

**CITY OF CARPINTERIA**  
**INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. **Project Title:**

Via Real Hotel, Project 16-1822-DP/CDP

2. **Lead Agency:**

City of Carpinteria, Community Development Department  
5775 Carpinteria Avenue, Carpinteria, CA 93013

3. **Contact Person and Phone:**

Nick Bobroff, Principal Planner  
Phone: (805) 755-4407  
Email: nickb@ci.carpinteria.ca.us

4. **Project Location:**

4110 Via Real, Carpinteria, CA 93013  
APN: 004-017-022

5. **Project Sponsor Name and Address:**

RAM Hotels  
21 Prestwick Lane, Amarillo, TX 79124

6. **General Plan Designation:**

General Commercial (GC)

7. **Zoning:**

Commercial Planned  
Development with a  
Residential Overlay (CPD/R)

8. **Description of Project:**

RAM Hotels proposes to construct and operate a 72-guestroom "Fairfield Inn and Suites by Marriott" hotel on a 2.6-acre site. An existing single story, 5,678 square foot church building, children's play area, parking lot, vegetable garden and several small storage sheds would all be demolished and removed to accommodate the project. The new two-story hotel would have a building footprint of 22,460 square feet and a total square footage of 44,191 square feet. The maximum height of the new hotel would vary from 21 feet 10 inches to 25 feet, measured from the new finished grade to the top of the roof parapets.

In addition to 72 guestrooms, the hotel would include a fitness center, business center, breakfast area, meeting room, outdoor pool, and outdoor garden patio. The hotel would also include typical support services (i.e., main lobby, admin/offices, employee breakroom, kitchen, laundry/storage, etc.). Twelve employees would be required to operate the hotel during every eight-hour shift. The hotel will operate with twelve employees daily working the following 3 shifts: Morning from 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM; Evening 3:00 PM to 11:00 PM; Overnight 11:00 PM to 7:00 AM

The project would be served by one driveway accessed from Via Real at the southeastern corner of the property. A 77-space surface parking lot and two loading zones would serve

the proposed hotel and be located around the side and rear perimeter of the project site. New site landscaping, lighting and walkways are proposed throughout, including around the building perimeter and around the parking lot. A new masonry wall would be constructed along the side and rear property lines. In some cases, the new wall would be located on top of a retaining wall to account for grade differences between adjoining properties. A separate paved private driveway easement located along the west (side) property line is proposed to remain “as is,” and will continue to serve several properties located to the north (behind) the subject property.

The project requires earthwork and grading (estimated at 4,700 cubic yards of cut; 2,900 cubic yards of fill; net export of 800 cubic yards of cut) in order to establish a level building pad, meet flood zone requirements and address site drainage needs. The finished floor height of the proposed hotel would be, in places, up to approximately two feet six inches above existing grade. Onsite stormwater improvements included in the project description include use of pervious concrete paving for parking areas, use of landscaped retention basins around the perimeter of the hotel building to capture roof runoff, and the expansion and improvements of a large, landscaped stormwater treatment and detention basin along the project’s Via Real frontage. Other surface and underground storm drain improvements are required to convey onsite stormwater flows to the proposed treatment and detention basin.

An existing drainage feature that runs north-to-south along the project site’s western edge would be protected in place and enhanced as riparian habitat. A 50-foot protective creek buffer would be established and restored with appropriate riparian and upland native plantings. A permeable walking trail and passive seating area is proposed within the creek buffer area. A separate area of riparian woodland located along the northern (rear) property line, approximately at the middle of the site would be protected in place.

Utility improvements required as part of the project include installation of a new eight-inch water line underneath the eastern hotel drive aisle to connect the existing main line in Via Real to the water line north of the project site in the Trieste Lane right-of-way. New water meters and connections for the building, irrigation system and fire protection system would tie the proposed hotel into the new water line. A new fire hydrant would be constructed toward the rear northeast corner of the hotel; the existing hydrant at the project’s southeast corner would remain. A new eight-inch sewer line would run through the eastern drive aisle toward the northeast corner of the property and continue on a northerly route up Trieste Lane, connecting to an existing main line on Venice Lane. A new underground pump station would be placed at the northeast corner of the hotel’s parking lot, underneath a parking space. An existing sewer pump house and force main would be removed during site demolition and prep.

Proposed offsite and frontage improvements include re-constructing the driveway curb cut and apron at the project entrance, new street lane striping to allow for left-hand turn movements into- and out of the project site, and restriping the bicycle lane across the project frontage. Proposed plans for the project are included as [Attachment 2](#).

Construction of the project is anticipated to take approximately 18 months, comprised of the following phases: (1) demolition and clearing- eight to 10 weeks; (2) Grading and earthwork- two weeks; (3) foundation construction- two weeks; (4) underground utility installation- three weeks; (5) framing- 10 to 12 weeks; (6) exterior finishes- eight to 10

weeks; (7) Interior insulation, sheetrock, etc.- eight to 10 weeks; (8) finish hardscape work- one week; (9) interior finish work- 10 to 12 weeks; (10) parking lot finishing- 10 weeks; (11) landscape installation- six weeks; (12) pool construction- six to eight weeks; and (13) installation of furniture, fixtures and interior equipment- eight weeks.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

The project site is located in an urban area toward the west end of the City of Carpinteria, north of U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101) on Via Real (see Vicinity Map, Attachment 1). The 2.6-acre (113,839 square feet) site is presently improved with a single story 5,678 square foot church building, a children’s play area, a surface parking lot, and vegetable garden. Several small storage buildings are located toward the rear of the property adjacent to the vegetable garden area. The site sits slightly above Via Real in elevation and slopes gently toward the street.

Several access, utility and drainage easements encumber the property: A 30-foot-wide easement for a water line runs along the property’s east (side) property line; a three-foot wide easement occupies a portion of the same strip of land for other public utilities. Along the west (side) property line, a 30-foot-wide strip of land is encumbered by a (20-foot wide) access easement for the adjacent properties to the north behind the subject property, and a 10-foot-wide easement for drainage purposes (to accommodate historic offsite drainage from northerly properties and convey it to the existing outlet and culvert at Via Real). The drainage easement is occupied by the existing vegetated drainage feature that runs north to south through the property and expands to also encompass a 50-foot by 130-foot area at the southwest corner of the property around the existing concrete headwall and drainage outlet. A 10-foot-wide sewer easement traverses the southwest corner of the property as well.

The general project area includes a mix of residential and commercial developments, including several nearby motels (Motel 6; Sandyland Reef Motel), limited retail/commercial/office uses, and several larger multifamily residential developments. The project site is bordered to the north by land zoned for agriculture and currently in open field agricultural production within unincorporated Santa Barbara County. To the northeast are single family residences located on Trieste Lane. Immediately adjacent to the project site to the east is the 37-unit “Pueblo del Estero” apartment complex (4140 Via Real). On the west, the project site is bordered by the recently completed 43-unit “Casas de las Flores” affordable housing apartments. To the south of the project site is Via Real and beyond U.S. Highway 101.

10. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:**

- Carpinteria Sanitary District
- Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District
- Carpinteria Valley Water District
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

11. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

The City of Carpinteria provided notification to Chair, Julie Tumamait-Stenslie of the Barbareño / Ventureño Band of Mission Indians, pursuant to AB52 requirements. Letters in support of AB52 consultation were also sent by the City of Carpinteria on July 14, 2020 to various applicable Tribal representatives. No comments indicating concerns regarding potential Tribal Cultural resources were received for the proposed project. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce potential significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources to less than significant.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

X	Aesthetics		Mineral Resources
X	Agriculture & Forestry Resources	X	Noise
	Air Quality		Population / Housing
X	Biological Resources		Public Services
X	Cultural Resources		Recreation
	Energy		Transportation
X	Geology / Soils	X	Tribal Cultural Resources
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Utilities / Service Systems
	Hazards / Hazardous Materials		Wildfire
X	Hydrology / Water Quality	X	Mandatory Findings of Significance
X	Land Use / Planning		

**DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this initial study:

	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
X	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

---

Nick Bobroff, Principal Planner  
 City of Carpinteria

---

Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) Negative Declaration: "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant" to "Less Than Significant." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures as described in (5) below may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (§15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

1. AESTHETICS  Would the project:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publically accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?		X		
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X		

**Existing Environmental Setting**

The project site is located in an urbanized area toward the west end of the City of Carpinteria, north of U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101) on Via Real. The 2.6-acre (113,839 square feet) site is presently improved with a single story 5,678 square foot church building, a children’s play area, a surface parking lot, and vegetable garden. Several small storage buildings are located toward the rear of the property adjacent to the vegetable garden area. The site sits slightly above Via Real in elevation and slopes gently toward the street.

The project site is landscaped predominantly with lawn area with few trees clustered around the building and along the east (side) property line. Because of the minimal existing site landscaping (outside of groundcover), the church building’s significant setback from Via Real (approximately 85 feet), and the building’s low, single-story height, views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from Via Real and U.S. Highway 101 over the site are generally available. The project site is somewhat obscured from view from U.S. Highway 101 by existing vegetation planted along the shoulder of the northbound U.S. Highway 101 right-of-way. Views from the project site to the ocean are not available due to the generally flat topography of the area and intervening vegetation and urban development.

The general project area includes a mix of residential and commercial developments, including several nearby motels (Motel 6; Sandyland Reef Motel), limited retail/commercial/office uses, and several larger multifamily residential developments. The project site is bordered to the north by land within unincorporated Santa Barbara County zoned for agriculture and currently in open field agricultural production. To the northeast are single family residences located on Trieste Lane. Immediately adjacent to the project site on the east side is the 37-unit “Pueblo del Estero” two-story apartment complex (4140 Via Real). On the west, the project site is bordered by the recently completed 43-unit two-story “Casas de las Flores” affordable housing apartments. To the south of the project site is Via Real and beyond U.S. Highway 101.

## **Thresholds of Significance**

The assessment of aesthetic impacts involves qualitative analysis that is inherently subjective in nature. Different viewers will have varying opinions and reactions to changes in a viewshed or the appearance of new buildings and structures. This evaluation compares the existing visual characteristics of the project study area against the potential changes in visual characteristics that could result from implementation of the proposed project.

The City of Carpinteria has adopted *Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as Amended* (1997), which provide criteria for determining the potential significance of visual impacts. Key factors in assessing the aesthetic resources of a project site include the physical attributes of the site, its relative visibility, and its relative uniqueness. Four types of areas are especially important: coastal and mountain views, the urban fringe, and travel corridors. Based on criteria contained in the City's *Guidelines*, the proposed project would result in a significant visual impact if it would result in one or more of the following conditions:

### **Views**

Projects that would impair public views from designated open space (public easements and right-of-way), roads or parks to significant visual landmarks or scenic vistas (Pacific Ocean, downtown skyline, mountains, waterways). To meet this significance threshold, one or more of the following conditions must apply:

- *The project would substantially impair a view through a designated public view corridor as shown in an adopted community plan, the General Plan, or the Coastal Land Use Plan. Minor view blockages would not be considered to meet this condition. In order to determine whether this condition has been met, consider the level of effort required by the viewer to retain the view.*
- *The project would cause "substantial" view impairment of a public resource (such as the ocean) that is considered significant by the applicable community plan.*
- *The project exceeds the allowed height or bulk regulations, and this excess caused unnecessary view impairment.*
- *The project would have a cumulative effect by opening up a new area for development, which will ultimately cause "extensive" view impairment (cumulative effects are usually considered significant for a community plan analysis, but not necessarily for individual projects). View impairment would be considered "extensive" when the overall scenic quality of a resource is changed; for example, from an essentially natural view to a largely man-made appearance.*

### **Neighborhood Character/Architecture.**

Projects that severely contrast with the surrounding neighborhood character. To meet this significance threshold, one or more of the following conditions must apply:

- *The project exceeds the allowed height or bulk regulations and existing patterns of development in the surrounding area by a significant margin.*
- *The project would have an architectural style or use building materials in stark contrast to adjacent development, where the adjacent development follows a single or common architectural theme.*

- *The project would result in the physical loss or degradation of a community identification symbol or landmark (e.g., a stand of trees, coastal bluff, historic landmark) which is identified in the General Plan, applicable community plan or Local Coastal Program.*
- *The project is located in a highly visible area (e.g., adjacent to an interstate highway) and would strongly contrast with the surrounding environment through excessive bulk, signage, or architectural projections.*
- *The project would have a cumulative effect by opening up a new area for development or changing the overall character of the area (e.g., rural to urban, single-family to multi-family).*

For this analysis, changes to existing visual conditions are not considered significant if the project-related changes would be subordinate to the existing visual environment. Only views available from public viewing locations, such as roadways, are evaluated against the above significance thresholds.

### **Project Specific Impacts:**

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

#### ***Less Than Significant Impact***

A significant impact would occur if the project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The project site is adjacent to Via Real, approximately 150 feet north of the U.S. Highway 101 center median. Persons traveling in either direction on Via Real or U.S. Highway 101 are provided with intermittent views of the Santa Ynez Mountains and foothills north of the project site through, and between/over, existing vegetation and development along the highway shoulder and along Via Real. The project area is not designated as a public view corridor, nor is this particular view of the Santa Ynez Mountains deemed significant in the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, although public views of the mountains and ocean are protected under the Coastal Act.

At a maximum height of 25 feet from new finished grade, and a finished floor height approximately three feet above the existing sidewalk elevation along the project's Via Real frontage, the proposed two-story structure would be below the City's 30-foot maximum height allowed per the Zoning Code. As the proposed building height and finished floor elevation are comparable to other nearby development, the proposed hotel building would not strongly contrast with the surrounding environment in terms of overall building height. The protection of the existing driveway easement and drainage feature along the west side of the property, coupled with the provided 50-foot creek buffer would preserve an approximately 100-foot-wide open corridor between the proposed hotel and its western (side) property line which would preserve a view corridor to the mountains from Via Real and U.S. Highway 101. Existing vegetation along the shoulder of U.S. Highway 101 and/or replacement landscaping along the shoulder of U.S. Highway 101 as part of the "South Coast Highway 101 HOV Lanes" project will continue to partially obscure views to the mountains from the highway and would also obscure views of the proposed hotel building itself.

The proposed project would incrementally contribute toward further obstruction of the public viewshed from Via Real and U.S. Highway 101 to the mountains, however the resultant view impacts from this project do not exceed any of the prescribed thresholds for significance. Therefore, the impact to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

### ***Less Than Significant Impact***

Currently there are no officially designated scenic highways in the City of Carpinteria or within the project area located within the County of Santa Barbara. Designation of "Official Scenic Highways" is governed by Article 2.5 of the California Streets and Highways Code and pertains to State Highway Routes. Section 263.1 and 263.6 of the California Streets and Highways Code identifies Highway 150 and U.S. Highway 101 as eligible for designation as state scenic highways (City of Carpinteria 2003). The County of Santa Barbara Scenic Highway Element (2009) indicates the entire length of US Highway 101 within Santa Barbara County and State Highway 150 from its junction with US Highway 101 east into Ventura County as eligible scenic highways.

