboring properties and from Sand Point Road (a private road). However, distant views of the property are available from Highway 101 and UPRR (both located approximately ¼ mile away); see photos of the project site from each vantage point included as Attachment 5 and from public walking paths located on the southeastern edge of Carpinteria Slough, approximately one mile away. Public access to the narrow beach area along Sand Point Road, is only available in rare circumstances of extreme low tide by walking around the Casablanca seawall or if attempted by boat. The subject property is developed with an existing residence and is bordered on both sides by residential development. The proposed residence would continue the pattern of existing residential development along the beach and would not significantly obstruct views of the mountain backdrop from the beach area along Sand Point Road. Ocean views are generally not visible over the Sand Point Road community due to the distance, topographic changes from Highway 101 to Sand Point Road, existing vegetation, and existing residential development. Views from Highway 101 and the UPRR are also not significant views due to the short timeframe that the Sand Point Road community (and the subject property specifically) is visible to travelers. The subject property is visible for 5 seconds or less from Highway 101 when traveling at normal vehicle speeds. Several photos of the project site as viewed from Highway 101 are included as Attachment 5, and incorporated herein by reference. These photos demonstrate that the proposed residence will not significantly disrupt public views due to the fact that visibility of the project decreases due to the distance, the short timeframe of

visibility given speeds of travel associated with these vantage points, and the fact that the project would blend in with other existing development and vegetation located along Sand Point Road. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in obstruction of a scenic vista.

The proposed new dwelling would extend further toward the beach than the existing dwelling; however the new dwelling would follow the string-line of adjacent properties. Therefore, the proposed development would not significantly obstruct public views from any public road or from a public recreation area to, and along the coast.

(c) Lighting on the exterior of the proposed project would be designed to minimize light spillover to adjacent residences through the use of shielding, cut-off fixtures, or similar measures. In addition, all exterior project lighting would comply with applicable County regulations, and standard County conditions applied to the project would require that lighting be low-intensity, low-glare, and hooded to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties. Glare is currently generated by existing windows of the existing residence and adjacent residences, vehicle windows, and other reflective surfaces in the area. The façade of the project building would include wood shingles and would not contain highly reflective materials. Overall, the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light that would adversely affect adjacent light-sensitive areas or a new source of glare that would substantially affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, project impacts associated with light and glare would be less than significant.

(b, d) Sand Point Road was initially developed around the 1940's/50's with seasonal beach cottages and has been steadily redeveloped with larger homes over the years. This is reflected in the massing and architectural style of homes that exist along Sand Point Road today. The massing and architectural style of homes varies considerably, and includes modern, Cape-Cod, Mediterranean, and California bungalow style structures that range from estate-sized homes to beach cottages. Existing homes along Sand Point Road range from 1,530 square feet (for a home built in 1958) to 7,043 square feet (for a home built in 2003). The floor area ratio (FAR) for homes along Sand Point Road ranges from 1.2% to 23.5% when calculating FAR based solely on lot area located south of the Carpinteria Slough, which provides for better continuity among parcels and a more accurate reflection on FAR values. The proposed home would have total habitable area of 7,683 square feet and a FAR of 7.5% (see Attachment 6). Thus, the proposed home is well within the range square footage and FAR of existing homes along Sand Point Road.

The proposed residence, at a maximum height of approximately 25 feet in peak height, would result in an increase in height from the existing dwelling given that the new residence is two stories throughout all areas of the dwelling. Whereas the westerly portion of the existing dwelling is two stories with an approximate height of 23'-8", the remainder of the dwelling is single story. Therefore, the height and massing of the proposed residence would increase from the existing dwelling. The proposed residence is of a beach architectural style, which is already represented in a number of homes along Sand Point Road. The proposed project was reviewed by the South Board of Architectural Review (SBAR) on three occasions, during which the project's architecture, mass, bulk, scale, and neighborhood compatibility were all considered. On January 19, 2018, after considering these factors, the SBAR indicated the project was acceptable and could return for preliminary approval (please see full SBAR minutes, included as Attachment 2). Therefore, the project would not result in the construction of a home visually incompatible with the surrounding area and would not result in significant change to the visual character of the area.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

The implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in any substantial change in the aesthetic character of the area since it is visually compatible with its surroundings and will not significantly obstruct public views from any public road or from a public recreation area to, from, and along the coast. Therefore, the project's impacts to aesthetics, with respect to the cumulative projects identified in Section 4.0 of this IS and the general project vicinity, are not cumulatively considerable.

## 5.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use, impair agricultural land productivity (whether prime or non-prime) or conflict with agricultural preserve programs?				X	
b. An effect upon any unique or other farmland of State or Local Importance?				X	

The project site does not contain a combination of acreage and/or soils which render the site an important agricultural resource. The site does not adjoin and so will not impact any neighboring agricultural operations.

### Cumulative Impacts:

The County’s Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project’s contribution to a regionally significant issue constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, no agricultural resources exist on-site and no impacts have been identified. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact.

### Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

## 5.3a AIR QUALITY

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

### County Environmental Threshold:

Chapter 5 of the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (as revised in July 2015) addresses the subject of air quality. The thresholds provide that a proposed project will not have a significant impact on air quality if operation of the project will:

- emit (from all project sources, mobile and stationary), less than the daily trigger for offsets for any pollutant (currently 55 pounds per day for NOx and ROC, and 80 pounds per day for PM<sub>10</sub>);
- emit less than 25 pounds per day of oxides of nitrogen (NOx) or reactive organic compounds (ROC) from motor vehicle trips only;
- not cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone);
- not exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD

- Board; and
- be consistent with the adopted federal and state Air Quality Plans.

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

**Impact Discussion:**

(a-c) Short-Term Construction Impacts. Project-related construction activities would require grading that has been minimized to the extent possible under the circumstances. Earth moving operations at the project site would not have the potential to result in significant project-specific short-term emissions of fugitive dust and PM<sub>10</sub>, with the implementation of standard dust control measures that are required for all new development in the County.

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

Long-Term Operation Emissions. Long-term emissions are typically estimated using the CalEEMod computer model program. However, the proposed project of one single family dwelling and associated appurtenant structures is below threshold levels for significant air quality impacts, pursuant to the screening table maintained by the Santa Barbara County APCD, which indicates that a project size of 290 houses is likely to generate approximately 22.5 lb/day of ROG or NO<sub>x</sub>. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a potentially significant long-term impact on air quality.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the significance criteria for air quality. Therefore, the project’s contribution to regionally significant air pollutant emissions is not cumulatively considerable, and its cumulative effect is less than significant (Class III).

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

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

**5.3b AIR QUALITY - GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Will the project:</b>	<b>Poten. Signif.</b>	<b>Less than Signif. with Mitigation</b>	<b>Less Than Signif.</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b>Reviewed Under Previous Document</b>
<b>a.</b> Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X		
<b>b.</b> Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X	

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

The largest source of GHG emissions from human activities in the United States is from fossil fuel combustion for electricity, heat, and transportation. Specifically, the *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gasses and Sinks: 1990-2017* (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2019) states that the primary sources of GHG emissions from fossil fuel combustion in 2017 included electricity production (35%), transportation (36.5%), industry (27%), and commercial and residential end users (17-19%, respectively). Factoring in all sources of GHG emissions, the energy sector accounts for 84% of total emissions in addition to agricultural (8%), industrial processes (5.5%), and waste management (2%) sources.

The County of Santa Barbara’s Final Environmental Impact Report for the Energy and Climate Action Plan (EIR) (PMC, 2015) and the *2016 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Update and Forecast* (County of Santa Barbara Long Range Planning Division, 2018) contain a detailed description of the proposed project’s existing regional setting as it pertains to GHG emissions. Regarding non-stationary sources of GHG emissions within Santa Barbara County specifically, the transportation sector produces 38% of the total emissions, followed by the building energy (28%), agriculture (14%), off-road equipment (11%), and solid waste (9%) sectors (County of Santa Barbara Long Range Planning Division 2018).

The overabundance of GHG in the atmosphere has led to a warming of the earth and has the potential to substantially change the earth’s climate system. More frequent and intense weather and climate-related events are expected to damage infrastructure, ecosystems, and social systems across the United States (U.S. Global Change Research Program 2018). California’s Central Coast, including Santa Barbara County, will be affected by changes in precipitation patterns, reduced foggy days, increased extreme heat days, exacerbated drought and wildfire conditions, and acceleration of sea level rise leading to increased coastal flooding and erosion (Langridge, Ruth 2018).

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

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



### **Environmental Threshold:**

Santa Barbara County's Energy and Climate Action Plan (ECAP), adopted in 2015, is a GHG emission reduction plan. The County has been implementing the plan's emission reduction measures since 2016. However, the County is not projected to meet the 2020 GHG emission reduction goal contained within the plan, and the plan is going to be updated beginning in fiscal year 2019-2020. Therefore, at this time, a significance threshold is more appropriate for project-level GHG emission analysis, rather than tiering off the ECAP's Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(a) states "A lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project." CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b) further states,

A lead agency should consider the following factors, among others, when assessing the significance of impacts from greenhouse gas emissions on the environment:

- (1) The extent to which the project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;
- (2) Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project...

The County of Santa Barbara does not have an adopted GHG emission significance threshold for sources other than industrial stationary sources. Therefore, significance thresholds from other California jurisdictions or agencies can be appropriately applied to land use projects within Santa Barbara County, as long as substantial evidence is provided to describe why the selected threshold is appropriate (CEQA Guidelines, § 15064.7(d)).

In 2012, San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) established an annual significance threshold of 1,150 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr). This significance threshold is approximately equivalent to the operational GHG emissions associated with a 70- unit residential subdivision in an urban setting (49- unit rural development) or a 40,000 sq. ft. strip mall in an urban setting (San Luis Obispo County APCD 2012). Santa Barbara County selected the San Luis Obispo County APCD threshold of 1,150 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr as the most appropriate threshold to determine significance of cumulative impacts from GHG emissions for this proposed project. The rationale for applying the San Luis Obispo County APCD GHG emissions significance threshold is discussed below.

### **Threshold Applicability**

- The threshold applies to GHG emissions that are not industrial stationary sources, but that are subject to discretionary approvals by the County, where the County is the CEQA lead agency.
- The threshold was developed to be consistent with Assembly Bill 32 (the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006), which established the State of California's 2020 GHG emissions reduction goal.
- The selected threshold considers GHG emissions comprehensively by measuring in annual metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.
- The threshold assessed historical and potential future land use development trends in San Luis Obispo County to establish the significance threshold. San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties have similar historical and potential future land use development trends.
- The threshold applies to GHG emissions from residential and commercial land use projects.
- The threshold assumes that construction emissions will be amortized over the life of a project and added to the operational emissions.

- The threshold does not apply to GHG that are emitted throughout the life cycle of products that a project may produce or consume.

**Impact Discussion:**

(a, b) The proposed demolition of an existing single family residence and construction of a new residence and appurtenant structures would not increase the residential density or type of use on site. Therefore, GHG emissions from direct, indirect, and mobile sources associated with the site would not substantially change, and would continue to be typical of a single-family residential land use. The new residence and appurtenant structures would be larger than the existing residence and structures; however, the new development would be constructed to meet current Title 24 Building Code requirements for energy efficient construction and appliances. Current construction methods and technology would replace outdated and energy inefficient structures and appliances, and GHG emissions related to energy use onsite would therefore not drastically differ from the existing condition. Typical construction equipment would be used during demolition and construction, and site disturbance would be commensurate with the type and size of this single-family residential project.

San Luis Obispo County APCD's numeric GHG emissions significance threshold of 1,150 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr is equivalent to the operational GHG emissions associated with a 70- unit residential subdivision in an urban setting. The proposed project consists of one single-family residence, with appurtenant structures, in an urban setting. Therefore, the proposed project is substantially smaller than the size of residential project that would exceed San Luis Obispo County APCD's GHG emission significance threshold. The project would not exceed the County of San Luis Obispo APCD threshold of significance.

While climate change impacts cannot result from a particular project's GHG emissions, the project's incremental contribution of GHG emissions combined with all other sources of GHGs may have a significant impact on global climate change. For this reason, a project's contribution to GHG emissions is analyzed below under "Cumulative Impacts."

**Cumulative Impacts:**

Comparison of the proposed project's scope (demolition of an existing single family residence and construction of a new residence and appurtenant structures) to the County of San Luis Obispo APCD threshold of significance (1,150 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr, equivalent to the operational GHG emissions associated with a 70- unit residential subdivision in an urban setting), demonstrates that the project's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable and would not have a significant impact on the environment (Class III).

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

Since the proposed project would not have a significant impact on the environment, no additional mitigation is necessary. Therefore, residual impacts would be less than significant.

**References:**

California Air Resources Board, *Climate Change Scoping Plan*, December 2008.

County of Santa Barbara Long Range Planning Division, *Energy and Climate Action Plan*, May 2015.

County of Santa Barbara Long Range Planning Division, *Step-by-Step Guide for Evaluating Significance of Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, June 2019.

County of Santa Barbara Long Range Planning Division, *2016 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Update and Forecast*, June 2018.

County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development, *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, October 2008 (Revised July 2015).

County of Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District, *Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents*, June 2017 Limited Update.

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

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

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

IPCC 2018, *Special Report: Global Warming of 1.5°C, Summary for Policymakers*. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 32 pp.

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

PMC, *Final Environmental Impact Report for the Energy and Climate Action Plan*, May 2015.

San Luis Obispo County APBD, *Greenhouse Gas Thresholds and Supporting Evidence*, March 2012.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gasses and Sinks: 1990-2017*, April 2019.

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

## 5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>Flora</b>					
a. A loss or disturbance to a unique, rare or threatened plant community?				X	
b. A reduction in the numbers or restriction in the range of any unique, rare or threatened species of plants?				X	
c. A reduction in the extent, diversity, or quality of native vegetation (including brush removal for fire prevention and flood control improvements)?		X			
d. An impact on non-native vegetation whether naturalized or horticultural if of habitat value?				X	
e. The loss of healthy native specimen trees?				X	
f. Introduction of herbicides, pesticides, animal life, human habitation, non-native plants or other factors that would change or hamper the existing habitat?			X		
<b>Fauna</b>					

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>g.</b> A reduction in the numbers, a restriction in the range, or an impact to the critical habitat of any unique, rare, threatened or endangered species of animals?				X	
<b>h.</b> A reduction in the diversity or numbers of animals onsite (including mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish or invertebrates)?				X	
<b>i.</b> A deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat (for foraging, breeding, roosting, nesting, etc.)?		X			
<b>j.</b> Introduction of barriers to movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?				X	
<b>k.</b> Introduction of any factors (light, fencing, noise, human presence and/or domestic animals) which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife?			X		

**Existing Plant and Animal Communities/Conditions:**

*Background and Methods:*

Santa Barbara County has a wide diversity of habitat types, including chaparral, oak woodlands, wetlands and beach dunes. These are complex ecosystems and many factors are involved in assessing the value of the resources and the significance of project impacts. For this project, two site visits were conducted. A July 10, 2017 botanical & wildlife survey, which covered approximately 1.45 acres beginning approximately 10 feet north of Sand Point Road and continued to the south side of the existing rock revetments along the beach; and a July 19, 2018 jurisdictional wetland delineation along the roadside berm located on the south side of Sand Point Road within the project site. The findings are presented in the Revised Biological Resources Assessment for 711 Sand Point Road by Storrer Environmental Services dated October 2018 (Attachment 3).

*Flora:*

The entire legal parcel owned by the applicant is comprised of 6.3 acres that is bisected by Sand Point Road. Bisected, the parcel consists of 5.38 acres north of Sand Point Road and 0.92 acres south of Sand Point Road. Within the 1.45-acre survey area, a total of 33 plant species were observed during the July 2017 botanical survey. Of the species observed, 10 (30 percent) were native and 23 (70 percent) were nonnative, naturalized, or ornamental/landscape species. A comprehensive list of vascular plant species observed in the Survey Area is provided in Appendix B of Attachment 3 (Revised Biological Resources Assessment for 711 Sand Point Road, Storrer Environmental Services, October 2018). El Estero (the Carpinteria Salt Marsh) is the 5.38-acre portion located north of Sand Point Road which constitutes Environmentally Sensitive Habitat (ESH). Salt Marsh Bird’s Beak, a federally and state-endangered plant, is known to occur in El Estero. The 0.92-acre portion of the property located south of Sand Point Road is where development will occur and contains no ESH. The 0.92-acre project site consists primarily of developed areas (including the existing residence, pavement driveway and decking), ice plant mats (0.48-acre), and non-native ornamental landscape plantings.

The ice plant mat community is dominated by a mix of ice plant mats (*Carpobrotus edulis*) and sea fig (*C. chilensis*), which comprise approximately 60 percent of the vegetation cover. Two native dune species, beach bur sage (*Ambrosia chamissonis*) and beach evening primrose (*Camissoniopsis cheiranthifolia* ssp. *cheiranthifolia*) occur frequently and comprise approximately 15 percent of the plant cover within the ice plant mat. Coastal goldenbush is also present (*Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii*) in this habitat area when situated between the rock revetments along the beach. Other species, including ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), statice (*Limonium sinuatum*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), alkali heath (*Frankenia salina*),

lemonade berry (*Rhus integrifolia*), and coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis* var. *consanguinea*) occur in less abundance within the ice plant mats.

One individual Red Sand-verbena, a special status plant species, was found within the 1.45-acre survey area along the toe of the slope of the northernmost rock revetment. The single Red Sand-verbena plant occupies four square feet of space and would be located over 60 feet south of the proposed redevelopment area. Other flora present in the survey area includes Annual Brome Grassland, non-native ornamental landscape plantings, and Salt Grass (*Distichlis spicata*). Salt Grass, a non-native wetland indicator species, is present along the roadside berm located on the south side of Sand Point Road within the project site. Given that Salt Grass is a wetland indicator species, a jurisdictional wetland delineation was conducted and determined no wetland habitat exists south of Sand Point Road. No positive wetland indicators for hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soil, or hydrology were observed, thus no County, Coastal Commission, or Federal wetland criteria were present within the project site.