Motorists traveling along US Highway 101 are afforded intermittent views of the Santa Ynez Mountains around/through vegetation along the highway shoulder, and over/around existing development adjacent to the highway. The proposed hotel would also be intermittently visible to highway travelers in both directions. Views of the proposed hotel from US Highway 101 are generally short in duration and would not be notably out of scale or character with adjoining development in terms of visibility or impacting existing views. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

- c) *In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publically accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

### ***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

A significant impact would occur if the project exceeds the allowed height or bulk regulations and existing patterns of development in the surrounding area by a significant margin; would have an architectural style or use building materials in stark contrast to adjacent development, where the adjacent development follows a single or common architectural theme; would result in the physical loss or degradation of a community identification symbol or landmark (e.g., a stand of trees, coastal bluff, historic landmark) which is identified in the General Plan, applicable community plan or Local Coastal Program; is located in a highly visible area (e.g., adjacent to an interstate highway) and would strongly contrast with the surrounding environment through excessive bulk, signage, or architectural projections; or where the project would have a cumulative effect by opening up a new area for development or changing the overall character of the area (e.g., rural to urban, single-family to multi-family).

The proposed project would comply with all pertinent development standards related to building height, size and placement on the property. No significant community identification symbols or landmarks are present in the project area or would be impacted by the project. The incorporated portion of the project vicinity is built out, such that the proposed project is not likely to have any impact on opening up the area for additional development or changing the overall character of the area. The unincorporated areas behind the project location are either zoned and developed with single family residential land uses, or zoned and used for agricultural uses. The project vicinity exhibits a mix of architectural styles and land use types. The proposed hotel would introduce yet another architectural vernacular to the area and make use of some exterior finishes

and colors/materials that are unique for this part of the City. As previously mentioned, the project site is located prominently on one of the City's major east-west arterial roadways and within sight of U.S. Highway 101. Given the visibility of the site and the somewhat unique architecture, materials, and colors proposed for the hotel building, strong contrasts in appearance could result in a potentially significant aesthetic impact unless properly mitigated. Review of the project by the Architectural Review Board, as required by Mitigation Measure AES-1 (below) to ensure the chosen architectural style, colors and materials do not strongly contrast with surrounding development and are appropriate to the neighborhood character would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Likewise, Mitigation Measure AES-2 would require that all mechanical equipment and trash receptacle areas be properly located and screened to avoid aesthetic impacts on surrounding land uses.

- d) *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

### ***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

The proposed hotel project would introduce new sources of exterior lighting to the project area as a result of new exterior building, pathway and parking lot lighting, in addition to new illuminated building and site signage. Given the proximity of the project to residential developments to the east, north and west, excessive lighting that spills over from the project site could pose an adverse impact on neighboring land uses and detract from nighttime views in the area. Compliance with the City's standard lighting conditions through Mitigation Measure AES-3, which requires that any new exterior lighting be night-sky compliant in design to minimize glare, spillover and similar lighting impacts, and AES-4, which addresses illuminated signage, would reduce these impacts to less than significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City's 2003 General Plan and Coastal Land Use Plan (the Plan), herein incorporated by reference. The Plan incorporates numerous Objectives and Policies that provide mitigation for the actions allowed under the Plan, including mitigation for aesthetic impacts as a result of buildout under the Plan. The proposed project must be found consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the Plan in order to be approved. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to aesthetic impacts, however, with adherence to the Plan's Objectives and Policies, the project's contribution to cumulative aesthetic impacts would not be considerable and would be further reduced through the implementation of the project-specific measures below.

### **Required Mitigation Measures**

**AES-1. Architectural Review Board (ARB) Review.** The design, scale, character, colors, and materials of the project architecture shall be compatible with vicinity development and consistent with the City's "small beach town" character.

**Plan Requirement and Timing:** The applicant shall submit plans for the project for review by the Architectural Review Board prior to approval of any Building Permit for physical development.

**Monitoring:** Community Development Department staff (CDD) shall review submitted plans, provide direction to the ARB regarding this mitigation measure and site inspect during the construction phase for compliance with the approved plans.

**AES-2. Equipment Screening.** All mechanical equipment, including but not limited to, heating and air conditioning units, and trash receptacle areas, shall be completely screened from surrounding properties by use of a wall or fence, or shall be enclosed within a building or roof parapet/equipment well.

**Plan Requirements:** The locations of all exterior mechanical equipment shall be depicted on a Roof and/or Mechanical Equipment Plan to be reviewed and approved by CDD with input from the ARB.

**Monitoring:** CDD and ARB shall review the Roof and/or Mechanical Equipment Plan for compliance with this measure prior to approval of a Building Permit for structures. Building Inspector/CDD staff shall inspect structures upon completion to ensure that mechanical equipment has been installed consistent with the approved Plan.

**AES-3. Lighting.** Any exterior night lighting installed on the project site shall be of low intensity, low glare design, minimum height, and shall be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels and into the protected riparian habitats and their associated buffers. Applicant shall develop a Lighting Plan incorporating these requirements and provisions for dimming lights after 10:00 pm.

**Plan Requirements:** Specifications for all selected exterior lighting fixtures shall be included in the plans. The locations of all exterior lighting fixtures and photometric exhibit showing the direction and intensity of light being cast by each fixture and the height of the fixtures shall be depicted on a Lighting Plan to be reviewed and approved by CDD with input from the ARB.

**Monitoring:** CDD and ARB shall review a Lighting Plan for compliance with this measure prior to approval of a building permit for structures. Building Inspector/CDD staff shall inspect structures upon completion to ensure that exterior lighting fixtures have been installed consistent with their depiction on the final Lighting Plan.

**AES-4. Illuminated Signs.** Building and grounds signage shall be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board to ensure the size, design, colors, and intensity of signage is appropriate to the neighborhood setting and does not create distracting or intrusive impacts on surrounding uses.

**Plan Requirements:** Detailed sign plans, depicting the location, construction, size, and dimensions of all project-related signage shall be submitted to the Architectural Review Board for review and approval prior to Building Permit issuance. All illuminated signage shall be outfitted with dimmable controls to control light intensity.

**Monitoring:** CDD staff shall ensure compliance with the Architectural Review Board-approved sign plans during Building Permit review and prior to occupancy clearance.

### **Residual Impact**

With incorporation of the required mitigation measures, residual aesthetic impacts would be less than significant.

<b>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES</b>  In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. -- Would the project	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversation of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		X		

**Existing Environmental Setting**

The project site is located within an urbanized part of the City zoned for commercial and residential uses, and is currently developed as a church. The California Department of Conservation's California Important Farmland Finder (CIFF) Map designates the project site as "Urban and Built-Up Land." The northern (rear) property line boundary of the project site comprises the City of Carpinteria municipal boundary, and abuts agricultural lands zoned AG-I-5 in unincorporated Santa Barbara County. The agricultural lands in question are used to grow row crops, and are designed by CIFF as "Farmland of Statewide Importance." Vehicular access to the agricultural lands is taken via a private access easement along the western (side) boundary of the project site.

## **Thresholds of Significance**

The City of Carpinteria's *Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as Amended* (1994), does not provide specific criteria, but rather provides the following general thresholds:

- Development proposed on any property five acres or greater in size with a Prime Agricultural Soils designation may represent a significant environmental impact.
- Development proposed on any property in an Agricultural Preserve would represent a significant environmental impact.
- Development proposed on any property which in the past five years has been in agricultural production and which is agriculturally zoned may represent a significant environmental impact.
- Development of 10 or more-acre non-prime parcels may be significant due to historical use or surroundings (conversion may make adjacent agricultural land ripe for conversion).

In addition, CEQA Appendix G states that a project will have a significant impact on the environment if it will:

- Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located.
- Convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use or impair the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land.

## **Project Specific Impacts**

- a) *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

### ***No Impact***

The project site is designated "Urban and Built-Up Land" according to the Department of Conservation's CIFF Map. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of any lands designated "prime farmland," "unique farmland," or "farmland of statewide importance." Accordingly, there would be no impact.

- b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?*

### ***No Impact***

The project site is not zoned for agricultural use, nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project would have no impact on existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

- c) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section*

*4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?*

**No Impact**

There are no lands in the immediate project area zoned for, or designated as “forest land,” “timberland,” or “timberland zoned Timberland Production.” Therefore, the project would have no impact on forest lands.

*d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

**No Impact**

There are no forest lands located on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Therefore, there is no potential for the project to result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

*e) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated**

As discussed in the existing environmental setting section (above), the project site is zoned and designated for, and developed with urbanized land uses, however it shares its northern (rear) property line boundary with unincorporated Santa Barbara County lands zoned for agriculture that are designated as “farmlands of statewide importance” and that are currently being cultivated for row crops. At its closest points, the proposed hotel would be located approximately 70 feet from the shared property line with the nearest agricultural lands. The proposed hotel’s parking lot would be a minimum of 12 feet from the shared property line at its closest point (at the location of the trash enclosure). Much of the shared rear property line would be physically separated by the required 50-foot creek buffer and the protected riparian canopy area adjacent to the rear property line. Nevertheless, when intensified urban land uses are located in close physical proximity to agricultural lands, the potential exists for land use compatibility conflicts to occur with respect to odors, dust, noise or similar impacts associated with typical agricultural activities. If not addressed, ongoing nuisance complaints related to agricultural activity could interfere with or disrupt the viability of the adjacent agricultural operations.

Therefore, Mitigation Measure AG-1 requires the recordation of an informational notice on the title of the property alerting current and future owners that the property is adjacent to properties zoned for agricultural uses, and that any inconvenience or discomfort from properly conducted agricultural operations, including noise, odors, dust, lighting and chemical usage, will not be deemed a nuisance. The informational notice will be recorded with the Clerk Recorder’s office. The hotel operator shall also be required to provide written notification of the County’s “Right to Farm” ordinance and its applicability to the adjacent agricultural operations to all hotel guests.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City's General Plan and Coastal Land Use Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to agricultural resource impacts. However, the project's contribution to cumulative agricultural impacts would not be considerable and would be further reduced through the implementation of the project specific measures to address property owner and hotel guest notification that the project has been developed next to an existing agricultural operation protected under the County of Santa Barbara's "Right to Farm" Ordinance.

### **Required Mitigation Measures**

**AG-1. Right to Farm Notification.** The following informational notice shall be recorded with the Santa Barbara County Clerk Recorder's office for appearance on any future property owners' Title Reports; shared with hotel employees; and disclosed to hotel guests prior to check-in:

#### **IMPORTANT: PROPERTY OWNER, EMPLOYEE & HOTEL GUEST NOTIFICATION**

This property is located adjacent to property zoned for agriculture and is located in an area that has been planned for agricultural uses. Existing agricultural growing operations are located north of the property. Vehicles associated with the agricultural use of this property utilize the adjacent driveway located immediately west and north of this property to access agricultural lands. While the Via Real Hotel project design includes landscape buffers and physical setbacks from the adjacent agricultural lands to reduce possible noise, light, odors and dust from impacting guests and employees of the Via Real Hotel project, property/business owners, employees and guests are to be notified that these are existing conditions and will not be considered by the City of Carpinteria to be a nuisance requiring extraordinary actions by the adjacent agricultural operators or landowners. It is in the public interest to preserve agricultural land and operations within the Carpinteria Valley and to specifically protect these lands for exclusive agricultural use. Any inconvenience or discomfort from properly conducted agricultural operations, including noise, lights, odors, dust, and chemicals, will not be deemed a nuisance.

**Plan Requirements:** The applicant shall prepare and submit to the Community Development Department for review and approval the informational notice containing the above disclosure statement. The notice shall be recorded prior to granting of occupancy clearance by the City of Carpinteria. Hotel operator shall be made aware of this disclosure requirement in writing and shall provide a copy of the disclosure document(s) used to notify hotel guests and employees of the adjacent agricultural land's "right to farm" protections.

**Monitoring:** Following recordation and prior to granting of occupancy clearance, CDD staff shall be provided with a conformed copy of the recorded informational notice, and a copy of the disclosure document that will be used to notify hotel guests and employees.

### **Residual Impact**

With incorporation of the required mitigation measure, residual agricultural and forest resources impacts would be less than significant.

<b>3. AIR QUALITY</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Clean Air Plan?			X	
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				X

### **Existing Environmental Setting**

The City of Carpinteria and Santa Barbara County are located in the South-Central Coast Air Basin (Basin), composed of Ventura County, Santa Barbara County and San Luis Obispo County. Development activities within Santa Barbara County that would potentially impact the Basin are under the jurisdiction of the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). The physical and regulatory air quality setting for the Carpinteria Valley and Santa Barbara County is described in detail in the APCD's 2016 Ozone Plan, which is incorporated by reference (SBCAPCD 2016). The 2016 Ozone Plan is available for review at local libraries, Carpinteria City Hall and at the APCD office at 260 N. San Antonio Road, Suite A, Santa Barbara or on their website at: [www.sbcapcd.org](http://www.sbcapcd.org).

*Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status.* Criteria air pollutants are defined as pollutants for which the federal and state governments have established ambient air quality standards or criteria for outdoor concentrations to protect public health. The federal and state standards have been set with an adequate margin of safety at levels above which concentrations could be harmful to human health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect the most sensitive persons from illness or discomfort. Criteria air pollutants include the following: ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns in size (PM<sub>10</sub>), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in size (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and lead. Ambient air quality is determined by comparing contaminant levels in ambient air samples to national and State standards that are set by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) were first established by the federal Clean Air Act of 1970. The NAAQS describe acceptable air quality conditions designed to protect the health and welfare of the citizens of the nation; these NAAQS may not be exceeded more than once a year, except annual standards, which may never be exceeded.

California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) were established by CARB in 1967 and are generally more restrictive than the NAAQS. They are consistent with the Clean Air Act that requires state regulations to be at least as restrictive as the federal requirements. The CAAQS provide thresholds used to determine if basin pollution levels are low enough to attain the national clean air standards. Basin air quality is considered in

“attainment” if pollutant levels are continuously below the CAAQS and violate the standards no more than once each year. The NAAQS and CAAQS are presented in Table 3.3-1, Ambient Air Quality Standards.

**Table 3.3-1 Ambient Air Quality Standards**

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Average Time</b>	<b>California Standards</b>	<b>National Standards</b>
O <sub>3</sub>	1 hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	—
	8 hours	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.075 ppm (147 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )
NO <sub>2</sub>	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.053 ppm (100 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )
	1 hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.100 ppm (188 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )
CO	8 hours	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	9 ppm (10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )
	1 hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	35 ppm (40 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )
SO <sub>2</sub>	24 hours	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	
	1 hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.075 ppm (196 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )
PM <sub>10</sub>	24 hours	50 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	150 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	—
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24 hours	No Separate State Standard	35 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	15.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup>

Source: CARB 2019a

Notes: ppm = parts per million by volume; µg/m<sup>3</sup> = micrograms per cubic meter; mg/m<sup>3</sup>= milligrams per cubic meter

The attainment classifications for these criteria pollutants are outlined in Table 3.3-2, Santa Barbara County Attainment Classification.