Approximately 0.3 acres of ornamental trees and landscape plantings are present in the Survey Area along the border of the driveway, along the front and rear of the existing residence, and along the eastern boundary of the Survey Area (Figure 4 – Vegetation Map). This vegetation type is not a recognized community in MVII, as it consists of species not native to the region that have been planted and/or exotic species that typically don't occur in the natural landscape outside of urban areas. Ornamental and landscape species observed and include Ngaio tree (*Myoporum laetum*), crimson bottlebrush (*Callistemon citrinus*), Mexican bush sage (*Salvia leucantha*), pampas grass (*Cortaderia jubata*) and Chinese juniper (*Juniperus chinensis*), and Norfolk Island pine (*Araucaria heterophylla*). (Revised Biological Resources Assessment for 711 Sand Point Road, Storrer Environmental Services, October 2018) (Attachment 3).

#### *Fauna:*

No special-status wildlife species were observed in the 1.45 acre survey area during the 2018 field survey and none are expected to occur. The Survey Area lacks suitable salt marsh and foredune habitat that would support special-status species known to occur in the vicinity (i.e., sandy beach tiger beetle, globose dune beetle, western snowy plover, Belding's savannah sparrow, and light-footed Ridgway's rail). However, the foredune habitat located south of the survey area has the potential to support the western snowy plover, but this feasible habitat area is located over 100 feet south of the proposed redevelopment area and also separated by the two existing rock revetments. El Estero, which is located approximately 68' north of the proposed redevelopment area, is known to support Belding's savannah sparrow and formerly, the light-footed Ridgway's rail. Additionally, seven bird species were observed in El Estero during the July 2018 field survey, including osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*), willet (*Catoptrophorus semipalmatus*), whimbrel (*Numenius phaeopus*), long-billed curlew (*Numenius americanus*), Eurasian collared-dove (*Streptopelia decaocto*), Anna's hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), and northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*). However, no nesting behavior or active bird nests were observed in the 1.45-acre survey area where the project would occur (Revised Biological Resources Assessment for 711 Sand Point Road, Storrer Environmental Services, October 2018) (Attachment 3) .

#### **Environmental Thresholds:**

Santa Barbara County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (2008) includes guidelines for the assessment of biological resource impacts. The following thresholds are applicable to this project:

*Wetlands:* Projects which result in a net loss of important wetland area or wetland habitat value, either through direct or indirect impacts to wetland vegetation, degradation of water quality, or would threaten the continuity of wetland-dependant animal or plant species are considered to have a potentially significant effect on the environment. Projects which substantially interrupt wildlife access, use and dispersal in wetland areas would typically be considered to have a potentially significant impact. Projects which disrupt the hydrology of wetlands systems would be considered to have a potentially significant impact.

**Impact Discussion:**

(a, b, c, d, e) The site is currently developed with a single family dwelling and is therefore already exposed to herbicides, pesticides, animal life, human habitation, non-native plants, and other factors associated with a single-family dwelling. The project would not result in the loss of any rare plant communities or environmentally sensitive habitat. Within the 0.93-acre development area one mature specimen 12" DBH Norfolk Island pine tree would be preserved in place and seven nonnative myoporum trees and two nonnative peach trees would be removed. The single Red Sand-verbena present onsite is located over 60 feet away from the 0.93-acre development area and therefore would not be impacted by the project. In order to protect the Norfolk Island pine tree, Red Sand-verbena plant, and other sensitive dune species potentially onsite from indirect construction related impacts, a Tree and Sensitive Plant Species Protection Plan and Construction Worker Training Program have been applied to the project (MM-BIO-01 and MM-BIO-04). The Tree and Sensitive Plant Species Protection Plan would fence all sensitive plant species at least six feet outside the plant's perimeter with staked orange fencing at least 3 feet high and the training element would educate construction personnel on the site's biological significance and the protection measures in place throughout construction.

The project would result in no direct impacts to the wetland vegetation located north of Sand Point Road given that it is located outside of the 0.93-acre development area. Vegetation types impacted by development within the 0.93-acre development area would include ice plant mats, salt grass berm, and ornamental/landscaping plants. Notable distances from project components to the wetland located north of Sand Point Road includes: 68 feet to the edge of the pool, 82 feet to the nearest portion of the dwelling, and 16 feet to the edge of the renovated, pervious driveway which will require light grading to realign the driveway entrance and massage existing contours for drainage and landscaping purposes. A 100-foot buffer from wetland vegetation is generally recommended in order to separate sensitive areas from human activity, pollutant runoff, invasive plants, etc; however with the implementation of the mitigation measures the adjacent wetland would be protected from indirect project impacts. In addition, human activity is already common within 100 feet of the adjacent wetland as a result of Sand Point Road, which borders/delineates the wetland, and existing residential development along Sand Point Road. Project mitigation measures that will address potential indirect impacts to the adjacent wetland include the implementation of a stormwater control plan which would filter runoff before traveling offsite (MM-NPDES-12 Stormwater Retention-Biofiltration System), an erosion control plan to address runoff during grading and construction operations (MM-Geo-02 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan); the implementation of designated and contained equipment washout and storage locations that are located outside of the 100-foot wetland buffer to the maximum extent feasible (MM-Bio-07 Equipment Storage-Construction & MM-Bio-08 Equipment Washout-Construction); stabilizing construction site entrances and exits to reduce the transport of sediment off site (MM-WatConv-01 Sediment and Contamination Containment); revegetating or securing graded areas within 30 days of completion of grading activities (MM-WatConv-03 Erosion and Sediment Control Revegetation); and no construction within 24 hours of a National Weather Service forecasted 0.5-inch rain event (MM-Bio-05 No Construction During Rain Events). Combined, the mitigation measures would prevent sediment and stormwater from entering the wetland and provide designated equipment areas to prevent the transmittal of potential pollutants offsite. Therefore, indirect impacts to adjacent wetland habitat would be less than significant.

(g, h, i, j, k) The 0.93-acre development area does not support critical habitat for any unique, rare, threatened or endangered species of animal and none are expected to occur within this area. Additionally, no special-status wildlife species were observed in the 1.45-acre survey area during the 2018 field survey. The foredune habitat that has the potential to support the western snowy plover, protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and a State Candidate Species, is located over 100 feet south of the proposed redevelopment area and is also separated by two existing rock revetments. Additionally, the new residence is in the same general location as the existing residence with a previously disturbed area. Accordingly, the proposed project would not result in a reduction in the diversity of animals on-site, deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat, or introduction of any factors (light, fencing, noise, human presence and/or domestic animals) which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife. The proposed project

includes no fencing or other barriers to animal movement and the development area is not known or expected to be used by wildlife species. The following mitigation measures would be incorporated into the project to address the possibility of indirect impacts to wildlife: MM-Bio-02 Preconstruction Survey, MM-Bio-03 Nesting Bird Survey (if project implemented between February 1 and August 31), MM-Bio-01 Worker Training, and MM-Noise-04 Equipment Shielding-Construction. With implementation of these measures, indirect impacts would be less than significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts:**

Since the project would not significantly impact biological resources onsite, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on the County's biological resources. Impacts associated with development occurring less than 100 feet from the wetland would be addressed through mitigation measures to further reduce impacts. To ensure that construction activities do not detrimentally impact the adjacent wetland, MM-Bio-03 requires biological resource training for construction workers, MM-Bio-05 temporarily ceases construction during rain events and MM-Bio-06 requires that construction work and staging occur at the maximum feasible distance from the wetland. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the adjacent wetland would be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values. Development has been sited and designed to prevent significant impacts to the adjacent wetland and would be compatible with the adjacent habitat areas. The ultimate result of the project, with inclusion of the required mitigation measures, would be the redevelopment of a previously disturbed area that avoids adjacent sensitive habitat and species. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative biological resource impacts, with respect to the cumulative projects identified in Section 4.0 of this MND and the general project vicinity, are not cumulatively considerable.

### **Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

The following mitigation measures would prevent indirect impacts to biological resources:

1. **MM-Bio-01 Worker Training.** Prior to the start of work, a County-approved biologist shall provide worker orientation for all construction contractors (including site supervisors, equipment operators, and laborers) which emphasizes the presence of special-status species within the Carpinteria Salt Marsh and adjacent foredune habitat, identification of those species, their habitat requirements, applicable regulatory policies and provisions regarding their protection, measures being implemented to avoid and/or minimize impacts, and penalties for noncompliance will be conducted. No staging of equipment or construction supplies shall occur prior to the tailgate meeting. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** The Owner/Applicant shall: (1) submit the Sensitive Plant Species Protection Plan (MM-Bio-04) for incorporation into the training; (2) The County-approved biologist shall incorporate the Sensitive Plant Species Protection Plan (MM-Bio-04) into the training. **TIMING:** The Owner/Applicant shall comply with this measure prior to initiation of grading/construction. **MONITORING:** The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to P&D compliance monitoring staff that the training has occurred prior to initiation of grading/construction.
2. **MM-Bio-02 Pre-construction Survey.** A County-approved biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey of the work area and the margins of the Carpinteria Salt Marsh for special-status wildlife that have the potential to occur no earlier than one week prior to construction. Wildlife observed within work areas will be captured and relocated to suitable habitat outside the construction zone. If listed species are observed within or near the work area, work will be suspended and the CDFW and USFWS shall be notified. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** All requirements shall be specified on all grading and building plans. **TIMING:** The Owner/Applicant shall comply with this measure no earlier than one week prior to initiation of grading/construction. **MONITORING:** The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to P&D compliance monitoring staff that the pre-construction survey and any potential wildlife relocation have occurred prior to the initiation of grading/construction. The written results of the pre-construction survey and potential wildlife

relocation shall be submitted to P&D compliance monitoring staff prior to the initiation of grading/construction.

3. **MM-Bio-03 Nesting Bird Survey.** If the Project is implemented during the bird nesting season (February 1 to August 31), a County-approved biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey of the proposed development envelope and adjacent habitats within 7 days and prior to construction commencement (i.e., mobilization, staging, vegetation clearing, or excavation) to avoid impacts to nesting raptors and other birds. Surveys shall be conducted in all areas within 500 feet of proposed disturbance areas. If breeding birds with active nests are found prior to (or during) Project construction, a County-approved biologist shall oversee the establishment of a buffer (prescriptively 300 feet for passerines and 500 feet for raptors) around the nest; no activities will be allowed within the buffer(s) until the young have fledged from the nest or the nest fails. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** All requirements shall be specified on all grading and building plans. **TIMING:** The Owner/Applicant shall comply with this measure prior to initiation of grading/construction. **MONITORING:** The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to P&D compliance monitoring staff that the nesting bird survey has occurred within 7 days and prior to construction commencement. The written results of the nesting bird survey shall be submitted to P&D compliance monitoring staff prior to the initiation of grading/construction.
  
4. **MM-Bio-04 Tree and Sensitive Plant Species Protection Plan – Construction Component.** The Owner / Applicant shall submit a Sensitive Plant Species Protection Plan prepared by a P&D-approved biologist and designed to protect the 12” DBH Norfolk Island pine tree, Red Sand-verbena, beach bur sage, and beach evening primrose during construction. The Owner Applicant shall comply with and specify the following as notes on the Tree and Sensitive Plant Species Protection Plan and Grading and Building Plans:
  - a. Fencing of all sensitive plant species to be protected at least six feet outside the tree’s dripline or plant’s perimeter with orange fencing (or other material satisfactory to P&D) at least 3 ft high, staked to prevent any collapse, and with signs identifying the protection area placed in 15-ft intervals on the fencing.
  - b. Fencing/staking/signage shall be maintained throughout all grading and construction activities.
  - c. All sensitive plant species located within the 0.93-acre development area shall be protected from stucco and/or paint during construction.
  - d. In the event of unexpected damage or removal, impacted plants shall be replaced at a minimum 3:1 ratio.

**PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** The Owner/Applicant shall: (1) submit the Sensitive Plant Species Protection Plan; (2) Include all applicable components in Landscape and Irrigation Plans if these are required; (3) include as notes or depictions all plan components listed above, graphically depicting all those related to earth movement, construction, and temporarily and/or permanently installed protection measures. **TIMING:** The Owner/Applicant shall comply with this measure prior to issuance of Coastal Development Permit. Plan components shall be included on all grading/construction plans. The Owner/Applicant shall install sensitive plant protection measures onsite prior to issuance of grading/building permits and pre-construction meeting. **MONITORING:** The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to P&D compliance monitoring staff that plants identified for protection were not damaged or removed or, if damage or removal occurred, that correction is completed as required by the Sensitive Plant Species Protection Plan prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance.

5. **MM-NPDES-12 Stormwater Retention-Biofiltration System.** To reduce stormwater runoff, allow for infiltration, reduce pollutants and minimize degradation of stormwater quality from development, parking lots and other paved surfaces, the Owner/Applicant shall construct a permanent biofiltration system to treat stormwater runoff from the site. Biofiltration includes vegetated swales, channels, buffer strips, retention, rain gardens, and shall be designed in



accordance with the California Storm Water BMP Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment (California Storm Water Quality Association) or other approved method. The biofiltration system shall be designed by a registered civil engineer specializing in water quality or other qualified professional to ensure that the filtration properties and the plants selected are adequate to reduce concentrations of the target pollutants. Where feasible, local plants sources (i.e., collected from the watershed or propagated from cuttings or seed collected from the watershed) shall be used in the biofiltration system. Biofilters shall not replace existing riparian vegetation or native vegetation unless otherwise approved by P&D. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** The Owner/Applicant shall include the biofiltration system design, including any plant palettes and the sources of plant material, on the grading and drainage and landscape plans, and depict it graphically. **TIMING:** The Owner/Applicant shall submit a stormwater control plan to P&D permit processing planner prior to Coastal Development Permit issuance. **MONITORING:** P&D compliance monitoring staff shall site inspect for installation. The Owner is responsible for annual maintenance of the biofiltration system. The Owner shall keep records of such maintenance and provide them as requested to the County. The Owner shall make the site available to P&D for periodic inspections for the life of the project and transfer of this responsibility is required for any subsequent sale of the property. The condition of transfer shall include a provision that the property owners conduct maintenance inspection at least once/year, retain proof of inspections, submit proof to the County upon request and allow the County access to the property to inspect to ensure compliance.

6. **MM-Bio-05 No Construction During Rain Events.** The general contractor/project manager shall monitor weather reports. No construction shall occur within 24 hours of a National Weather Service forecasted 0.5-inch rain event. Erosion control measures must be kept on site and immediately available for installation. Earth disturbance activities may commence and/or resume after the rain event has passed and site conditions are dry enough to work. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** All requirements shall be specified on all grading and building plans. **TIMING:** The Owner/Applicant shall comply with this measure throughout the duration of site construction, including grading and landscaping. **MONITORING:** The Owner/Applicant shall notify P&D compliance monitoring staff when construction work is halted and resumed in accordance with this condition. P&D compliance monitoring staff shall ensure compliance on site during construction.
7. **MM-Bio-07 Equipment Storage-Construction.** The Owner/Applicant shall designate one or more construction equipment filling and storage areas within the 0.93-acre development area to contain spills, facilitate clean up and proper disposal and prevent contamination from discharging to the storm drains, street, drainage ditches, creeks, or wetlands. The areas shall be no larger than 50 x 50 foot unless otherwise approved by P&D and shall be located outside of the 100-foot wetland buffer to the maximum extent feasible. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** The Owner/Applicant shall designate the P&D approved location on all Coastal Development Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit plans. **TIMING:** The Owner/Applicant shall install the area prior to commencement of construction. **MONITORING:** P&D compliance monitoring staff shall ensure compliance prior to and throughout construction.
8. **MM-Bio-08 Equipment Washout-Construction.** The Owner/Applicant shall designate one or more washout areas for the washing of concrete trucks, paint, equipment, or similar activities to prevent wash water from discharging to the storm drains, street, drainage ditches, creeks, or wetlands. Note that polluted water and materials shall be contained in these areas and removed from the site as needed. The areas shall be located outside of the 100-foot wetland buffer to the maximum extent feasible. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** The Owner/Applicant shall designate the P&D approved location on all Coastal Development Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit plans. **TIMING:** The Owner/Applicant shall install the area prior to commencement of

construction. **MONITORING:** P&D compliance monitoring staff shall ensure compliance prior to and throughout construction.

9. **MM-WatConv-01 Sediment and Contamination Containment.** The Owner/Applicant shall prevent water contamination during construction by implementing the following construction site measures:
- a. All entrances/exits to the construction site shall be stabilized using methods designed to reduce transport of sediment off site. Stabilizing measures may include but are not limited to use of gravel pads, steel rumble plates, temporary paving, etc. Any sediment or other materials tracked off site shall be removed the same day as they are tracked using dry cleaning methods. Entrances/exits shall be maintained until graded areas have been stabilized by structures, long-term erosion control measures or landscaping.
  - b. Apply concrete, asphalt, and seal coat only during dry weather.
  - c. Cover storm drains and manholes within the construction area when paving or applying seal coat, slurry, fog seal, etc.
  - d. Store, handle and dispose of construction materials and waste such as paint, mortar, concrete slurry, fuels, etc. in a manner which minimizes the potential for storm water contamination.

**PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** The Owner/Applicant shall ensure all above construction site measures are printed as notes on plans. **TIMING:** Stabilizing measures shall be in place prior to commencement of grading and construction. Other measures shall be in place throughout construction. **MONITORING:** The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate compliance with these measures to P&D compliance monitoring staff as requested during construction.