**Table 3.3-2 Santa Barbara County Attainment Classification**

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Averaging Time</b>	<b>State Designation/Classification</b>	<b>National Designation/Classification</b>
O <sub>3</sub>	8 hour	Attainment	Unclassified / Attainment
	1 hour	Attainment	—
NO <sub>2</sub>	1 hour	Attainment	—
	Annual arithmetic mean	Attainment	Unclassified / Attainment
CO	1 hour, 8 hour	Attainment	Unclassified / Attainment
SO <sub>2</sub>	1 hour	Attainment	—
	24 hour	Attainment	Unclassified /Attainment
PM <sub>10</sub>	24 hour	Nonattainment	Unclassified
	Annual arithmetic mean	Nonattainment	—
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24 hour	Unclassified	Unclassified / Attainment
	Annual arithmetic mean	Unclassified	Unclassified / Attainment

Source: CARB 2020; EPA 2019

As shown in Table 3.3-2, Santa Barbara County is designated as a nonattainment area for state PM<sub>10</sub> standards. Effective July 1, 2020, Santa Barbara County was designated as being an attainment area for State ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) standards. It is also an attainment area or unclassified for all other standards.

*Air Quality Monitoring Data.* The APCD maintains ambient air quality monitoring stations throughout the County. The closest ambient air quality monitoring station to the project site is located on Gobernador Canyon Road in Carpinteria, which measures O<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub>. The nearest station measuring CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> is the Santa Barbara monitoring station located at 700 E. Canon Perdido. The UCSB West Campus monitoring station is the nearest station to the project site that measures SO<sub>2</sub>. The most recent background ambient air quality data from 2018 to 2020 is presented in Table 3.3-3.

**Table 3.3-3 Ambient Air Quality Data  
 (parts per million (ppm) unless otherwise indicated)**

Pollutant	Averaging Time	2018	2019 <sup>1</sup>	2020 <sup>2</sup>	Most Stringent Ambient Air Quality Standard	Monitoring Station
O <sub>3</sub>	8-hour	0.070	0.071	0.086	0.070	Carpinteria – Gobernador Road
	1-hour	0.084	0.086	0.103	0.09	
CO	1-hour*	1.5	1.0	1.0	20	Goleta (Las Flores Canyon for 2020)
SO <sub>2</sub>	1-hour	0.002	0.01	0.08	0.25	West Campus
PM <sub>10</sub>	Annual	25.2 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	20.1 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	24.1 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	20 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Santa Barbara
	24-hour	128.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	72 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	84.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	50 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Annual	8.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	6.8 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	9.3 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	12 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Santa Barbara
	24-hour	38.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	23 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	63.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	35 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-hour	0.029	0.018	0.012	0.18	Carpinteria – Gobernador Road

Source: SBCAPCD Annual Monitor Reports 2018-2020.

Notes: µg/m<sup>3</sup> = micrograms per cubic meter; -- = no data available to determine the value.

As Table 3.3-3 demonstrates, air quality within the project region is in compliance with both CAAQS and NAAQS for NO<sub>2</sub>, CO and SO<sub>2</sub>, but not O<sub>3</sub>. The PM<sub>10</sub> levels monitored at the air monitoring stations exceeded

<sup>1</sup> SBCAPCD 2019 Annual Air Quality Report highest concentration used as is this is the data that is available for that year.

<sup>2</sup> SBCAPCD 2020 Annual Air Quality Report highest concentration used as is this is the data that is available for that year.

the state 24-hour and annual standards during 2018, 2019, and 2020. PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels exceeded the state and the federal 24-hour and annual standards during 2018 and 2020.

*Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District.* The APCD Rules and Regulations establish emission limitations and control requirements for various sources, based upon their source type and magnitude of emissions. The APCD rules applicable to the proposed project may include the following:

- Rule 302 (Visible Emissions). Rule 302 prohibits emissions of visible air contaminants from any potential source of air contaminants. The rule prohibits air contaminants, other than water vapor, that are a certain level of darkness or opacity from being discharged for a combined period of more than three minutes in any one hour.
- Rule 305 (Particulate Matter – Southern Zone). Rule 305 states that a person shall not discharge into the atmosphere from any source particulate matter in excess of the concentrations listed in the rule.
- Rule 303 (Nuisance). This rule could apply to fugitive dust emitted during proposed construction activities or odors during operation. This rule states that a person shall not discharge air contaminants from any source that can cause injury, detriment, nuisance or annoyance to any considerable number of persons, or that can endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or their business or property.
- Rule 311 (Sulfur Content of Fuels). The purpose of this rule is to limit the sulfur content in gaseous fuels, diesel and other liquid fuels and solid fuels for the purpose of both reducing the formation of SO<sub>x</sub> and particulates during combustion.
- Rule 323 (Architectural Coatings). This rule is applicable to any person who supplies, sells, offers for sale, applies, or solicits the application of any architectural coating, or who manufactures any architectural coating for use within the District.
- Rule 329 (Asphalt Paving). The provisions of this rule shall apply to the manufacture, application and sale of cutback and emulsified asphalt materials for the paving, construction and maintenance of streets, highways, parking lots and driveways.
- Rule 345 (Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities). Rule 345 establishes limits on the generation of visible fugitive dust emissions at demolition and construction sites. The rule includes prohibition of visible dust (opacity of 20% or greater) beyond the property line, a requirement to cover soil hauling trucks or maintain adequate freeboard below the truck bed rim, and minimization of road dust from track-out/carry out by construction vehicles.
- Rule 352 (Natural Gas-Fired Furnaces). This rule applies to any person who manufactures, supplies, sells, offers for sale, installs, or solicits the installation of any natural gas-fired fan-type central furnaces or water heaters for use within the District
- Rule 360 (Natural Gas Boilers). This rule applies to any person who supplies, sells, offers for sale, installs, modifies, or solicits the installation or modification of any boiler, water heater, steam generator or process heater for use within the District with a rated heat input capacity greater than or equal to 75,000 British thermal units per hour up to and including 2,000,000 British thermal units per hour.

### **Environmental Thresholds**

Air quality impacts are evaluated on both a short-term and long-term basis. Short-term impacts are generally considered to occur during project construction while long-term impacts are associated with project operation.

Air quality threshold criteria are developed and applied using federal, state and local data and methodologies including computerized modeling techniques. State CEQA Guidelines state in Appendix G, that for air quality, a project will ordinarily have a significant effect on the environment if it will:

- *Violate any ambient State or Federal air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.*

In addition, the APCD has prepared criteria and thresholds for determining significance under CEQA. According to the APCD's Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents (APCD 2011), a proposed project would not have a significant impact on air quality, either individually or cumulatively, if operation of the project will:

- *Emit (from all project sources, both stationary and mobile) less than the daily trigger for offsets or air quality impact analysis set in the APCD New Source Review Rule, for any pollutant;*
- *Emit less than 25 pounds per day of NO<sub>x</sub> or 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 (10 excess cancer cases in a million for cancer risk and a Hazard Index of more than one (1.0) for non-cancer risk;*
- *Be consistent with the latest adopted federal and state air quality plans for Santa Barbara County*

Due to the relatively low background ambient CO levels in Santa Barbara County, localized CO impacts associated with congested intersections are not expected to exceed the CO health related air quality standards. Therefore, CO "hotspots" analyses are not required.

Quantitative thresholds of significance are not currently in place for short-term or construction emissions; however, the APCD uses 25 tons per year for ROG or NO<sub>x</sub> as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts. Under APCD Rule 202 D.16, if the combined emissions from all construction equipment used to construct a stationary source that requires an Authority to Construct permit will have the potential to exceed 25 tons of any pollutant, except CO, in a 12-month period, the owner of the stationary source shall provide offsets under the provisions of Rule 804, and shall demonstrate that no ambient air quality standard would be violated (APCD 2011a).

Although quantitative thresholds of significance are not currently in place for short-term emissions, CEQA requires that short-term impacts such as exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generation during grading be discussed in the environmental document. In the interest of public disclosure, the APCD recommends that construction-related NO<sub>x</sub>, ROC, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions from diesel and gasoline powered equipment, paving and other activities, be quantified.

Standard dust control measures must be implemented for any discretionary project involving earth-moving activities. Some projects have the potential for construction-related dust to cause a nuisance. Because Santa Barbara County is currently in nonattainment for the state PM<sub>10</sub> standard, dust mitigation measures are required for all discretionary construction activities (regardless of the significance of the fugitive dust impacts) based on policies within the 1979 Air Quality Attainment Plan (APCD 2011a).

Also, because diesel particulate matter is the primary airborne carcinogen in California, if the activity involves the use of diesel-powered equipment within a quarter-mile of a sensitive receptor such as a school, residence, daycare or eldercare facility, the APCD may consider the impact significant. The project site is immediately bordered by residential land uses to the east, north, and west.

**Project Specific Impacts**

a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Clean Air Plan?*

***Less Than Significant Impact***

Wolf Environmental, Inc. conducted an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment for the Project (Wolf Environmental, Inc., 2021). A copy of their report is provided in Appendix C and relevant information is incorporated in this section by reference.

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model quantifies direct emissions from construction and operations (including vehicle use), as well as indirect emissions, such as GHG emissions from energy use, solid waste disposal, vegetation planting and/or removal, and water use. The model is an accurate and comprehensive tool for quantifying air quality impacts from land use projects throughout California. The model can be used for a variety of situations where an air quality analysis is necessary or desirable such as CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents, pre-project planning, compliance with local air quality rules and regulations, etc.

Wolf Environmental utilized the CalEEMod model (Version 2020.4.0, dated 12/05/21) to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with both construction and operations for the project. The model quantifies direct emissions from construction and operations (including vehicle use), as well as indirect emissions, such as GHG emissions from energy use, solid waste disposal, vegetation planting and/or removal, and water use. Detailed results of the CalEEMod analysis are included in the air quality report (Wolf Environmental, Inc., 2021). Table 3-4 indicates the construction emissions and Table 3-5 indicates the operational emissions from the Project.

**Table 3-4. Project Construction Emissions (tons/year)**

<b>Summary Report</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>NOx</b>	<b>ROG</b>	<b>SOx</b>	<b>PM10</b>	<b>PM2.5</b>	<b>CO2e</b>
Project Construction Emissions	1.34	1.29	1.93	2.67e-003	0.17	0.10	240.28

**Table 3-5. Project Operational Emissions (tons/year)**

<b>Summary Report</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>NOx</b>	<b>ROG</b>	<b>SOx</b>	<b>PM10</b>	<b>PM2.5</b>	<b>CO2e</b>
Project Operational Emissions	3.03	0.67	1.19	6.15e-003	0.48	0.14	989.59

### Construction Emissions

Due to the relatively low background ambient CO levels in Santa Barbara County, localized CO impacts associated with congested intersections are not expected to exceed the CO health related air quality standards. Therefore, CO “hotspots” analyses are not required.

Quantitative thresholds of significance are not currently in place for short-term or construction emissions; however, the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) uses 25 tons per year for Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG) or NO<sub>x</sub> as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts. Under SBCAPCD Rule 202 D.16, if the combined emissions from all construction equipment used to construct a stationary source that requires an Authority to Construct permit will have the potential to exceed 25 tons of any pollutant, except CO, in a 12-month period, the owner of the stationary source shall provide offsets under the provisions of Rule 804 and shall demonstrate that no ambient air quality standard would be violated (APCD 2011a). Please note that this project is not a stationary source, and this latter threshold is not applicable.

Although quantitative thresholds of significance are not currently in place for short-term emissions, CEQA requires that short-term impacts such as exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generation during grading be discussed in the environmental document. In the interest of public disclosure, the SBCAPCD recommends that construction-related NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions from diesel and gasoline powered equipment, paving and other activities, be quantified.

Standard dust control measures must be implemented for any discretionary project involving earth-moving activities. Some projects have the potential for construction-related dust to cause a nuisance. Because Santa Barbara County is currently in nonattainment for the state PM<sub>10</sub> standard, dust mitigation measures are required for all discretionary construction activities (regardless of the significance of the fugitive dust impacts) based on policies within the 1979 Air Quality Attainment Plan (APCD 2011a).

Due to the temporary, short-term nature of construction emissions, the SBCAPCD does not apply the quantitative operational emissions thresholds of 25 pounds per day for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> to construction activities. As no quantitative emissions thresholds for maximum daily construction emissions are established, and the proposed project is under those thresholds in any event, the proposed project air quality impacts in relation to construction activity would be less than significant.

### Operational Emissions

Long-Term emissions from the Project would be generated primarily by mobile source (vehicle) emissions from the Project site and area sources such as lawn maintenance equipment. Significance criteria have been established for criteria pollutant emissions as documented above would apply to the project regarding NO<sub>x</sub> or ROG emissions. CalEEMod results indicate that the annual operational emissions from the Project will be less than the air district emissions thresholds for criteria pollutants noted above, and therefore the proposed project air quality impacts in relation to operational activity would be less than significant.

The primary way of determining consistency with the Air Quality Plan’s (AQP’s) assumptions is determining consistency with the applicable General Plan to ensure that the Project’s population density and land uses are consistent with the growth assumptions used in the AQP’s for the air basin.

As required by California law, city and county General Plans contain a Land Use Element that details the types and quantities of land uses that the city or county estimates will be needed for future growth, and then designate locations for land uses to regulate growth. Existing and future pollutant emissions computed in the AQP are based on land uses from area general plans. AQP's detail the control measures and emission reductions required for reaching attainment of the air standards.

The applicable General Plan for the project is the City of Carpinteria General Plan/Local Coastal Land Use Plan, dated April 2003. The Project is consistent with the currently adopted General Plan for the City as well as the County's Climate Action Plan (CAP) and is therefore consistent with the population growth and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) applied in the plan. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the growth assumptions used in the applicable AQP's. As a result, the Project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality plans. Therefore, no mitigation is needed.

*b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?*

***Less Than Significant Impact***

Construction of the project would result in emissions of ozone precursors including reactive organic gasses (ROG), nitrous oxides (NOx), and fugitive dust emissions (PM10). During operation, the project would result in emissions of ozone precursors associated with mobile source emissions and other stationary sources. Inconsistency with any of the plans would be considered a cumulatively adverse air quality impact. As discussed above, the Project is consistent with the currently adopted General Plan for the City and is therefore consistent with the population growth and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) applied in the AQP.

Project specific emissions that exceed the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants would be expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the County is in non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. It should be noted that a project is not characterized as cumulatively insignificant when project emissions fall below thresholds of significance.

As indicated in Tables 3-4 and 3-5, results of the analysis show that emissions generated from construction and operation of the Project will be less than the applicable air district emission thresholds for criteria pollutants. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts on applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. No mitigation required

*c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

***Less Than Significant Impact***

Sensitive receptors refer to those segments of the population most susceptible to poor air quality (i.e., children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing serious health problems affected by air quality). Land uses that have the greatest potential to attract these types of sensitive receptors include schools, parks, playgrounds, daycare centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential communities.

Although the Project site is adjacent to residential uses, the fact that no SBCAPCD criteria pollutant thresholds or GHG emissions thresholds would be exceeded because of either project construction or operations ensures this impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

d) *Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

### **No Impact**

CEQA requires that an analysis of potential odor impacts be conducted for the following two situations:

- Generators – projects that would potentially generate odorous emissions proposed to be located near existing sensitive receptors or other land uses where people may congregate, and
- Receivers – residential or other sensitive receptor projects or other projects built for the intent of attracting people located near existing odor sources.

The intensity of an odor source's operations and its proximity to sensitive receptors influences the potential significance of odor emissions. Air districts throughout the state have identified some common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors. The types of facilities that are known to produce odors are typically associated with heavy industry or agriculture. The Project will not generate odorous emissions given the nature or characteristics of the Project. The project will have no impacts from such emissions. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally increase air pollutant emissions, which could cumulatively degrade regional air quality. However, all new development within the Carpinteria Valley would be consistent with the City or County's General Plan/Local Coastal Land Use Plans; therefore, all such development would be within the projections contained in the adopted CAP. Therefore, cumulative development in the Carpinteria Valley should not hinder progress toward attainment of the County's air quality objectives and cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.

### **Required Mitigation Measures**

None required.

### **Residual Impact**

Residual impacts of air quality resources would be less than significant.

<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>  <b>Would the project:</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X		
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a creek preservation policy or tree protection ordinance?		X		
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

The following technical studies related to biological resources, were conducted for this project:

- Wetland Delineation and Jurisdictional Determination, Strorrer Environmental Services LLC, April 2017 (Strorrer, 2017).
- Preliminary Jurisdictional Waters/Wetlands Delineation Report, September 19, 2017 (Stantec, 2017)
- Tree Inventory & Mapping Associated with Swale B (RECON, 2018).

Copies of these Wetland Delineation Reports, and RECON's tree inventory spreadsheet are provided in Appendix D.

Information regarding description of existing natural resources conditions present at the project site and discussion of potential impacts are partially based on these reports and incorporated by reference, as applicable.

## **Environmental Thresholds**

In addition to these reports, the following City of Carpinteria Guidelines and Policies were also utilized as guidelines to analyzing the potential impacts to Biological Resources and formulation of mitigation measures:

- Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, Exhibit A- Environmental Review Guidelines, City of Carpinteria.
- Creeks Preservation Program Final Document, Volume One, City of Carpinteria, September 2005.
- General Plan/Local Coastal Land Use Plan & Environmental Impact Report, City of Carpinteria, 2003.
- Relevant Technical Studies prepared for projects in the Project Site Vicinity
- City of Carpinteria Environmental Thresholds, Resolution 4082 (1994), *Biological Resources*. This threshold determines whether a project may substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or habitat to the species, interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or substantially diminish the habitat for fish, wildlife, or plants. The threshold provides for the evaluation of plant and animal species listed in State and Federal publications as well as in professional journals which identify the rarity, endangerment, vigor, and general distribution of the endangered species. City General Plan and Coastal Plan environmentally sensitive habitat designations are also utilized for project impact evaluation. Finally, information from wildlife biologists or botanists may be used to determine the value and significance of biological resources not currently listed in publications and journals.
- City of Carpinteria Environmental Thresholds, Resolution 4082 (1994), *Mitigation Measures*. Measures capable of reducing or avoiding potentially significant impacts shall be identified during the preliminary evaluation of non-exempt projects. A broad range of potential mitigations should be considered to maximize the potential for project modifications which mitigate adverse impacts and enable projects to qualify for Negative Declarations. The list of mitigation measures identified at the Initial Study stage must later be refined and specified to meet the standards for inclusion in the environmental document.

## **Existing Environmental Setting**

The project site is situated within the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Carpinteria 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle. The property is bordered on the north by agricultural land and residential development, to the south by Via Real and U.S. Highway 101, to the west by an apartment complex, and to the east by residential development and commercial structures. The project site is relatively flat, ranging in elevation from approximately 15 feet above Mean Sea Level (MSL) in the north to 7 feet above MSL in the south.

The Carpinteria Salt Marsh is located south of the proposed Project area, to the south of U.S. Highway 101. It is one of the largest and most critical estuaries in California, supporting several sensitive plant and animal species. The Project site is in the Carpinteria Valley of southeastern Santa Barbara County. The Carpinteria Valley is bounded to the east, north and northwest by the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains and to the south and west by the Pacific Ocean. The peaks and ridges of the adjacent foothills range from approximately 600 to 2,000 feet above MSL. Elevations of the valley floor range from sea level to approximately 130 feet above MSL. In general, topography of the Carpinteria Valley area slopes towards the south to southwest.

The approximately 2.61-acre project site is presently improved with a single story 5,678 square foot church, a children's play area, a surface parking lot and the remnants of a vegetable garden. Several small outbuildings are located near the rear of the lot adjacent to the former garden. The habitat on the project site

primarily consists of planted ornamental species, disturbed/developed areas and non-native plant species. Most of the site not otherwise occupied by buildings or impervious surfaces is dominated by non-native grasses and groundcover. Several scattered non-native trees are planted near the church building and playground, and along the eastern side property line adjacent to the surface parking lot. A secondary paved road, serving the agricultural lands located to the north of the project site runs along the property's western (side) property boundary. Based on a review of historic aerial photos, the area at the northerly (rear) of the subject lot appears to have been used as a vegetable garden from 2011 through 2014.

Four vegetation/land cover types were identified on the project site (Stantec, 2017). Figure 1. Shows the Vegetation Communities on the project site. These vegetation communities are:

*Myoporum Groves* - This vegetation community is dominated by non-native myoporum trees (*Myoporum laetum*), occurring along the western boundary of the project site, in the upstream half of the drainage that traverses the northern portion of the site.

*Non-native Grassland* - This non-native community occurs on the southern and western portions of the project site, adjacent to the church building and playground area, and is dominated by kikuyu grass (*Pennisetum clandestinum*). Throughout the property, areas mapped as non-native grassland historically have been periodically maintained via mowing and/or weed whipping.

*Ruderal Herbaceous Scrub* - Ruderal vegetation occupies the northern outcrop portion of the property. It is dominated by non-native, herbaceous plant species including greenstem filaree (*Erodium moschatum*), cheeseweed, cut-leaved geranium (*Geranium dissectum*), prickly sow thistle, English plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), scarlet pimpernel (*Lysimachia arvensis*), kikuyu grass, and annual grasses such as bromes (*Bromus* spp.) and wild oat (*Avena fatua*).

*Disturbed/Developed* - This land use type describes existing structures, dirt roads, and other disturbed areas; ornamental vegetation is also included under this classification.

*Man-made drainages (Swales)* - There are two on-site man-made drainage features on the property, referred to here as "Swale A" and "Swale B" (Stantec, 2017). Figure 2 shows the drainage swales on the project site. Historically, both drainage swales functionally served as an irrigation ditch, conveying agricultural runoff from the fields to the north, to an existing concrete headwall and 36-inch culvert that crosses under Via Real and the U.S. Highway 101 to the South, where it connects to the Carpinteria Salt Marsh. Swale A, approximately 315 feet, is located along the western boundary of the site. Swale A is described as a culverted irrigation ditch that extends north-to-south adjacent to the western driveway (Figure 2). Vegetation adjacent to Swale A is primarily ground cover consisting of non-native grasslands. Within Swale A, non-native species such as pampas grass (*Cortaderia selloana*), wild radish (*Raphanus sativus*), morning glory (*Calystegia* sp.), and an unidentified sedge (*Cyperus* sp.) were observed. A couple of red willows are the only native species associated with Drainage Swale A. The morphological and hydrological characteristics of these drainage swales are described in further detail in the Wetlands Delineation Report (Stantec, 2017, Appendix D).

Drainage Swale B, approximately 256 feet, is located near the northwest corner of the project site, adjacent to an unpaved road on the agricultural property immediately to the north of the project site (Figure 2). Swale B, described as a roadside ditch, appears to receive some agricultural runoff from the adjacent fields, but does not convey flows to Swale A. The Vegetation associated with drainage Swale B includes both native and non-native trees. Native vegetation includes coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), arroyo willow (*Salix*

*lasiolepis*), and red willows (*Salix laevigata*); interspersed with non-native myoporum trees (*Myoporum laetum*). Understory vegetation is dominated by kikuyu grass (*Pennisetum clandestinum*) with English ivy (*Hedera helix*) also present. Additional species observed within and adjacent to Swale B include non-native Canary Island date palm (*Phoenix canariensis*), castor bean (*Ricinus communis*), and pampas grass (*Cortaderia selloana*).

The 2017 jurisdictional delineation conducted at the project site (Stantec, 2017) estimated the following acreage of potential jurisdictional waters and wetlands associated with the drainage swales:

**Table 4-1. Potential Jurisdictional Waters on the Project Site**

<b>Drainage Feature</b>	<b>USACE/RWQCB Non-wetland Waters (acres)</b>	<b>CDFW Jurisdictional Waters (acres)</b>	<b>CCC Wetlands (acres)</b>
Drainage Swale A	0.02	0.09	0.02
Drainage Swale B	0.04	0.04	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.02</b>

USACE= US Army Corps of Engineers  
 RWQCB = Regional Water Quality Control Board  
 CDFW= California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
 CCC = California Coastal Commission

**Project Specific Impacts**

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

As indicated under the Existing Environmental Setting section, a substantial portion of the project site is developed or disturbed, with existing buildings and parking structures and a children’s play area. Except for a few native trees associated with drainage Swale B, the vegetation communities occurring on the site is primarily non-native and ruderal in nature. In addition to the lack of native vegetation and cover, the surrounding residential areas to the east, west, northeast and the agricultural lands to the north; all greatly diminish the project site as a natural habitat area for special-status plants and wildlife species. No special-status species were detected during any of the project site surveys. The California Natural Diversity Database (CDFW, 2021) was queried to obtain a list of occurrence records of special status plants and wildlife in the project vicinity. The database search radius included six USGS Quadrangles surrounding the project site, including the Carpinteria Quadrangle within which the project site is situated. The query yielded 257 “element” (species) records for the larger search radius around the project site. Out of this broad list, 18 special status plants and wildlife species were assessed in Table 4-2, based on database analysis and literature review; for their potential to occur on the project site. The species occurrence potential was based on the following criteria:

**Present:** Species were observed within the project site during project surveys or population has been acknowledged by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), or local experts.

**High:** Both a documented record exists of the species at the project site or immediate vicinity, and the suitable habitat conditions (including soil type) preferred by this species, occurs on the site.

**Moderate:** Number of recent records of species in the project area and the habitat conditions preferred by the species are marginal and/or limited within the project site and immediate surroundings.

**Low (Unlikely to Occur):** Recent records of species in the project area is low, number of species records is low, and the project site does not support suitable habitat for this species

**Table 4-2. Special-status Species Occurrence Potential, 4110 Via Real, Carpinteria**

Species Name	Regulatory Status	Preferred Habitat/Environmental Conditions	Potential to Occur on Project Site
<b>Plants</b>			
Late-flowered mariposa lily <i>Calochortus fimbriatus</i>	Fed: none CA: none CRPR: 1B.3	Perennial bulbiferous herb, occurs in chaparral, cismontane woodland, riparian woodland, 900-6250 feet elevation.	Low/Unlikely to Occur. Suitable habitat not present, project site not within the preferred elevation.
Ojai fritillary <i>Fritallaria ojaiensis</i>	Fed: none CA: none CRPR: 1B.2	Perennial herb, occurs in broad-leafed upland forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, and lower montane coniferous forest, microhabitat: rocky, 740-3,275 feet elevation.	Low/Unlikely to Occur. Suitable habitat not present, project site not within the preferred elevation.
Santa Barbara honeysuckle <i>Lonicera subsicata</i> var. <i>subsicata</i>	Fed: none CA: none CRPR: 1B.2	Perennial evergreen shrub, occurs in chaparral, cismontane woodland and coastal scrub, 35-3280 feet elevation.	Low/Unlikely to Occur: Suitable habitat not present, project site not within the preferred elevation.
Sonoran maiden fern <i>Thelypteris puberula</i> var. <i>sonorensis</i>	Fed: none CA: none 2B.2	Perennial rhizomatous herb, occurs in meadows and seeps, 165-2000 feet elevation	Low/Unlikely to Occur: Suitable habitat not present, project site not within the preferred elevation.
Nuttall's scrub oak <i>Quercus dumosa</i>	Fed: none CA: none CRPR: 1B.1	Perennial evergreen shrub occurs in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, and coastal scrub, 50-1310 feet.	Low/Not Present. Suitable habitat not present, project site not within the preferred elevation. Focused tree survey did not detect this species on the project site.
Umbrella larkspur <i>Delphinium umbraculorum</i>	Fed: none CA: none CRPR: 1B.3	Perennial herb, occurs in chaparral and cismontane woodland, 1310-5250 feet elevation.	Low/Unlikely to Occur. Suitable habitat not present, project site not within the preferred elevation.

White-veined monardella <i>Monardella hypoleuca</i> ssp. <i>hypoleuca</i>	Fed: none CA: none CRPR: 1B.3	Perennial herb, occurs in chaparral, cismontane woodland	Low/Unlikely to Occur: Suitable habitat not present, project site not within the preferred elevation.
<b>Animals</b>			
California red-legged frog <i>Rana draytonii</i>	FT, CSC	Found mainly near ponds in humid forests, woodlands, grasslands, coastal scrub, and streamside with plant cover. Most common in lowlands or foothills. Frequently found in woods adjacent to streams. Breeding habitat is in permanent or ephemeral water sources; lakes, ponds, reservoirs, slow streams, marshes, bogs, and swamps.	Low/unlikely to Occur: Suitable habitat conditions are not present for this species on the project site. Low records for this species in the project vicinity, from over 10 years.
Coast range newt <i>Taricha torosa</i>	CSC	Burrow in or use soil, fallen logs, or debris for cover. Found in drier chaparral, oak woodland, and grasslands. During breeding, coast range newts will migrate to intermittent streams, rivers, lakes, and ponds where they lay eggs in shallow water attached to submerged rocks or twigs.	Low/unlikely to Occur: Suitable habitat conditions are not present for this species on the project site. Low records for this species in the project vicinity, mostly from the Santa Barbara area.
Coastal whiptail <i>Aspidoscelis tigris</i> <i>stejnegeri</i>	CSC	Found in a variety of ecosystems, primarily hot and dry open areas with sparse foliage - chaparral, woodland, and riparian areas.	Low/Unlikely to Occur: Suitable habitat is not present on the project site. The understory of the marginal riparian habitat adjacent to swale A is highly disturbed. One record for this species in the project area, from 2013.
Cooper's Hawk (nesting) <i>Accipiter cooperii</i>	WL	Forages and nests in open woodlands, woodland margins, and riparian forests	Low/Unlikely to Occur: Project site presents very limited foraging opportunities

			but there is not suitable breeding habitat.
Monarch butterfly ( <i>Danaus plexippus</i> )	FC, USFS	Winter roost sites extend along the coast from northern Mendocino to Baja Calif., Mexico. Roosts located in wind-protected tree groves (eucalyptus, Monterey pine, cypress), with nectar and water sources nearby	Low/Unlikely to Occur: There are no suitable roosting habitats on site and no records of overwintering of monarch butterflies in the immediate vicinity of the project site.
San Diego desert woodrat <i>Neotoma lepida intermedia</i>	CSC	Found in a variety of ecosystems, primarily hot and dry open areas with sparse foliage - chaparral, woodland, and riparian areas.	Low/Unlikely to Occur: Project site does not support suitable habitat. The habitat adjacent to swale A, presents marginal habitat, however this area is highly disturbed.
Silvery legless lizard <i>Anniella pulchra</i>	CSC	Sandy or loose loamy soils under sparse vegetation; soil moisture is essential; prefer soils with high moisture content. There are no known records for this species within the immediate project surrounding.	Low/Unlikely to Occur: Suitable habitat is present on the project site, however, it is limited to a very small area along the northern swale (swale B). The understory of the marginal riparian habitat adjacent to swale B is highly disturbed. Low records of species in the project vicinity from over 10 years.
Western pond turtle <i>Emmys marmorata</i>	CSC	Inhabits permanent or nearly permanent bodies of water in various habitat types; requires basking sites such as partially submerged logs, vegetation mats, or open mud banks.	Low/Unlikely to Occur: The project site does not support suitable habitat; there are no permanent or nearly permanent bodies of water on site. Low records of this species in the project vicinity, most recent from 2016.