10. **MM-Geo-02 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.** Where required by the latest edition of the California Green Code and/or Chapter 14 of the Santa Barbara County Code, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) and/or an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) shall be implemented as part of the project. Grading and erosion and sediment control plans shall be designed to minimize erosion during construction and shall be implemented for the duration of the grading period and until re-graded areas have been stabilized by structures, long-term erosion control measures or permanent landscaping. The Owner/Applicant shall submit the SWPPP, SWMP or ESCP) using Best Management Practices (BMP) designed to stabilize the site, protect natural watercourses/creeks, prevent erosion, convey storm water runoff to existing drainage systems keeping contaminants and sediments onsite. The SWPPP or ESCP shall be a part of the Grading Plan submittal and will be reviewed for its technical merits by P&D. Information on Erosion Control requirements can be found on the County web site re: Grading Ordinance Chapter 14 (<http://sbcountyplanning.org/building/grading.cfm>) refer to Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Requirements; and in the California Green Code for SWPPP (projects < 1 acre) and/or SWMP requirements. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** The grading and SWPPP, SWMP and/or ESCP shall be submitted for review and approved by P&D prior to Coastal Development Permit Issuance. The plan shall be designed to address erosion, sediment and pollution control during all phases of development of the site until all disturbed areas are permanently stabilized. **TIMING:** The SWPPP requirements shall be implemented prior to the commencement of grading and throughout the year. The ESCP/SWMP requirements shall be implemented between November 1st and April 15th of each year, except pollution control measures shall be implemented year round. **MONITORING:** Permit Compliance staff shall perform site inspections throughout the construction phase.

11. **MM-WatConv-03 Erosion and Sediment Control Revegetation.** The Owner/Applicant shall re-vegetate graded areas within 30 days of completion of grading activities with deep rooted, native, drought-tolerant species to minimize slope failure and erosion potential. Use hydroseed, straw blankets, other geotextile binding fabrics or other P&D approved methods as necessary to

hold slope soils until vegetation is established. P&D may require the reseeded of surfaces graded for the placement of structures if construction does not commence within 30 days of grading. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** Include this measure as a note on all grading and building plans. **TIMING:** The Owner/Applicant shall re-vegetate graded areas within 30 days of completion of grading activities. **MONITORING:** The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate compliance to grading and building inspectors in the field.

12. **MM-Noise-04 Equipment Shielding-Construction.** Stationary construction equipment that generates noise which exceeds 65 dBA at the project boundaries shall be shielded with appropriate acoustic shielding to P&D's satisfaction. **PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** All requirements shall be specified on all grading and building plans. **TIMING:** Equipment and shielding shall be installed prior to construction and remain in the designated location throughout construction activities. **MONITORING:** The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to P&D compliance staff that the acoustic shielding is in place prior to commencement of construction activities. P&D compliance staff shall perform site inspections throughout construction to ensure compliance.

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be less than significant.

## 5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<b>Will the proposal:</b>	<b>Poten. Signif.</b>	<b>Less than Signif. with Mitigation</b>	<b>Less Than Signif.</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b>Reviewed Under Previous Document</b>
<b>a.</b> Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any object, building, structure, area, place, record, or manuscript that qualifies as a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?			X		
<b>b.</b> Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric or historic archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?			X		
<b>c.</b> Disturb any human remains, including those located outside of formal cemeteries?				X	

<b>Will the proposal:</b>	<b>Poten. Signif.</b>	<b>Less than Signif. with Mitigation</b>	<b>Less Than Signif.</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b>Reviewed Under Previous Document</b>
<p><b>d.</b> Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in the Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p> <p>1) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</p> <p>2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p>			X		

**County Environmental Thresholds:**

Chapter 8 of the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (2008, revised February 27, 2018) contains guidelines for the identification, significance evaluation, and mitigation of impacts to cultural resources, including archaeological, historic, and tribal cultural resources. In accordance with the requirements of CEQA, these guidelines specify that if a resource cannot be avoided, it must be evaluated for importance under specific CEQA criteria. CEQA Section 15064.5(a)(3)A-D contains the criteria for evaluating the importance of archaeological and historic resources. For archaeological resources, the criterion usually applied is: (D), “Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.” A project that may cause a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource may have a significant effect on the environment.

Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the significance criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources: (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage; (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. The resource also must possess integrity of at least some of the following: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. For archaeological resources, the criterion usually applied is (D).

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

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

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

**Existing Setting:**

For at least the past 10,000 years, the area that is now Santa Barbara County has been inhabited by Chumash Indians and their ancestors. Based on records on file at the CCIC (Central Coast Information Center of the University of California, Santa Barbara), one recorded archaeological site is located within 0.25 miles of the project site. A Phase 1 Archaeological Assessment was conducted by Brent Leftwich in October 2018. The Assessment found that ten previous studies that have occurred within 0.25 miles of the project area and no previously documented archaeological sites or cultural resources are located within the project site. Dr. Leftwich conducted a Phase I survey on September 18, 2018 which surveyed the entire project area using 5-meter transects. A small amount of marine shell was scattered throughout the project area; however Dr. Leftwich concluded that the shell is likely natural in origin, as it is typical of both estuary and dune environments and does not appear to be of great age. No cultural materials (i.e. flaked stone, groundstone, fire affected rock) or dark midden soils were observed. The likelihood of undiscovered, significant cultural resources existing in the project area is very low and no additional archaeological monitoring or cultural resource testing is recommended.

To date, Santa Barbara County has received one tribal request, from the Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians, to participate in government-to-government consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1 and in accordance with the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 52. On October 11, 2018, a formal notice of decision to undertake environmental review for the proposed project was sent to Julie Tumamait-Stenslie, Chair, Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians. The notice provided notification of the opportunity for consultation under AB 52, and included a description of the proposed project and a summary of the Phase 1 study methods and results. No reply was received and no tribal cultural resources (TCRs) were identified on the subject parcel. Additionally, as part of Dr. Leftwich’s Phase 1 Archaeological Assessment, he also sent Ms. Tumamait-Stenslie the results of his

background research and Phase 1 Assessment, provided a summary of the geomorphological history of Sandyland sand spit, and offered to discuss her concerns. As of his report date no reply was received.

The proposed project includes demolition of an existing residence that was originally constructed before 1952 and was significantly modified through the 1980's. Due to significant modifications that occurred to the structure, the residence does not retain its integrity of design or materials and does not meet any of the County of Santa Barbara significance criteria for listing as a County Landmark or Place of Historic Merit, nor is it eligible for placement in the California Register of Historic Resources or for nomination to the Register of Historic Places (Phase I Historic Resources Report, Post/Hazeltine Associates, June 28, 2017).

**Impact Discussion:**

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

**Cumulative Impacts:**

Project specific cultural resource impacts have been identified as less than significant due to the fact that no cultural or historical resources have been identified on-site and the potential for undiscovered cultural resources to exist onsite is low. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative cultural resource impacts, with respect to the cumulative projects identified in Section 4.5 of this MND and the general project vicinity, is not cumulatively considerable.

**5.6 ENERGY**

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Substantial increase in demand, especially during peak periods, upon existing sources of energy?				X	
b. Requirement for the development or extension of new sources of energy?				X	

**Impact Discussion:**

The County has not identified significance thresholds for electrical and/or natural gas service impacts (Thresholds and Guidelines Manual). Private electrical and natural gas utility companies provide service to customers in Central and Southern California, including the unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County. The proposed project consists of demolition of an existing single-family residence and construction of a new single-family residence, and energy use is estimated as follows:

**Energy Use**

<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Project Demand</b>
Natural Gas (13.7 million BTU per capita <sup>1</sup> )	41.1 million BTU per year (assuming household of 3)
Electricity (7.4MWh/yr/home PG&E; 6.9 MWh/yr/home SCE) <sup>2</sup>	6.9 megawatt hours per year

In summary, the project would have a negligible effect on regional energy needs. No adverse impacts would result.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

The project’s contribution to the regionally significant demand for energy is not considerable, and is therefore less than significant.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

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

**5.7 FIRE PROTECTION**

<b>Will the proposal result in:</b>	<b>Poten. Signif.</b>	<b>Less than Signif. with Mitigation</b>	<b>Less Than Signif.</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b>Reviewed Under Previous Document</b>
<b>a.</b> Introduction of development into an existing high fire hazard area?				X	
<b>b.</b> Project-caused high fire hazard?				X	
<b>c.</b> Introduction of development into an area without adequate water pressure, fire hydrants or adequate access for fire fighting?				X	
<b>d.</b> Introduction of development that will hamper fire prevention techniques such as controlled burns or backfiring in high fire hazard areas?				X	
<b>e.</b> Development of structures beyond safe Fire Dept. response time?				X	

**Impact Discussion:**

The project is not located within a High Fire Hazard Area, and/or does not involve new fire hazards. The project is located in an area with an adequate response time from fire protective services. The Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District has reviewed the project to ensure it meets Fire Department standards for access and fire suppression, therefore impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

<sup>1</sup> <http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/states/residential.cfm/state=CA#ng>  
<sup>2</sup> <http://enduse.lbl.gov/info/LBNL-47992.pdf>

## 5.8 GEOLOGIC PROCESSES

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

### Threshold:

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

1. The project site or any part of the project is located on land having substantial geologic constraints, as determined by P&D or PWD. Areas constrained by geology include parcels located near active or potentially active faults and property underlain by rock types associated with compressible/collapsible soils or susceptible to landslides or severe erosion. "Special Problems" areas designated by the Board of Supervisors have been established based on geologic constraints, flood hazards and other physical limitations to development.
2. The project results in potentially hazardous geologic conditions such as the construction of cut slopes exceeding a grade of 1.5 horizontal to 1 vertical.
3. The project proposes construction of a cut slope over 15 feet in height as measured from the lowest finished grade.
4. The project is located on slopes exceeding 20% grade.