**Plants**

CRPR = California Rare Plant Rank

CRPR 1A = Plants presumed extirpated in California and either rare or extinct elsewhere

CRPR 1B = Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere

CRPR 2A = Plants presumed extirpated in California but common elsewhere

CRPR 2B = Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California but more common elsewhere

CRPR 3 = Review List: Plants about which more information is needed

CRPR 4 = Watch List: Plants of limited distribution

**Threat Ranks**

Ranks at each level also include a threat rank (e.g., CRPR 4.3) and are determined as follows:

- 0.1-Seriously threatened in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat)*
- 0.2-Moderately threatened in California (20-80% occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat)*
- 0.3-Not very threatened in California (less than 20% of occurrences threatened / low degree and immediacy of threat or no current threats known)*

#### **Animals**

CSC= California Species of Special Concern (CDFW)

FT= Federally recognized as Threatened (USFWS)

FC = Candidate Species for Federal Listing (USFWS)

USFS= US Forest Service Sensitive Species

WL = Watch List (CDFW)

As the analysis in Table 4-2 of special status species potential occurrence reveals, the project site supports very limited habitat for special status species. Except for drainage swale A and swale B on the property, most of the site is developed with existing structures, parking lots, landscaped areas supporting non-native grassland and ornamental trees. A portion of the property in the north, behind the existing church building was also historically used for an orchard/horticultural use. Remnants of pipes and signs of cultivation are still evident in this area. The project site is also surrounded by residential development and is situated just north of the busy US Highway 101 corridor and is fragmented from other natural areas in the vicinity. The historical intensive use of the parcel and existing conditions greatly preclude the potential for special status plants and wildlife species to occur on the property. No state- or federally-listed threatened or endangered plants or wildlife species were detected during project surveys. The proposed development is anticipated to result in loss of approximately 0.70 acres of ruderal, non-native grasses (lawn). The loss of this vegetation is considered not significant since this vegetation cover is not suitable habitat for special status species. In 2018, following consultation with California Coastal Commission (CCC) and City staff, the project was designed to avoid all impacts to the existing drainage features (Swale A and Swale B) on the property.<sup>3</sup> The analysis of potential impacts to the drainage swales on the project site, regulatory coordination and impacts avoidance measures, are further described in Section b).

Although no impacts to special status plants or wildlife would occur because of the lack of suitable habitat and avoidance of impacts to protected drainage swales; the project site does support marginal habitat in the form of non-native grass (lawn) and riparian trees for primarily foraging birds. The riparian trees offer a low potential for nesting. The trees on the project site can support nesting birds, including raptors, protected under the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The project could adversely affect raptors and other nesting birds if construction occurs while they are present on or adjacent to the site, through direct mortality or abandonment of nests. The loss of a nest due to construction activities would be a violation of the MBTA and CFGC 3503 et. seq., and a potentially significant impact. Therefore, Implementation of Mitigation Measure (MM) BIO-1 (nesting bird survey) is proposed, which would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

---

<sup>3</sup> Following a site visit in 2018 with Dr. Jonna Engel, Biologist, California Coastal Commission (CCC), City Staff, and Applicant's consulting biologist, the CCC determined that Swale B did not meet the definition of a "Creek" that is typically afforded protection under the Local Coastal Plan (LCP). However, since this drainage swale supports native riparian vegetation, recognized as ESH or Environmental Sensitive Habitat, the riparian vegetation within swale B should be protected. The CCC also determined that Swale A meets the definition of a "Creek", based on presence of wetland soils detected during the jurisdictional delineation and hydrologic connection between upstream areas and receiving waters downstream. As such, a 50-foot setback was required to protect Swale A. The project was therefore designed to avoid all impacts to ESH habitat within drainage swale A and Swale B; with a 50-foot set back from Swale A.

- b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?*

***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

Table 4-1 under the existing conditions description, provides an estimate of jurisdictional waters present on the site. The drainage swales are potentially state and federal waters subject to jurisdictional protection under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (Water Quality Certification), Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code (Streambed Alteration Agreement Program) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Dredge and Fill Permit).

b - c) In analyzing the potential impacts to riparian habitats, wetlands, and the swales (“creeks”) on the project site; the policies/regulations and goals of two important local regulatory programs were utilized as reference. These include:

- The City of Carpinteria Creeks Preservation Program (City of Carpinteria, 2005); and
- City of Carpinteria General Plan/Local Coastal Land Use Plan (City of Carpinteria, 2003)

*City of Carpinteria Creeks Preservation Program, Section 3.3.2 – Biological Resources*

Objective 2 of the program states:

*“Restore aquatic, riparian and upland habitats occurring within and adjacent to local creeks, including sensitive communities and species. Sensitive communities and species are defined as those designated as endemic, rare, threatened, endangered, or of concern by the federal, state, and/or local governments.”*

In support of this Objective, the City will not permit projects (whether public or private) that would result in the significant fragmentation of biological habitat within creek Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) and/or creek setback areas established by the General Plan/Local Coastal Plan (LCP) and Zoning Ordinance-ESHA Overlay District. Likewise, the City will not permit projects that would create significant barriers to the movement or migration of fish and wildlife through creeks and adjacent habitats (i.e., wildlife corridors will be maintained). Significant fragmentation or barriers are manmade features, structures, or activity that would block or greatly reduce the movement of wildlife between recognized natural habitat areas or that would significantly reduce the biological value or diversity of the habitat.

*Implementation Policy:* A 50-foot buffer or setback is required from the top of the upper banks of the creeks or existing edge of riparian vegetation (dripline)

The following City Local Coastal Plan/Land Use Plan (LUP) objectives and wetlands polices were also considered in the analysis of potential impacts and in project design to avoid potential impacts to protected resources:

- **Objective LU-1a:** *The policies of the Coastal Act (Public Resources Code Section 30210 through 30263) are hereby incorporated by reference (and shall be effective as if included in full herein) as the guiding policies of the Land Use Plan.*
- **Objective LU-1c:** *Where policies in the Land Use Element overlap, the policy that is most protective of resources (e.g., land, water, air, etc.) shall take precedence.*
- **Objective OSC-1a:** *Protect Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area(s) (ESHA) from development and maintain them as natural open space or passive recreational areas.*
- **Objective OSC-6:** *Preserve the natural environmental qualities of creekways and protect riparian habitat.*

As indicated in the response to Section a, above, focused wetland delineation studies and riparian vegetation mapping of sensitive resources on the property were conducted. Project proponents then consulted with the City and CCC staff, which included a site visit to evaluate proposed project development and existing conditions. Following the site visit and review of project site technical studies and preliminary project design plans, the CCC determined the following<sup>4</sup>:

- The creeks-related development standards apply to both the channel along the western boundary of the property (Swale A), and the channel along the northern property line (adjacent to the farm fields) (Swale B);
- The mandatory 50' creek buffer area would be an appropriate location to use for onsite stormwater measures (i.e., bioretention and biofiltration) as part of a habitat enhancement/restoration project; and
- The project should include a habitat restoration/enhancement component for the creek (drainage channels) itself to improve water quality before stormwater leaves the project site via the culvert under Via Real and U.S. Highway 101 and enters the protected Carpinteria Salt Marsh.

Based on the City of Carpinteria's Creeks Preservation Program requirements, objectives of the LCP/LUP, and the CCC determination; the project was re-designed to protect the isolated riparian habitat in Swale B in place, and incorporate a 50-foot setback from drainage swale A, thus avoiding all direct impacts to the riparian area associated with swale B (considered to be "ESHA" or Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area) and to preserve the channel and hydrologic flow integrity of Swale A. In addition, in adherence to the CCC requirements and to reduce potential indirect impacts to the swales to a level below significance, the project proposes to implement MM BIO-2, Riparian Habitat Enhancement/Restoration and MM BIO-3 Storm Water Quality Enhancement. Figure 3 is an overlay of the engineering plans, which depicts the design of the stormwater treatment system. The stormwater system will be designed to provide both water quality enhancement and serve as a small wetland habitat.

Due to the proposed habitat restoration/enhancement of the riparian habitat within on-site streambeds, a Section 1600 permit would be required from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). In addition, projects involving discharges of pollutants to waters of the state are regulated under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit (NPDES) program, and must have a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) reviewed and approved by the Central Coastal Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the City. Permitting such as those discussed above would occur after the completion of the CEQA process and approval from the City. With the incorporation of MM BIO-2 and MM BIO-3, potential minimal, indirect impacts to drainage swales on the site will be reduced, in adherence to the City's Creeks Preservation Program, LCP/LUP goals and policies and

---

<sup>4</sup> CCC communication relayed to project team via Mr. Nick Bobroff, City of Carpinteria.

the CCC requirements. Therefore, potential impacts to protected creek habitat on the site would be reduced to less than significant levels.

- c) *Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated**

Please refer to the response to Section b, above. The project was designed to avoid all direct impacts to both drainage swales A and B, which are potentially subject to state regulations. However, the project will be subject to both Section 1600 and NPDES permits due to habitat restoration within a watercourse and the inclusion of a retention basin for stormwater. Although MMs BIO-2 and BIO-3 would be implemented to enhance the riparian habitat associated with drainage swales A and B, preserve channel integrity of swale A and to enhance the storm water quality exiting the project site, before it discharges to protected habitat in the Carpinteria Salt Marsh, south of the project, the project would still require permitting as detailed in Section b. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the project impacts to potential state or federally protected wetlands would be reduced to less than significant.

- d) *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

**No Impact**

No native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or native wildlife nursery sites are present on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an impact on wildlife movement or native wildlife nursery sites. There would be no impact.

- e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a creek preservation policy or tree protection ordinance?*

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated**

Project plans do not entail removal of any native or protected trees. As discussed under Section b, above, the project has conducted technical studies to inventory potential jurisdictional wetlands on the project site, consulted with the City of Carpinteria and the CCC and in adherence to LCP/LUP and City's Creeks Preservation Program; has re-designed the project to avoid all direct impacts to potential jurisdictional waters and protected swales on the site. MMs BIO-2 and BIO-3 are also proposed to enhance riparian habitat and to enhance storm water quality, respectively. As part of MM BIO-2, a Riparian Habitat Enhancement/Restoration Plan will be prepared, which will contain the details of the riparian habitat enhancement associated with drainage swales A and B, and the stormwater wetland treatment system to be created. With the implementation of MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-3, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a creek preservation policy or tree protection ordinance and any potential indirect impacts to protected swales would be reduced to less than significant levels.

- f) *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

**No Impact**

The project site is not subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. There would be no impact.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City's General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to biological resource impacts. However, the project's contribution to cumulative biological resource impacts would not be considerable and would be further reduced through the implementation of the project specific measures addressing nesting and migratory bird protection, protection of wetlands/creek ways (swales) on the project site in adherence to LCP/LUP and City's Creeks preservation program requirements, and enhancement of ESHA riparian habitat and storm water quality

**Required Mitigation Measures**

The below Mitigation Measures (MMs) are required to reduce impacts to potential nesting/migratory birds, and wetlands/riparian habitat, to less than significant levels.

**BIO-1. Nesting Bird Surveys.** To avoid disturbance of nesting and special-status birds, including raptor species protected by the MBTA and CFGC, activities related to the project including, but not limited to, vegetation removal, ground disturbance, and construction and demolition shall occur outside of the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 30), if feasible. If construction must begin during the breeding season, then a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to initiation of ground disturbance and vegetation removal activities. The nesting bird pre-construction survey shall be conducted on foot inside the Project Boundary, including a 300-foot buffer (500-foot for raptors), and in inaccessible areas (e.g., private lands) from afar using binoculars to the extent practical. The survey shall be conducted by a biologist familiar with the identification of avian species known to occur in southern California coastal communities. If nests are found, an avoidance buffer (dependent upon the species, the proposed work activity, and existing disturbances associated with land uses outside of the site) shall be determined and demarcated by the biologist with bright orange construction fencing, flagging, construction lathe, or other means to mark the boundary. All construction personnel shall be notified as to the existence of the buffer zone and to avoid entering the buffer zone during the nesting season. No ground disturbing activities shall occur within this buffer until the avian biologist has confirmed that breeding/ nesting is completed, and the young have fledged the nest. Encroachment into the buffer shall occur only at the discretion of the qualified biologist.

**Plan Requirements:** The most suitable bird nesting habitat shall be identified on the building and grading plans. This Measure shall be printed on all building and grading plans.

**Timing:** A Qualified Biologist will conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey, no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction.

**Monitoring:** City of Carpinteria's Community Development Department (CDD) shall check plans prior to issuance of a Grading or Building Permit and shall spot check in the field. The qualified biologist shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the grading contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program. A report summarizing the results of the nesting bird survey and monitoring activities shall be prepared and submitted to the City, once all survey and monitoring activities are completed.

**BIO-2. Riparian Habitat Restoration Plan.** In adherence to LCP/LUP goals and Policies, City's Creek Preservation Program and CCC requirements, the project will restore and enhance the riparian habitat associated with drainage swales A and B. Enhancement would include removal of non-native plants and planting of native plants such as arroyo and red willows. As part of this MM, a Riparian Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Plan (Plan) will be prepared for the project. This Plan will provide details on the restoration of the riparian areas associated with swales A and B and will include such elements as a planting plan, location of enhancement/restoration, irrigation (if needed), and success and monitoring criteria. The Plan will also incorporate biological aspects of the stormwater wetland treatment system (see MM BIO-3); that will be created to enhance stormwater quality. Details such as design of the wetland treatment system, planting plan and monitoring of this water quality enhancement; will be included in the Plan.