**Impact Discussion:**

(a) The project site is not underlain by any known fault. Compliance with existing building regulations would ensure that potential ground shaking impacts caused by movement along a distant fault are less than significant. The project site is subject to liquefaction due to the presence of sandy soils and a high-water table. The potential for liquefaction would be reduced to less than significant through implementation of MM-Geo-01, which requires that the building design and construction comply with the recommendations of geotechnical reports prepared for the project. MM-Geo-01 together with the normal building permit review and inspection process would ensure that all soils-related hazards would be reduced to a less than significant.

(b and i) The project would involve 470 cubic yards of cut, 380 cubic yards of import, and 850 cubic yards of fill which would have negligible impacts on the environment. Additionally, the project site does not contain any steep slopes, as the subject parcel has a gradual downward slope from south to north at approximately three percent. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigations are necessary.

(c) Predictions about the long-term effects of global climate change include rising sea levels due to the melting of glaciers and thermal expansion. Rising sea levels could increase the incidence of flooding in coastal areas with altitudes at or near sea level. Potential impacts to the project associated with sea level rise (SLR) were projected and evaluated in the *Coastal Engineering Review* (David W. Skelly, GeoSoils, Inc., April 16, 2019) (Attachment 8). The *Coastal Engineering Review* utilized the County's 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment and cross referenced that figure for consistency with the 2018 Ocean Protection Council (OPC) SLR Guidance, which has been identified by the California Coastal Commission (CCC) as the best available science to determine SLR as identified in the November 2018 SLR Guidance Update. Based on the County's Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment for the high SLR scenario, the anticipated SLR in 2095 is 4.6', which is approximate to OPC's 4.8' SLR figure for 2095 when modeled under the medium-high risk aversion and low emissions figure scenario. (Following OPC SLR Guidance under the medium-high risk aversion scenario, the low emissions figure for the year 2090 (4.4 feet) and the low emissions figure for the year 2100 (5.3 feet) were averaged, which is 4.8 feet.) Therefore, the use of 4.6 feet is in conformance with the County's 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment and reasonably consistent with OPC SLR Guidance.

In addition to analyzing SLR, the *Coastal Engineering Review* analyzed potential future wave overtopping of the anticipated shoreline for the 75 year design life of the project. The overtopping calculation was factored without the presence of the existing revetments using the future beach slope, and assumed the future beach berm elevation, the historical highest water elevation of ~+7.6 feet NAVD88 from NOAA, and mean wave period and significant wave heights in excess of those taken from the Santa Barbara CDIP Station during the 1982-83 storms (8.5 feet as the design wave height at 15 seconds versus the maximum recorded significant wave height of about 7 feet and the mean period of 14 seconds). Based on the design parameters, the natural beach overtopping rate for the design conditions is 10.5 ft<sup>3</sup>/s-ft for 4.6 feet SLR and the height of overtopping bore is approximately 2.3 feet. The estimated beach retreat was 167 feet in 75 years, which would place the future beach berm at approximately the structure string line. The elevation of the future berm is +13.5 feet NAVD88 and when the maximum bore height of 2.3 feet is added, the effective flood elevation at the structure string line is +15.8 feet NAVD88. Due to the site's topography, which slopes back towards Sand Point Road, and the fact that the bore height dissipates as it travels, +15.8 feet NAVD88 is the effective flood elevation.

The County of Santa Barbara has determined that the advisory flood elevation at this site is +15.4 feet NAVD88 plus 2 feet (clearance requirement) for the minimum recommended finished floor height (FF) of +17.4 feet NAVD88. In order to account for the potential scenario in which the revetment is removed, 4.6 feet of SLR, and the most extreme storm event occurs, GeoSoils calculates a future water elevation of +15.8 feet NAVD88. Based upon the County requirement that the FF be 2 feet above the advisory BFE, the minimum FF elevation of the inhabited level of the residence would be +17.8 NAVD88, which the project adheres to. GeoSoils' recommendation has been incorporated into MM-Geo-01, which requires that

the design of the proposed residence comply with the recommendations of the *Coastal Engineering Review* as well as with the recommendations of other relevant reports. In addition, the proposed project is required to meet Santa Barbara County Public Works-Flood Control Division requirements for properties located within the “Coastal High Hazard Zone,” and the “FEMA Interim Advisory Flood Recovery Zone” including requirements that the lowest horizontal portion of the structure be elevated to +17.4 feet NAVD88. (*Coastal Engineering Review* April 16, 2019).

Regarding building design, the proposed project would be designed to accommodate and withstand the extreme tidal and run-up events assuming that the seawall were removed. The lower level would be below the predicted flood elevations so this space is designed as uninhabited with break-away walls. The piles for the structure are to be designed to include both hydrodynamic and hydrostatic forces with a one percent chance of being exceeded in any year. Applying the County Flood control freeboard requirement to the GSI BFE gives an FF elevation of 17.8 feet NAVD88, which would be the minimum elevation for mechanical equipment and living space. The lower level space is to be considered uninhabited space and shall have break-away walls designed in accordance with ASCE 24-05. (*Coastal Engineering Review* April 16, 2019). The proposed new residence would be constructed at a higher elevation above sea level than the existing structure. Therefore, the proposed project would represent an improvement from current conditions with respect to sea level rise and exposure to geologic hazards. Through compliance with County Public Works-Flood Control requirements and implementation of MM-Geo-01, impacts would be mitigated to less than significant.

(e and f) Grading operations that would occur on the project site would remove vegetative cover and disturb the ground surface, thereby increasing the potential for erosion and sedimentation impacts. However, the potential for the project to cause substantial erosion and sediment transport would be adequately mitigated by the County’s standard erosion control and drainage requirements, which include an erosion control plan (MM-Geo-02 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan), stabilizing construction site entrances and exits (MM-WatConv-01 Sediment and Contamination Containment), revegetating or securing graded areas within 30 days of completion of grading activities (MM-WatConv-03 Erosion and Sediment Control Revegetation), and no construction within 24 hours of a National Weather Service forecasted 0.5-inch rain event (MM-Bio-05 No Construction During Rain Events). Thus, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

(d, g, h, j, k, l) There are no unique geological features located on the project site, and the project would not result in the use of septic systems. The project would not involve mining, the loss of topsoil, or construction-related vibrations.

### **Cumulative Impacts:**

The existing environmental setting includes a single family dwelling and rock revetment located within a geographic location that is currently subject to coastal hazards, and that will be subject to future coastal hazards. Therefore, from a CEQA perspective, potential site constraints associated with sea level rise and storm events are an existing condition, are not caused by the project, and therefore do not represent a new impact under CEQA. As identified in the impact analysis above, the design of the proposed new home will be required to comply with the recommendations of geotechnical and structural engineering studies and the Sea Level Rise and Wave Run-Up Analysis consistent with Mitigation Measure MM-Geo-1 (below) as well as with County Flood Control requirements, thereby ensuring the safety of the proposed development for the life of the project, and reducing project-specific impacts to less than significant. Furthermore, the proposed new residence would be constructed at a higher elevation above sea level than the existing structure resulting in an improvement to current conditions with respect to sea level rise. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative geologic process impacts (including coastal hazards), with respect to the cumulative projects identified in Section 4.0 of this MND and the general project vicinity, is not cumulatively considerable.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

The following mitigation measure, along with MM-Bio-07 Equipment Storage-Construction, MM-Bio-08 Equipment Washout-Construction, MM-Geo-02 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, MM-WatConv-03 Erosion and Sediment Control Revegetation, MM-WatConv-01 Sediment and Contamination Containment would reduce the project’s geologic impacts to a less than significant level:

**1. MM-Geo-01.** Building design and construction shall comply with all recommendations of the following reports:

- 1) Stantec “*Sea Level Rise Assessment for 711 Sand Point Road*” dated February 21, 2018; and
- 2) GeoSoils, Inc. “*Final Response to County of Santa Barbara Coastal Engineering Review, 711 Sand Point Road, Carpinteria, CA, Cosmoledo Trust New Residence*” dated April 16, 2019.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** Building Plans shall comply with the recommendations of the above-referenced reports. This condition shall be included as a notation on project plans prior to Coastal Development issuance and Building Permit issuance. **Monitoring:** P&D staff shall check plans for notations prior to permit issuance. B&S staff shall ensure compliance with recommendations during plan check review and in the field.

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be less than significant.