**Plan Requirements/Timing:** The Applicant shall provide a copy of the Riparian Habitat Restoration Plan (Plan) to the CDD for review and approval, prior to issuance of building permits, and will require that the restoration work be completed prior to Occupancy clearance for the building. The Plan must also outline protective measures for the riparian habitats that must be implemented during construction (i.e., fencing, exclusion zones, etc.) to avoid potential impacts to sensitive riparian habitats. The Restoration Plan will also require approval from CDFW as a Streambed Alteration Agreement will be required.

**Monitoring:** Following the enhancement/restoration of the riparian habitat, a qualified biologist will conduct one (1) annual inspection of Swales A and B and associated riparian habitat for 5 years, to document that the habitat is viable and providing the intended ecological functions and values. The monitoring frequency for the riparian habitat restoration/enhancement associated with Swales A and B may be conducted in tandem with the monitoring for the Stormwater Treatment Wetland Habitat (MM BIO-3). The monitoring & reporting elements will be detailed in the Plan. The Biologist will submit annual reports to CDD, based on the annual monitoring criteria. The CDD shall inspect the wetland habitat once a year after construction of the habitat, with the final inspection at the end of the 5 years.

**BIO-3. Stormwater Treatment Wetland.** In adherence to LCP/LUP goals and Policies, City's Creek Preservation Program and CCC requirements, the project will design and construct a stormwater treatment wetland habitat as part of the proposed treatment swale to enhance stormwater quality. The small freshwater wetland will be designed to provide both enhancement of stormwater quality and serve as a wetland habitat for wildlife.

**Plan Requirements/Timing:** The Applicant will provide the final design plans showing the stormwater treatment wetland, on all grading plans submitted to the City, for review and approval prior to issuance of any permits for construction. The biological aspects of the stormwater treatment wetland habitat (including planting plan); will be detailed in the Riparian Habitat Restoration/Enhancement Plan (Plan), as identified in MM BIO-2. The Stormwater Treatment Wetland Plan will also require approval from the RWQCB, if a Section 402 water quality certification or other regulatory permitting is required.

**Monitoring:** Following the construction of the treatment wetland, a qualified biologist will conduct one (1) annual inspection of the treatment wetland and swale, for 5 years, to document that the system is viable and providing the intended ecological functions and values. CDD shall review and approve the design, prior to the issuance of grading or building permits. The monitoring and reporting program for the treatment wetland

can be integrated with the Riparian Habitat Enchantment/Creation program (MM BIO-2). The CDD shall inspect the wetland habitat once a year after construction of the habitat, with the final inspection at the end of the 5 years.

**Residual Impact**

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

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES  Would the project:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

**City of Carpinteria Environmental Thresholds**

- City of Carpinteria Environmental Thresholds, Resolution 4082 (1994), *Cultural Resources*. This threshold determines whether a project may disrupt or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social group and whether it may conflict with established religious uses of the area. Cultural resources include prehistoric, historic, and Native American ethnic sites.

Each project is reviewed to see if it is within a sensitive area. If this is so, or it is in a potentially sensitive area based on known archaeological site distribution patterns, a qualified archaeologist is required to evaluate the significance of the site as defined in CEQA and National Historic Preservation Act.

- City of Carpinteria Environmental Thresholds, Resolution 4082 (1994), *Mitigation Measures*. Measures capable of reducing or avoiding potentially significant impacts shall be identified during the preliminary evaluation of non-exempt projects. A broad range of potential mitigations should be considered to maximize the potential for project modifications which mitigate adverse impacts and enable projects to qualify for Negative Declarations. The list of mitigation measures identified at the Initial Study stage must later be refined and specified to meet the standards for inclusion in the environmental document.

**Existing Environmental Setting**

The project site currently supports a church building, parking lot, a child’s playground. The project site has also been previously disturbed by both agricultural and residential development. The site is not identified as a sensitive cultural area on any City or County documents, and there are no known cultural resources within the site.

### **Project Specific Impacts**

- a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?*
- b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?*
- c) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

### ***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

The proposed project consists of the demolition of existing development and the development of a new 72-guestroom hotel, including a fitness center, business center, breakfast area, meeting room, outdoor pool, and outdoor garden patio.

In 2020, on behalf of the proposed project, consultation was initiated with the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC), Department of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara, relative to a records search for potential archaeological and built environment cultural resources. CCIC conducted a records search within a 2,000-foot radius of the project site.<sup>5</sup> The search indicated there are no historic, or archaeological resources recorded for the project site. Further, CCIC analysis indicated that archaeological sites in this broad area tend to be located along watercourses, on coastal terraces, and on alluvial benches. No such physical & environmental conditions are present on the project site.

Based on the results of the records search, CCIC indicated there is a low to moderate potential for cultural resources to be present within the project area. Though the estuary and Santa Monica Creek are nearby, CCIC concluded that it is unclear whether the project area was a seasonal wetland prior to modern development. CCIC maps and records do not clarify this. Based on CCIC recommendations, Mitigation Measure MM CR-1, is proposed. With the implementation of this measure, potential impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City's General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to cultural resource impacts. However, the project's contribution to cumulative cultural resource impacts would not be considerable and would be further reduced through the implementation of the project specific measure addressing standard discovery provisions.

### **Required Mitigation Measures**

**CR-1. Cultural Resources Discovery.** In the event archaeological remains are encountered during grading, work shall be stopped immediately or redirected until a CDD-qualified archaeologist and Native American representative are retained by the applicant to evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigation specifications of the City Archaeological Guidelines. If remains are found to be significant, they

---

<sup>5</sup> Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) records search, letter dated August 4, 2020.

shall be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with City Archaeological Guidelines and funded by the applicant.

**Plan Requirements/Timing:** This condition shall be printed on all building and grading plans.

**Monitoring:** CDD shall check plans prior to issuance of a Grading or Building Permit and shall spot check in the field. In the event that potentially significant cultural or archaeological resources are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, all work on the site will cease and a qualified archaeologist will be contacted in addition to the Native American Heritage Commission.

**Residual Impact**

With the implementation of the proposed mitigation measure, there would be no residual impacts.

6. ENERGY  Would the project:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

**Environmental Thresholds**

Neither the City of Carpinteria nor the County of Santa Barbara have identified significance thresholds for electrical and/or natural gas service impacts. CEQA Appendix G provides thresholds used to evaluate potential Energy impacts of the proposed project.

**Existing Environmental Setting**

Private electrical and natural gas utility companies provide service to customers in Central and Southern California, including the unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County. In Carpinteria, electrical service is provided by Southern California Edison and gas service is provided by the Southern California Gas Company. The City of Carpinteria also recently joined 3CE, Central Coast Community Energy. Central Coast Community Energy is a Community Choice Energy agency established by local communities to source clean and renewable energy in Santa Barbara County while retaining the local utility provider’s traditional role in delivering power and maintaining electric infrastructure, as well as billing.

**Project Specific Impacts**

- a) *Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*

b) *Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Neither the City nor County has identified significance thresholds for electrical and/or natural gas service impacts (Thresholds and Guidelines Manual). The proposed project consists of the development of land for the construction of a new 72-guestrooms hotel. A church, child’s play area, parking lot, vegetable garden, and storage sheds would be demolished to accommodate the proposed project. During the construction phase, energy efficient construction equipment would be utilized. The hotel would be constructed in compliance with current building code requirements in effect at the time of building permit issuance, including Title 24 energy efficiency requirements and Green Building Code requirements. The Hotel would also be serviced by local Waste Management companies, which would also provide recycling services, which the hotel will promote. In summary, the project would have minimal long-term energy requirements and a negligible demand on regional energy needs. Thus, the environmental impact from proposed project development resulting in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

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

**Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures:**

The project would result in less than significant impacts upon energy consumption. As no significant energy impacts are anticipated, no mitigation would be required.

**Residual Impact:**

No residual impacts would occur.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS  Would the project:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:  i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		X		

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv. Landslides?				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X		
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?		X		
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
f) Director or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

**City of Carpinteria Thresholds**

The City of Carpinteria’s Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as Amended (1997), states the following conditions or impacts shall be considered significant:

- The graded or cleared portion of the site includes more than 10,000 square feet of area having a slope greater than 15 percent.
- There is a significant risk that more than 2,500 square feet will be unprotected or inadequately protected from erosion during any portion of the rainy season.
- Grading or clearing will occur within 50 feet of any watercourse or 100-year floodplain.
- Grading will involve cut and fill volumes of 3,000 cubic yards or more, or cut or fill heights of 15 feet or greater.
- The project will significantly increase water runoff, velocities, peak discharges, or water surface elevations on or off-site. Coordinate with the Department of Public Works for clarification.
- The project will produce erosion impacts which constitute a structural hazard or significant visual impact, or will result in sediment or excessive drainage flows which cannot be contained or controlled on-site.
- The project will result in impacts which violate or conflict with any of the Federal, State, or local policies, ordinances or regulations listed above.

### **Existing Environmental Setting:**

The Carpinteria Valley is subject to geologic hazards related primarily to earthquakes and secondary hazards, such as landslides and liquefaction. The project site is located over one mile north of the Rincon and Carpinteria Faults. These faults are not delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, as they are not "active" faults. The State of California Conservation Department, Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) has calculated the probabilities for earthquakes throughout the State of California. Research indicates a 10 percent probability within the next 50 years for an earthquake between magnitudes 6.5 and 7.0 to occur along a fault within five miles of the project area. As noted in the Carpinteria General Plan/Coastal Plan, there are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones for the Carpinteria Planning Area. There has been no recent movement (within the last 11,000 years), or recent fault rupture that has been identified along the known faults in the area.

### **Project Specific Impacts:**

Pacific Material Laboratory of Santa Barbara, Inc., conducted a geotechnical study of the project site and prepared a geotechnical report, attached in Appendix E (Pacific Materials Laboratory, 2016). The analysis for this section incorporates this study by reference, as applicable.

- a) *Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*
- i. *Rupture of a known earthquake fault as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*
  - ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking?*
  - iii. *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*
  - iv. *Landslides?*
- c) *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?*
- d) *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?*

### ***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

There is the potential for an earthquake in the Carpinteria area that would cause seismic shaking and could affect the project site. However, the project would be required to conform to the California Building Code (CBC) requirements. In addition, only previously manipulated and engineered slopes on the property are proposed to be minimally re-graded to achieve a finished slope face that is more gradual (less steep) than the existing slope faces. The final slope angles would be shallower than existing conditions, and mid-elevation benches in the slopes would further decrease the potential for mass soil movement (shallow landslides). It is important to note that all the earthwork proposed for the project involves manipulation of manufactured slopes (previously modified landforms) and not natural topography. In addition, the project proposes to vegetate all new undeveloped slope areas to minimize the potential for shallow erosion to occur, which would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

The geotechnical report prepared by Pacific Materials Laboratory (PML, 2014) identified compressible clay layers that were encountered in the subsurface exploration at depths ranging from 3 to 13 feet below the existing ground surface. The underlying soils were found to have a low potential for expansion. The potential for liquefaction was identified to be high. A Liquefaction Analysis contained in the report predicts a total anticipated settlement of 1.5 inches, due to soils prone to liquefaction and corresponding volumetric compression. This compression would potentially contribute to a differential settlement of 0.75 inches to proposed structures, in a seismic event. Based on this analysis, the report indicates that “cosmetic damage to the building due to the settlement will require repair and the floor system may require re-leveling. However, risk to the human occupancy is considered extremely low.” Because of the liquefaction potential, mitigation measure GEO-1 is proposed. This measure outlines grading, excavation/recompaction, and foundation design recommendations designed to provide stability and reduce the potential risk from liquefaction and other seismic activity-related impacts. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

*b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

Grading on the site would involve 4,700 Cubic Yards (CY) of cut and 2,900 CY of fill. Thus, approximately 800 CY would need to be exported from the site. Substantial soil erosion is not anticipated as the site is generally flat, with a less than two percent (2%) overall slope from the north to the south property lines. Nevertheless, project grading activities would occur within a 100-year floodplain and within 50 feet of the onsite Swale A, which has hydrologic connectivity to the Carpinteria Salt Marsh. Since the project would disturb an area larger than one acre, development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would also be required. Therefore, under Section 10- Hydrology and Water Quality, The Low Impact Design (LID)/Stormwater measures that will be implemented under **MM WQ-1** and **MM WQ-2** will conform with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and MS4 permit requirements and entail the development of a SWPPP for the project. In addition, **MM WQ-3** requires the preparation of a Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. Use of the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be detailed in the mandatory SWPPP and Soil Erosion and Sediment Control plan will further prevent soil erosion and the discharge of sediment into the local waterways and storm drains during the project’s construction phase. Although proposed earthmoving activities on the site would occur within both a 100-year floodplain and within 50 feet of Swale A, which itself has hydrologic connectivity to the Carpinteria Salt Marsh, this alone does not make it more likely that significant impacts would occur if the mitigation measures are applied and the SWPPP/BMPs are adhered to. Therefore, these potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of the identified mitigation measures.

*e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

***No Impact***

The proposed project would be connected to, and served by, the Carpinteria Sanitary District (CSD). Therefore, septic systems would not be required, and no impact would occur.

*f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

### ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The potential for paleontological resources to be encountered during project grading is very low or none, as the construction is proposed on a developed lot. The soils on the parcel were historically subjected to extensive cut and fill, which have been mechanically manipulated for the previous construction. Therefore, project impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City's General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to geologic resource impacts. However, the project's contribution to cumulative geologic resource impacts would not be considerable and would be further reduced through the implementation of the project specific measures addressing standard Uniform Building Code provisions and grading and erosion control.

### **Required Mitigation Measures**

**GEO-1. Geotechnical Report Compliance.** Project construction and grading shall comply with all recommendations for Grading, Foundations and Retaining Walls, contained in the Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Pacific Materials Laboratory, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

**Plan Requirements:** Grading and building plans shall include all required measures as determined by the City Engineer.

**Timing:** Prior to issuance of building and grading permits and during grading and construction.

**Monitoring:** The City Engineer shall site inspect during grading. The City Building Inspector shall ensure that all recommendations are implemented during construction, by conducting periodic site inspections during and at the completion of construction.

Compliance with water quality measures WQ1-WQ-3 are also necessary to reduce Geology/Soils impacts to less than significant levels.

**Residual Impact:** With incorporation of the mitigation measure GEO-1, and mitigation measures WQ-1 through WQ-3, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS  Would the project:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

**Thresholds of Significance**

The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District does not publish numerical thresholds for GHG emissions. Projects in SBCAPCD’s footprint rely on the following thresholds from the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD).

Based on the adopted air district guidance, the following three quantitative thresholds may be used to evaluate the level of significance of GHG emissions impacts for residential and commercial projects:

1. Qualified GHG Reductions Strategies. A project would have a significant impact if it is not consistent with a qualified GHG reduction strategy that meets the requirements of the State CEQA Guidelines. If a project is consistent with a qualified GHG reduction strategy, it would not have a significant impact; OR,
2. Bright-Line Threshold. A project would have a significant impact if it exceeds the “bright-line threshold” of 1,150 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>E/year; OR,
3. Efficiency Threshold. A project would have a significant impact if the efficiency threshold exceeds 4.9 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>E/service population/year. The service population is defined as the number of residents plus employees for a given project.

The efficiency threshold is specifically intended to avoid penalizing large-scale plans or projects that incorporate emissions-reducing features and/or that are located in a manner that results in relatively low vehicle miles traveled.

**Existing Environmental Setting:**

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are often called greenhouse gases (GHGs), analogous to the way in which a greenhouse retains heat. Common GHGs include water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxides (N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>x</sub>), fluorinated gases, and ozone. GHGs are emitted by both natural processes and human activities. Of these gases, CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> are emitted in the greatest quantities from human activities. Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion, whereas CH<sub>4</sub> results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Man-made GHGs, many of which have greater heat-absorption potential than CO<sub>2</sub>, include fluorinated gases, such as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) (Cal EPA, 2006).

The accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere regulates the earth’s temperature. Without the natural heat trapping effect of GHGs, Earth’s surface would be about 34° C cooler (Cal EPA, 2006). However, it is believed that emissions from human activities, particularly the consumption of fossil fuels for electricity production and transportation, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations.

**Project Specific Impacts:**

**Construction GHG Emissions**

Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from construction of the project were estimated and included herein for disclosure purposes. Project-generated GHG emissions are estimated using CalEEMod consistent with the SBCAPCD recommendations for project-level review because CalEEMod can quantify indirect GHG emissions and GHG mitigation (SBCAPCD 2015a). Construction of the proposed project would result in GHG emissions, which are primarily associated with use of off-road construction equipment, on-road hauling and vendor (material delivery) trucks, and worker vehicles. GHG emissions associated with temporary construction activity were quantified using the CalEEMod. On-site sources of GHG emissions include off-road equipment, and off-site sources include hauling and vendor trucks and worker vehicles.

**Operational GHG Emissions**

Based on the adopted air district guidance, the following three quantitative thresholds may be used to evaluate the level of significance of GHG emissions impacts for residential and commercial projects:

1. Qualified GHG Reductions Strategies. A project would have a significant impact if it is not consistent with a qualified GHG reduction strategy that meets the requirements of the State CEQA Guidelines. If a project is consistent with a qualified GHG reduction strategy, it would not have a significant impact; OR,
2. Bright-Line Threshold. A project would have a significant impact if it exceeds the “bright-line threshold” of 1,150 metric tons CO2E/year; OR,
3. Efficiency Threshold. A project would have a significant impact if the efficiency threshold exceeds 4.9 metric tons of CO2E/service population/year. The service population is defined as the number of residents plus employees for a given project.

The efficiency threshold is specifically intended to avoid penalizing large-scale plans or projects that incorporate emissions-reducing features and/or that are located in a manner that results in relatively low vehicle miles traveled. As the project would be below the “bright-line” threshold of 1,150 metric tons CO2E/year (see Table 8-1, below), impacts would be less than significant.

**Table 8-1. Project Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Summary	CO2e
Project Operational Emissions Per Year (plus amortized construction emissions)	997.59 MT/yr

- a) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

### ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The anticipated operational and amortized greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the Project are below identified threshold levels; implementation of the Project would therefore not result in Project-specific or site-specific significant adverse impacts from greenhouse gas emissions within the Project study area. Therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

*b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

### ***Less Than Significant Impact***

California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32). AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. Under AB 32, California Air Resources Board (CARB) must adopt regulations by January 1, 2011, to achieve reductions in GHGs to meet the 1990 emission cap by 2020. On December 11, 2008, CARB adopted its initial Scoping Plan, which functions as a roadmap of CARB's plans to achieve GHG reductions in California required by AB 32 through subsequently enacted regulations. CARB's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan builds on the efforts and plans encompassed in the initial Scoping Plan.

SB 375 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO's) to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) that will prescribe land use allocation in that MPO's regional transportation plan. CARB, in consultation with MPO's, has provided each affected region with reduction targets for GHGs emitted by passenger cars and light trucks in the region for the years 2020 and 2035.

Executive Order B-30-15 establishes a California greenhouse gas reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 to ensure California meets its target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Executive Order B-30-15 requires MPO's to implement measures that will achieve reductions of greenhouse gas emissions to meet the 2030 and 2050 greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets.

As required by California law, city and county General Plans contain a Land Use Element that details the types and quantities of land uses that the city or county estimates will be needed for future growth, and that designate locations for land uses to regulate growth.

The Project is consistent with the currently adopted General Plan for the City and the adopted SBCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and is therefore consistent with the population growth and VMT applied in those plan documents. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the growth assumptions used in the applicable AQP.

CARB's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan builds on the efforts and plans encompassed in the initial Scoping Plan. The current plan has identified new policies and actions to accomplish the State's 2030 GHG limit. Below is a list of applicable strategies in the Scoping Plan and the Project's consistency with those strategies.

- California Light-Duty Vehicle GHG Standards – Implement adopted standards and planned second phase of the program. Align zero-emission vehicle, alternative and renewable fuel and vehicle technology programs for long-term climate change goals.
- The Project is consistent with this reduction measure. This measure cannot be implemented by a particular project or lead agency since it is a statewide measure. When this measure is implemented, standards would be applicable to light-duty vehicles that would access the Project. The Project would not conflict or obstruct this reduction measure.
- Energy Efficiency – Pursuit of comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California. Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards.
- The Project is consistent with this reduction measure. Though this measure applies to the State to increase its energy standards, the Project would comply with this measure through existing regulation. The Project would not conflict or obstruct this reduction measure.
- Low Carbon Fuel – Development and adoption of the low carbon fuel standard.
- The Project is consistent with this reduction measure. This measure cannot be implemented by a particular project or lead agency since it is a statewide measure. When this measure is implemented, standards would be applicable to the fuel used by vehicles that would access the Project. The Project would not conflict or obstruct this reduction measure.

Based on the assessment above, the Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Therefore, any impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to greenhouse gas emission impacts. However, the project's contribution to cumulative greenhouse gas emission impacts would not be considerable.

**Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures:**

None required.

**Residual Impact:**

There will be no residual impacts.

<b>9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>  <b>Would the project:</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X

**Environmental Thresholds**

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project would have a significant impact due to hazards or hazardous materials, if it would create a public health hazard, expose people to potential health hazards or pose a threat to the environment through the use, production or disposal of materials which pose a hazard. The County’s safety thresholds address involuntary public exposure from facilities or activities involving significant quantities of hazardous materials (e.g., oil wells, pipelines, rocket propellants, chlorine, etc.).

**Existing Environmental Setting:**

The County’s safety threshold addresses involuntary public exposure from projects involving significant quantities of hazardous materials. The threshold addresses the likelihood and severity of potential accidents to determine whether the safety risks of a project exceed significant levels.

There is no evidence that significant amounts of hazardous materials were used, stored or spilled on the premises or within 2,000 feet of the premises in the past, according to the California Water Board GeoTracker and the EPA "Cleanups In My Community Map" (GeoTracker, 2021). Since the site has been used prior for church and community gathering, past use and storage of chemicals is unlikely. The site may have been used for agriculture upwards of 25 years ago. Agricultural chemicals may have been stored here, though not in significant quantities given the length of time since agricultural activities ceased on the property and the relatively small area in cultivation.

### **Project Specific Impacts:**

- a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*
- b) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

### ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The project site is developed with a church and a playground. The proposal to develop the site with a hotel use would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Hotel properties typically do not cause significant hazards to the public or the environment through an accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. The types and quantities of hazardous materials present or stored on the site would be limited to those commonly associated with hotel uses, such as batteries, oil, paints, solvents, fertilizers and gasoline. 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, or require the preparation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan. The use of common household materials (cleaners, garden and automotive products, etc.) on the project site would not result in significant hazardous materials/waste impacts. Traffic that would be generated by the project would not substantially interfere with emergency response capabilities to the project site or to other properties in the project area. Therefore, impacts regarding the use, release and transport of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

- c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?*

### ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The closest school is Aliso Elementary School, which is over a half a mile from the project site. The closest hospital is over 10 miles away from the project site. The proposed hotel project would not emit or involve the handling of hazardous materials, substances or waste. Therefore, impacts regarding hazardous materials near schools would be less than significant.

- d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

### ***Less Than Significant Impact***

A portion of the property in the north, behind the existing church building was used for small-scale agricultural operations, primarily as an orchard. Due to this relatively small-scale agricultural operation, no out of the ordinary contaminants are to be expected.

The following databases compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 were checked (November 29, 2021) for known hazardous materials contamination at the project site:

- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) database.
- Geotracker search for Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST); and

The CERCLIS and GeoTracker databases showed no evidence of toxic substances at the project site or the surrounding area of the project site. Thus, the proposed project development would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and therefore, potential impacts from hazardous materials would be less than significant.

*e) For a project located within an airport Land Use Plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

### ***No Impact***

The airport closest to the project site is the Santa Barbara Airport, located approximately 19.6 miles west of the project site. The City of Carpinteria does not have any airports or airstrips, and the project site is not located within an airport Land Use Plan, or within two miles of a public or private airstrip. No impact would occur.

*f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

### ***No Impact***

The project site is located on a developed parcel adjacent to residences, urban uses, U.S. Highway 101, and agricultural lands. The development of a 72-guestroom hotel on the site would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.

*g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?*

### ***No Impact***

The project site is located adjacent to multi-family residences and agricultural lands. The project site is not adjacent to or near wildlands. As indicated in Section 20- Wildfire; the project site is not located in a Fire Hazard Severity Zone, according to the Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map adopted by Cal Fire in 2007. Moderately severe fire hazard zone occurs over 1.5 miles from the project site and a very high severity zone occurs over 2.5 miles to the north (Cal Fire – Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map, 2007). Therefore, the project would not have the potential to expose people to a significant risk because of wildland fires. In addition, the facility would have a fire hydrant that would be installed as part of the project development, that would mitigate the risk from wildfire. No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

Since the project would not create significant impacts with respect to hazardous materials and/or risk of upset, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on safety within the City.

**Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures:**

None are recommended or required.

**Residual Impact:**

Residual hazardous materials / safety impacts would be less than significant.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY  Would the project:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface water or ground water quality?		X		
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?		X		
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or		X		

planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?				
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?		X		
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?		X		

**Environmental Thresholds**

The City of Carpinteria’s Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as Amended (1997), are utilized as environmental thresholds for assessing impacts of the proposed project, relative to Hydrology and Water Quality:

**Hydrology – *Flooding***

- a) Significant impacts result if the project would impose flood hazards on other properties.
- b) The Municipal Code prohibits development within areas of special flood hazard except under certain circumstances. The policy requires approval by the Floodplain Administrator before construction, development or alteration begins within any area of special flood hazard.

If the project would result in increased runoff:

- a) Impacts on hydrologic conditions may be significant because the area available for aquifer recharge is reduced. This may impact well water supplies.
- b) There may be significant impacts on stream hydrology if uncontrolled runoff results in erosion and subsequent sedimentation of downstream water bodies.

Threshold:

- Moderate to large-scale projects where grading would occur during rainy season; or
- Projects proximate to bodies of water or drainageways.

If project would result in modifications to existing drainage patterns:

- a) There may be significant impacts on biological communities if drainage patterns are changed.

Threshold:

- Projects where drainage patterns are influenced such that existing vegetation would decline because long-or short-term soil-plant-water relationships would no longer meet habitat requirements.
- Projects which would result in substantial changes to streamflow velocities.

**Water Quality- *Pollution/Contamination***

- a) Impacts on water quality may result in significant human health and safety impacts.

Threshold:

- Projects which would generate any amount of highly noxious substance.
- Projects which would generate large amounts of substances which in small amounts are insignificant but are cumulatively hazardous.
- Projects that would result in the deterioration of the quality of a drinking water source.

b) Impacts on water quality may have significant impacts on biological communities.

Threshold:

- Projects which would generate or result in the accumulation of substances which affect health or cause genetic defects of wildlife either by direct physical contact with contaminated water, or by water quality changes which cause decline in riparian or lacustrine vegetation which provide wildlife habitat.

c) Project would be significant if it would result in erosion and subsequent sedimentation of water bodies:

Threshold:

- moderate to large-scale grading project (>2,000 cubic yards per graded acre)
- projects that results in loss of vegetation on slopes (e.g., brush management measures).

The analysis and determinations in this section are based on the following drainage and hydrology studies conducted for this project:

- Preliminary Drainage Report- Evaluation of BMPs and Drainage Improvements at 4110 Via Real in Carpinteria, (Stantec 2016, Revised March 2017),
- Flood Hazard Determination Report, Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Conservation District Water Agency, December 10, 2015).
- Flood Determination Memo - 4110 Via Real, Accessor Parcel Number (APN) 004-017-022 (Memo from Stantec to City of Carpinteria, April 1, 2016).

Copies of these documents are provided in Appendix F.

### **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 over-drafted 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 pumping from a well would substantially affect production or quality from a nearby well.

### **Existing Environmental Setting:**

The project site slopes gently to the southwest and southeast at a 0.5 percent slope. The site supports Hydrological soils Group Type Cb soils (Camarillo fine sandy loam, fine substratum), per United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey ([www.websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov](http://www.websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov)). The proposed project is a 2-story hotel building surrounded by paved parking and landscaping. Agricultural fields to the north of the project site drain to an existing headwall and a 36" diameter storm drain that cross under Via Real and the U.S. Highway 101 to the south (Stantec 2016, revised 2017). The drainage runoff from the northerly adjacent properties currently drains along the western side of the property in drainage swale A and the drainage along the western boundary of the site drains to the existing drop inlet at Via Real.

The groundwater depth below natural ground at the site is approximately 8-10 feet. The project site is located within flood Zone A, as shown in the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for the area, prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) <sup>6</sup>. Base Flood Elevations (BFE) have not been established for this Zone.

The project site currently receives municipal water service from the Carpinteria Valley Water District.

### **Project Specific Impacts:**

- a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface water or ground water quality?*
- b) *Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*
- c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:*
  - i. *Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*
  - ii. *Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*
  - iii. *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or*
  - iv. *Impede or redirect flood flows?*

### ***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

The project site is currently developed, with existing structures and paved areas. The proposed project consists of the demolition of existing development and the development of a new 72-guestroom hotel, including a fitness center, business center, breakfast area, meeting room, outdoor pool, and outdoor garden patio. Table 10-1 below shows the relevant data relative to post developmental conditions (Stantec 2016, revised 2017). Project construction could result in erosion and/or sedimentation that could potentially affect adjacent wetlands. These effects could also result in impediments to groundwater recharge as well as changes to the existing drainage patterns on-site. Such patterns would also be affected by project grading. Unless properly mitigated, project construction activities could therefore result in potentially significant effects to hydrology and water quality.

---

<sup>6</sup> FIRM Panel 0683C1420G, December 4, 2015.