**5.9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/RISK OF UPSET**

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

**Impact Discussion:**

There is no evidence that hazardous materials were used, stored or spilled on site in the past, and there are no aspects of the proposed use that would include or involve hazardous materials at levels that would constitute a hazard to human health or the environment.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

**5.10 LAND USE**

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Structures and/or land use incompatible with existing land use?				X	
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X	
c. The induction of substantial growth or concentration of population?				X	
d. The extension of sewer trunk lines or access roads with capacity to serve new development beyond this proposed project?				X	
e. Loss of existing affordable dwellings through demolition, conversion or removal?				X	
f. Displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	
g. Displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	
h. The loss of a substantial amount of open space?				X	
i. An economic or social effect that would result in a physical change? (i.e. Closure of a freeway ramp results in isolation of an area, businesses located in the vicinity close, neighborhood degenerates, and buildings deteriorate. Or, if construction of new freeway divides an existing community, the construction would be the physical change, but the economic/social effect on the community would be the basis for determining that the physical change would be significant.)				X	
j. Conflicts with adopted airport safety zones?				X	

**Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project does not cause a physical change that conflicts with adopted environmental policies or regulations. The project is not growth inducing, and does not result in the loss of affordable housing, loss of open space, or a significant displacement of people. The project does not involve the extension of a sewer trunk line, and does not conflict with any airport safety zones. The project is compatible with existing land uses.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

## 5.11 NOISE

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Long-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding County thresholds (e.g. locating noise sensitive uses next to an airport)?				X	
b. Short-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding County thresholds?		X			
c. Project-generated substantial increase in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas (either day or night)?				X	

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

The proposed project site is located outside of 65 dB(A) noise contours for roadways, public facilities, airport approach and take-off zones. Surrounding noise-sensitive uses consist of single family residences and the Carpinteria Salt Marsh.

### Impact Discussion:

(a,c) The proposed project consists of demolition of an existing residence and construction of a new residence. Long-term noise generated onsite would not: 1) exceed County thresholds, or 2) substantially increase ambient noise levels in adjoining areas. Noise sensitive uses on the proposed project site would not be exposed to or impacted by off-site noise levels exceeding County thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

(b) Noise generated from heavy equipment during grading and construction can temporarily exceed County noise thresholds of 65 dBA CNEL for a distance of up to approximately 1,600 feet. During grading and construction on the proposed parcel, temporary construction noise could significantly affect nearby residents. Application of Mitigation Measure Noise-02, limiting construction hours, would mitigate short term construction related noise impacts to a less than significant level.

### Cumulative Impacts:

The project would result in no long term noise impacts. Short term noise impacts associated with construction activities would be successfully mitigated through implementation of construction hour limitations required by MM-Noise-02. This requirement would be applied to other construction projects in the vicinity as described in Section 4.0. Due to the finite and temporary nature of construction, a cumulative impact resulting from the combined effects from other projects would not be considerable. Therefore, the project's noise impacts, with respect to the cumulative projects identified in Section 4.0 of this MND and the general project vicinity, are not cumulatively considerable.

### Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required for long-term noise associated with the project. During construction, with the application of the mitigation measure, potential impacts would be mitigated to be less than significant.

1. **MM-Noise-02 Construction Hours.** The Owner /Applicant, including all contractors and subcontractors shall limit construction activity, including equipment maintenance and site preparation, to the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. No construction shall occur on weekends or State holidays. Non-noise generating interior construction activities such as plumbing, electrical, drywall and painting (which does not include the use of compressors, tile saws, or other noise-generating equipment) are not subject to these restrictions. Any subsequent amendment to the Comprehensive General Plan, applicable Community or Specific Plan, or Zoning Code noise standard upon which these construction hours are based shall supersede the hours stated herein. **Plan Requirements:** The Owner/Applicant shall provide and post a sign stating these restrictions at all construction site entries. **Timing:** Signs shall be posted prior to commencement of construction and maintained throughout construction. **Monitoring:** The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate that required signs are posted prior to grading/building permit issuance and pre-construction meeting. Building inspectors and permit compliance staff shall spot check and respond to complaints.

## 5.12 PUBLIC FACILITIES

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

### Threshold:

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

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

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

Demolition	60
New construction	15

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

**Impact Discussion:**

(a, b) The proposed project consists of the demolition of an existing residence and the construction of a new residence, resulting in no net increase in homes in the area. This level of new development would not have a significant impact on existing police protection or health care services and existing service levels would be sufficient to serve the proposed project. The project would not generate the number of students (approximately 20) that would require an additional classroom.

(c) The proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of County thresholds. The solid waste generated by the project's ongoing operation would not exceed 196 tons per year and construction and demolition waste would not exceed 350 tons. Specifically, demolition of the existing residential structures would generate approximately 115 tons of solid waste (3,812 s.f. x 60 pounds/s.f. / 2000 pounds/ton). New residential construction totaling 10,086 s.f. would generate approximately 76 tons of construction waste. In total, based on the estimates in the table above, the project would generate up to approximately 191 tons of construction waste. To calculate the project's long-term solid waste generation associated with the new single family dwelling, the following formula is used: 3.01 people/unit x # of units x 0.95 tons/year = tons/year/project (*County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*). Therefore, the project would generate an estimated 2.86 tons of solid waste per year, which would not exceed the significance threshold of 196 tons per year. Additionally, because the project site currently contains an existing single family dwelling, the estimated 2.86 tons of solid waste per year is not considered a net increase from existing conditions. Therefore, solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

(d, e) The project would not cause the need for new or altered sewer system facilities as it is already in the service district, and the District has adequate capacity to serve the project. The proposed project would create new impervious surfaces that could result in greater surface runoff from the site since there would be less open ground capable of absorbing rainwater. This increased surface runoff would be accommodated within proposed underground storm water storage and dissipater system. No additional drainages or water quality control facilities would be necessary to serve the project. Therefore, the project would have no impact to public facilities, either on a project specific or cumulative basis.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

**5.13 RECREATION**

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Conflict with established recreational uses of the area?				X	
b. Conflict with biking, equestrian and hiking trails?				X	
c. Substantial impact on the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities (e.g., overuse of an area with constraints on numbers of people, vehicles, animals, etc. which might safely use the area)?				X	

**Impact Discussion:**

(a, b) No established recreational uses, including biking, equestrian or hiking trails are located within the area proposed for development. The beach area beyond the rock revetment which abuts the residence is public beach area, but would not be impacted by the proposed development. No adverse impacts would result.

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

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

**5.14 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION**

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

**Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project is limited to demolition of an existing single-family residence and construction of a new single-family residence, and, as such, would not increase vehicular traffic to or from the site nor would it affect roadways; parking facilities; pedestrian, bicycle, or transit access; or any other type of transportation facility.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

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



### 5.15 WATER RESOURCES/FLOODING

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

#### Water Resources Thresholds

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

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

### **Water Quality Thresholds:**

A significant water quality impact is presumed to occur if the project:

- Is located within an urbanized area of the county and the project construction or redevelopment individually or as a part of a larger common plan of development or sale would disturb one (1) or more acres of land;
- Increases the amount of impervious surfaces on a site by 25% or more;
- Results in channelization or relocation of a natural drainage channel;
- Results in removal or reduction of riparian vegetation or other vegetation (excluding non-native vegetation removed for restoration projects) from the buffer zone of any streams, creeks or wetlands;
- Is an industrial facility that falls under one or more of categories of industrial activity regulated under the NPDES Phase I industrial storm water regulations (facilities with effluent limitation; manufacturing; mineral, metal, oil and gas, hazardous waste, treatment or disposal facilities; landfills; recycling facilities; steam electric plants; transportation facilities; treatment works; and light industrial activity);
- Discharges pollutants that exceed the water quality standards set forth in the applicable NPDES permit, the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) Basin Plan or otherwise impairs the beneficial uses<sup>3</sup> of a receiving water body;
- Results in a discharge of pollutants into an "impaired" water body that has been designated as such by the State Water Resources Control Board or the RWQCB under Section 303 (d) of the Federal Water Pollution Prevention and Control Act (i.e., the Clean Water Act); or
- Results in a discharge of pollutants of concern to a receiving water body, as identified by the RWQCB.

### **Impact Discussion**

(a, c) The project would not change the course or direction of water movements or change the amount of water in a surface water body.

(b, d) The project would create minor amounts of additional stormwater runoff as a result of newly constructed impermeable surfaces (i.e. structures, hardscaping, etc.). Construction activities such as grading could also potentially create temporary runoff and erosion problems. The project site currently contains 6,556 square feet of existing impervious surfaces onsite and the proposed project would result in a total of 9,040 square feet of impervious surface onsite. The addition of 2,484 square feet of additional impervious surface onsite is a 37 percent increase, which exceeds the County significance threshold of an increase in impervious surfaces by 25% or more. However, a Tier 1 Stormwater Control Plan (RRM Design Group, March 5, 2018) was prepared for the proposed project, which includes provisions for runoff to be captured and directed to vegetated areas as well as underground infiltration catch basins located onsite. Additionally, application of standard County grading, erosion, and drainage-control measures would ensure that no significant increase of erosion or sediment-laden stormwater runoff would occur. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

(e, f) The project is located within the "Coastal High Hazard/Repetitive Loss Zone" of the County Floodplain Management Plan and is therefore subject to coastal run-up and flooding during storm events, with the

---

<sup>3</sup> Beneficial uses for Santa Barbara County are identified by the Regional Water Quality Control Board in the Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coastal Basin, or Basin Plan, and include (among others) recreation, agricultural supply, groundwater recharge, fresh water habitat, estuarine habitat, support for rare, threatened or endangered species, preservation of biological habitats of special significance.

potential to impact the residence if appropriate design measures are not implemented. The property is also subject to sea-level rise and tsunami risk, which was discussed in Section 4.8 (Geologic Processes) above in full detail. In the *Coastal Engineering Review* dated April 16, 2019 by GeoSoils (Attachment 8), site flooding was also analyzed using the USGS Coastal Storm Modeling System (CoSMoS), which is able to factor in SLR, shoreline erosion, and 100 year storm thresholds. The CoSMoS output found that the threshold for the initiation of site flooding from the slough is with approximately 75 cm (2.5 feet) of SLR, which would occur after the year 2060 per the OPC SLR table. The modeling also found that under extreme design conditions (100 year storm event with 150 centimeters (approx. 4.9 feet) of SLR) the site will flood and the shoreline may retreat but only to the location of the proposed dwelling. With both revetments removed, the potential for coastal hazards to impact the development is mitigated to less than significant by the proposed design. The structure elevation above potential future flooding, the pile foundation (depth and size), the FEMA approved design methods for the improvements below the flood elevation (blow out panels), all combine to mitigate the potential hazards. Provided the recommendations in the Stantec report and herein are incorporated into the design (MM-Geo-01), the proposed project is reasonably safe from coastal hazards.

Tsunami risk at the subject property was evaluated in the *Sea Level Rise Assessment for 711 Sand Point Road* (Craig A. Steward, Stantec, February 21 2018) (Attachment 7). The report found that the site is located within the tsunami inundation zone with potential low range tsunami wave heights from three feet to ten feet and high range wave heights from 20 feet to 50 feet. Tsunami run-up is also analyzed in the County's Seismic and Safety Element (Republished February 2015). The Seismic and Safety Element designates the subject property as an area with moderate potential for tsunami inundation. The Seismic and Safety Element states, "*Since the recurrence interval for a substantial tsunami is probably greater than the life of structures, and considering the value of coastline property, prohibition of building for this reason does not appear justified*" and recognizes that, ". . . a large number of people would frequently occupy the beach even if there were few buildings." Due to the infrequent nature of tsunamis, the likelihood of the subject residence being subject to tsunamis during the life of the building is unlikely. In addition, the lower level of the structure has been designed with breakaway walls for flood protection purposes, further reducing the likelihood of a tsunami reaching habitable areas of the residence. Therefore, potential impacts associated with tsunami risk are considered less than significant.

(h, i, j.) The subject property is currently developed with a single-family dwelling that is served by the Carpinteria Water District and the proposed new home would continue to be served by the District. The Carpinteria Water District receives water from the Carpinteria basin. The volume extracted annually from the basin does not exceed the operational yield of the basin therefore the basin is not overdrafted (May 30, 2014 Fugro Consultants, Carpinteria Groundwater Basin Annual Report). As the residence would be served by the Carpinteria Water District and Carpinteria Sanitary District, the project would not contribute to saltwater intrusion or regional degradation of groundwater quality.

(l) The project could adversely affect surface water quality by increasing the volume and decreasing the quality of stormwater runoff. The project would involve the use of fertilizers, pesticides, and household cleaners and chemicals. Runoff from driveways and/or parking lots could introduce oil and other hydrocarbons into drainage facilities. The environmental impact of such surface water quality is measured by the difference between existing conditions and the proposed project. The proposed project will have a negligible additional surface water runoff, and thus the proposed project would be expected to generate only minor amounts of storm water pollutants. Minor amounts of such household hazardous material would not present a significant potential for release of waterborne pollutants and would be highly unlikely to create a public health hazard. In addition, grading and ground disturbance associated with development of the project, along with construction activities, could result in short-term erosion and sedimentation into the adjacent El Estero and the introduction of construction-related pollutants (e.g. concrete washout, oil, heavy metals, etc.). Impacts would be significant but mitigable with the construction BMPs identified in the Biological Section.

### **Cumulative Impacts:**

The County’s Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project’s contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the threshold of significance for water resources. Compliance with the Stormwater Control Plan (RRM Design Group, March 5, 2018) pursuant to MM-Wat-01 would ensure capture and treatment of runoff from the proposed project. As discussed above, and in detail in Section 4.8, and incorporated herein by reference, project-specific and cumulative impacts associated with coastal hazards and flooding would not be significant. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative coastal hazard/flooding impacts, with respect to the cumulative projects identified in Section 4.0 of this MND and the general project vicinity, is not cumulatively considerable.

Therefore, the project’s contribution to the regionally significant issues of water supplies and water quality is not considerable, and is less than significant.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

The following mitigation measure, along with MM-Bio-07 Equipment Storage-Construction, MM-Bio-08 Equipment Washout-Construction, MM-Geo-02 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, MM-WatConv-03 Erosion and Sediment Control Revegetation, MM-Geo-01, and MM-WatConv-01 Sediment and Contamination Containment would reduce the project’s water resource impacts to a less than significant level:

1. **MM-Wat-01.** Building design and construction shall comply with all recommendations of the Tier 1 Stormwater Control Plan (RRM Design Group, March 5, 2018). **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Grading and drainage plans shall comply with the recommendations of the above-referenced plan. This condition shall be included as a notation on project plans prior to Coastal Development Permit issuance and Grading Permit issuance. **Monitoring:** P&D staff shall check plans for notations prior to permit issuance. B&S staff and Permit Compliance staff shall ensure compliance with recommendations during plan check review and in the field.

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be less than significant.

**6.0 INFORMATION SOURCES**

**6.1 County Departments Consulted**

Fire, Flood Control

**6.2 Comprehensive Plan:**

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

**6.3 Other Sources:**

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

Topographical maps

Archaeological maps and reports  
 Other

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

The project would result in project-specific impacts that are significant but mitigable in the following issue areas: biological resources, geologic processes, noise, and water resources/flooding. The project would result in project-specific impacts that are less than significant in the following issue areas: aesthetic/visual resources, air quality, cultural resources. Mitigation measures applied to the project would ensure that the project would not result in any significant cumulative impacts.

## 8.0 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
1. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions or significantly increase energy consumption, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X		
2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?				X	
3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects and the effects of probable future projects.)				X	
4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X	
5. Is there disagreement supported by facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts and/or expert opinion supported by facts over the significance of an effect which would warrant investigation in an EIR ?				X	

1. Project specific biological resource and water quality impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures, as discussed in Section 5.4 (Biological Resources)

and Section 5.16 (Water Resources). Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Further, as discussed in sections 4.3 (Air Quality), Section 4.6 (Energy) and Section 4.5 (Cultural Resources), the project would not contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions, to increased energy consumption, nor would it eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

2. The project would not have the potential to achieve short-term to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals, because proposed mitigation measures would reduce all potentially significant impacts to less than significant.
3. As discussed in the “cumulative impacts” section under each issue area of this document, the project would not result in any impacts which are cumulatively considerable.
4. The project does not result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. There is no excessive noise, no known or expected hazardous materials and no other factors associated with the project that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.
5. There is no known disagreement among experts regarding the projects impacts.

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

Coastal Plan Policies 2-6, 3-1, 3-8, 3-12, 3-13, 3-14, 3-18, 3-19, 4-3, 4-5, 9-1, 9-9, 9-14, 10-1, 10-2, and 10-5. Coastal Act Policies 30211, 30240, 30230, 30231, and 30251.

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

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

Finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures incorporated into the REVISED PROJECT DESCRIPTION would successfully mitigate the potentially significant impacts. Staff recommends the preparation of an ND. The ND finding is based on the assumption that mitigation measures will be acceptable to the applicant; if not acceptable a revised Initial Study finding for the preparation of an EIR may result.

With Public Hearing       Without Public Hearing

**PREVIOUS DOCUMENT:**

**PROJECT EVALUATOR:** Sean Stewart      **DATE:**

## **11.0 DETERMINATION BY ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING OFFICER**

I agree with staff conclusions. Preparation of the appropriate document may proceed.  
 I DO NOT agree with staff conclusions. The following actions will be taken:

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

**SIGNATURE:** \_\_\_\_\_ **INITIAL STUDY DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SIGNATURE:** \_\_\_\_\_ **NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SIGNATURE:** \_\_\_\_\_ **REVISION DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SIGNATURE:** \_\_\_\_\_ **FINAL NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

## 12.0 ATTACHMENTS

1. Project Plans
2. South Board of Architectural Review Minutes
3. Revised Biological Assessment, Storrer Environmental Services, LLC., October 2018
4. Tier 1 Stormwater Control Plan, RMM Design Group, March 5, 2018
5. Visual Analysis from HWY 101 and UPRR
6. FAR Summary Table
7. Sea Level Rise Assessment for 711 Sand Point Road, Craig A. Steward, Stantec, February 21 2018
8. Final Response to County of Santa Barbara Coastal Engineering Review, 711 Sand Point Road, Carpinteria, CA, Cosmoledo Trust New Residence, David W. Skelly, GeoSoils, Inc., April 16, 2019