**Table 10-1. Project Data, 4110 Via Real, Carpinteria**

<b>Project Name/Number</b>	Via Real Hotel
<b>Application Submittal Date</b>	September 6, 2016
<b>Project Location</b>	4110 Via Real, Carpinteria, CA 93013
<b>Project Phase No.</b>	NA
<b>Project Type and Description</b>	2-story hotel building surrounded by paved parking
<b>Total Project Site Area (acres)</b>	2.61 acres
<b>Total New Impervious Surface Area</b>	0.92 acres
<b>Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area</b>	0.75 acres
<b>Total Pre-Project Impervious Surface Area</b>	0.75 acres
<b>Total Post-Project Impervious Surface Area</b>	1.68 acres
<b>Net Impervious Area</b>	NA (Tier 3)
<b>Watershed Management Zone(s)</b>	1
<b>Design Storm Frequency and Depth</b>	25-year rainfall event
<b>Urban Sustainability Area</b>	No Applicable

The project would be required to comply with Chapter 8.10 of the City of Carpinteria Municipal Code, which addresses stormwater pollution prevention. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with the Non-Point Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and the Construction General Permit (CGP) program to control both construction and operational (i.e., occupancy) storm water discharges. In California, the State Water Quality Control Board administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing permitting requirements. Under the conditions of the permit, the project applicant would be required to eliminate or reduce non-stormwater discharges to waters of the nation, develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for project construction activities (developed by a Qualified SWPPP Developer and in compliance with the CGP), and perform inspections of the storm water pollution prevention measures and control practices to ensure conformance with the project site's SWPPP. The state permit prohibits the discharge of materials other than storm water discharges and prohibits all discharges that contain a hazardous substance in excess of reportable quantities established at 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 117.3 or 40 CFR 302.4. The state permit also specifies that construction activities must meet all applicable provisions of Sections 30 and 402 of the CWA.

In order to reduce potential impacts from post development storm water runoff, and to comply with the City of Carpinteria's Stormwater Management Plan (CMC 8.10) and Tier 3 Post-Construction Requirements (PCRs), the project proposes a variety of Low Impact Design (LID) mitigation measures identified as Water Quality (WQ) measures, which are also described in the Drainage Study Report (Stantec 2016, revised 2017),

included in Appendix F. Measures include preservation of natural drainage features, use of permeable pavements, and controlling all runoff on site. Other measures include filter inserts, and directing runoff from impervious areas to pervious, self-retaining landscaped areas. In addition, a stormwater treatment swale and detention basin are proposed as treatment of runoff water, before it exits the site. The treatment swale will include a freshwater wetland habitat (see MM BIO-3, under Biological Resources Section). The stormwater quality measures are depicted in Figure 2 – Stormwater Quality Plan. The treatment swale will also be designed to promote percolation into the ground which will result in the slow and controlled discharge of runoff into the below ground.

The LID/Stormwater measures detailed in MM WQ-1 will ensure that the proposed project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, substantially decrease groundwater, or interfere with groundwater recharge. The reduction in the amount of impervious surfaces, preservation of natural drainage on the site, construction of a stormwater treatment swale/retention basin and a treatment wetland will all collectively retain/enhance the stormwater discharge from the site. In addition, MM WQ-2 is proposed, which includes conformance with the NPDES permit requirements. In addition, MM WQ-3 is required, which entails the preparation and implementation of a Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. Use of the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be detailed in the mandatory SWPPP and Soil Erosion and Sediment Control plan will further prevent soil erosion and the discharge of sediment into the local storm drains during the project's construction phase. As a result, the construction impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated. Once constructed, the project will not introduce polluted runoff into the existing storm drain system. In addition, the project will not create excess runoff that will exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage system. With incorporation of mitigation measures WQ-1, WQ-2 and WQ-3. impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

- d) *In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*
- e) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

### ***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

As indicated earlier, the project site is located in Zone A, on Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel 060831420, based on the Flood Hazard Determination (Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District & Water Agency, 2015). Zone A is the flood insurance rate zone that corresponds to the 100-year floodplains that are determined in the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) by approximate methods. Because detailed hydraulic analyses are not performed for such areas, no Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) or depths are available for this zone. However, in the Drainage study conducted by Stantec, they utilized the Letter of Map Revision based on the fill for an adjacent property called the "Casas de las Flores" project (4096 Via Real). FEMA accepted the calculations and Base Flood Elevation for this adjacent project. Utilizing the BFEs for this project, the drainage study estimated the elevation at the project site to be 13.04 feet. In accordance with standard practice, the finish floor height of the proposed structures will be elevated two (2) feet above the BFE. Therefore, the building finish floor height should be elevated to a minimum elevation of 15.04 feet (NAVD1988). Consistent with this minimum required finish floor height, the finish floor will be set at 17.0 feet based on the flood elevation and earthwork, to provide a balanced site. This finished floor requirement is reflected as a Mitigation Measure (MM WQ-4). With the implementation of MM WQ-4, potential risks from floods are reduced to a less than significant level.

Tsunami is a series of traveling ocean waves of extremely long length generated primarily by vertical movement on a fault (earthquake) occurring along the ocean floor. As a tsunami reaches the shallow waters

of the coast, the waves slow down, and the water can pile up into a wall 30 feet or more in height. The project site is not susceptible to inundation by tsunamis as stated by the California Emergency Management Agency's "Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning." The tsunami inundation zone ends at U.S. Highway 101, which is approximately 100 feet south of the project site; therefore, impacts associated with tsunamis would be less than significant.

Mudflows commonly occur in conjunction with landslides, due to slope instability. The project site is generally flat and, according to the City of Carpinteria General Plan/Coastal Plan, the site is not located in an area of high risk for landslides (2003). Therefore, impacts associated with mudflows would be less than significant.

The project site is served by the Carpinteria Valley Water District (District), by a 2-inch water meter and service line on the southeast corner of the property. Domestic water service (including irrigation and fire line) for the project will come from the District and be served by a new upsized 3-inch water meter and service line to replace the existing 2-inch meter. Water for irrigation of the common area landscaping west of the creek would be supplied via a new irrigation meter as discussed below under "Utilities and Service Systems".

Coordination regarding water supply for the project was initiated with the District in 2016. In an e-mail dated September 26, 2016, the District indicated that the District does not issue a "Can and Will Serve Letter."<sup>7</sup> The District also indicated in the e-mail that they will not fully commit to the supply of water until the project meets certain requirements. Mitigation Measures WS-1 is therefore proposed, which entails compliance with the District's requirements. With the implementation of these measures, the project's demand on water supply would be in conformance with local plans for water resources management and impacts to local groundwater management plan would be less than significant.

Implementation of the approved Project's Stormwater Control Plan and the project's Low Impact Development design features would ensure that 100 percent of runoff from impervious surfaces would stay on site, be filtered, and return to the groundwater basin. Therefore, the project's impact on groundwater and water supplies would be less than significant.

### **Required Mitigation Measures:**

**WQ-1 Implementation of Low Impact Design (LID) Development Measures.** The following LID measures will be incorporated with the stormwater treatment design for the project:

- *Limitation of development envelope.* The project development footprint will be limited to provide areas for treatment and retention of stormwater runoff by means of a treatment swale along the southerly boundary, high groundwater, and preservation of historic drainage patterns.
- *Preservation of natural drainage features.* The drainage runoff from the northerly adjacent properties is currently draining along the western side of the property in a drainage swale. This drainage pattern is proposed to be preserved. A 50-foot setback from the existing drainage swales will be accommodated and depicted on project designs.
- *Incorporation of existing drainage into stormwater treatment design/treatment wetland.* The stormwater treatment system for the project will be so designed to direct all stormwater runoff into the existing drainages and into a stormwater treatment swale along the southern property line. The vegetated stormwater treatment will act as an aesthetic feature at the entry to the property. A

---

<sup>7</sup> E-mail from Mr. Brian King, Carpinteria Valley Water District, dated September 26, 2016.

freshwater treatment wetland will also be created at the end of the detention basin, to further clarify water and to provide a habitat for wildlife.

- *Minimization of imperviousness.* The project will utilize porous pavement within the northwesterly parking lot to reduce the amount of impervious material.
- *Use of permeable pavements.* The project utilizes porous asphalt concrete pavement at various locations on the site to allow infiltration of the parking areas, treat stormwater, and minimize runoff.
- *Dispersal of runoff to pervious areas.* To meet the Tier 3 requirement for retaining 95<sup>th</sup> percentile rainfall intensity on the site, a large percentage of roof water will be discharged to bioretention devices. The remaining drainage runoff will be directed to the existing swales along the eastern and western sides of the project site, which will then be routed through the treatment swale and wetlands, before it discharges off-site. In addition to the stormwater treatment, the vegetated swale will be designed to promote infiltration of water during rainfall events.

**Plan Requirements:** The set back from the existing drainage, LID and all storm water treatment design features shall be depicted on all building and grading plans. A final copy of the design plans showing these features will be submitted to CDD and Public Works for review and approval.

**Timing:** All stormwater treatment measures shall be completed prior to occupancy clearance.

**Monitoring:** City of Carpinteria's Community Development Department (CDD) and Public Works Department shall check plans prior to issuance of a Grading or Building Permit and shall spot check in the field.

**WQ-2. Compliance with NPDES Permit Requirements.** The project shall comply with the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permitting program. Since the project would disturb one or more acres from construction activities, the construction operators must obtain coverage under a NPDES permit, which is administered by the State, prior to the start of construction. In order to obtain an NPDES permit, the project Applicant must prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The following measures are examples of construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that may be included in the SWPPP:

- **Stockpiling of Soil.** City Ordinance requires operators to preserve native topsoil on-site unless infeasible and protect all soil storage piles from run-on and runoff. For smaller stockpiles, covering the entire pile with a tarp may be sufficient.
- **Protecting Construction Materials from Run-On and Runoff.** At the end of every workday and during precipitation events, contractors must provide cover for materials that could leach pollutants.
- **Designating Waste Disposal Areas.** Clearly identify separate waste disposal areas on-site for hazardous waste, construction waste, and domestic waste by designating with signage, and protect from run-on and runoff.
- **Installing Perimeter Controls on Downhill Lot Line.** Install perimeter controls such as sediment filter logs or silt fences around the downhill boundaries of your site.
- **Maintaining a Stabilized Exit Pad.** Minimize sediment track-out from vehicles exiting the site by maintaining an exit pad made of crushed rock spread over geotextile fabric. If sediment track- out occurs, remove deposited sediment by the end of the same workday.

**Plan Requirements:** The BMPs will be depicted on all building and grading plans and will be submitted to the CDD and Public Works for review and approval. The Applicant shall prepare a SWPPP and provide a

copy of the document and a copy of the project's NPDES Construction General Permit to the CDD and Public Works Department.

**Timing:** All stormwater treatment measures and structural BMPs shall be in place prior to commencement of construction.

**Monitoring:** City of Carpinteria's Community Development Department (CDD) and Public Works Department shall check plans prior to issuance of a Grading or Building Permit and shall spot check in the field.

**WQ-3. Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan.** To control erosion and potential discharge of soil during construction into the drainage swales, the applicant shall prepare a Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. This plan can be part of the SWPPP.

**Plan Requirements:** Specific BMPs that would be implemented from the Soil and Erosion Control Plan that are not otherwise covered under the SWPPP shall also be depicted on all grading plans.

**Timing:** All Soil Erosion & Sediment Control BMPs shall be in place prior to commencement of construction.

**Monitoring:** City of Carpinteria's Community Development Department (CDD) and Public Works Department shall check plans prior to issuance of a Grading or Building Permit and shall spot check in the field.

**WQ-4. Minimum Finished Floor Elevation.** The project shall be designed to have a minimum finished floor elevation of 17.0. Applicant shall obtain a Letter of Map Revision based on fill from FEMA to remove the new structure built on the property from the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA).

**Plan Requirements:** Project plans submitted for Building and Engineering Permits shall depict a minimum finished floor elevation of 17.0 feet. A copy of the Letter of Map Revision based on fill shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to submittal to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for approval and issuance of a Letter of Map Revision Based on Fill Determination Document (LOMR).

**Timing:** Project plans depicting the minimum required finished floor elevation shall be submitted prior to Building and Engineering Permit approvals. A copy of the application for LOMR shall be submitted to City prior to submittal to FEMA. A copy of the approved LOMR shall be submitted to the City following FEMA approval.

**Monitoring:** CDD and Public Works shall review building and engineering plans for conformance with this Measure. Public Works staff shall review and approve submittal of LOMR request to FEMA prior to submittal.

**WS-1. Compliance for Carpinteria Valley Water District Requirements.** The Project will comply with the requirements of the Carpinteria Valley Water District (District) to ensure domestic water supply for the project. The following items shall be submitted to the District for their review and approval:

- Final design plan set that shows profiles for water, sewer, and storm drainage
- Signed plans set by the City of Carpinteria planning department and public work department.
- The City completed Plan Set shall include all of the District's comments
- All required fees (including the Capital Cost Recovery Fee [CCRF], and any fees associated with inspection of the installation or cost to cover any system improvement required by the project shall be paid prior to Plan set submittal.
- Main Extension Agreement with the District for the Construction of any new water mains or other facilities requiring upgrades or improvements to meet the demand for the project shall be completed prior to final Plan set submittal.

- Construction deposits and bonds per the main extension agreement shall also be paid prior to final Plan set submittal

**Plan Requirements:** Profiles for water, sewer, and storm drainage shall be depicted on all final Plan set for submittal to the District.

**Timing:** Final Plan set, and applicable fees shall be submitted to the District, prior to obtaining a grading permit for the project.

**Monitoring:** The Applicant shall provide proof of District approval/sign-off prior to issuance of building permits.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City’s General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to water resource impacts. However, based on the analysis above, the project’s contribution to cumulative water resource impacts would not be considerable. In addition, The City’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. Therefore, the project’s contribution to the regionally significant issues of water supplies and water quality is not considerable and is less than significant.

**Residual Impact:**

With the incorporation of the proposed Mitigation Measures, residual impacts would be less than significant.

<b>11. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b>  <b>Would the project:</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>No IMPACT</b>
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

**Environmental Thresholds**

The City of Carpinteria’s Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as Amended (1997) do not provide thresholds related to land use and planning. The CEQA Guidelines Appendix G thresholds in the checklist above are applied in this analysis.

**Existing Environmental Setting:**

The subject property of approximately 2.61 acres, is located toward the northwest end of the City on the north side of Via Real, roughly equidistant between the intersections with Santa Monica Road to the east and Cravens Lane to the west. A portion of the City limit is contiguous with the northwest boundary of the project

site. Existing use of the property is as a church. Adjacent land uses include multi-family housing developments immediately to the east and west, single family residential development to the northeast, open field agriculture, located outside of the City limits, to the northwest, and U.S. Highway 101 to the south, across Via Real. The property is presently served by all utilities and Via Real is considered an arterial street, developed with standard street improvements (curb, gutter, sidewalks, and class II bicycle lanes).

The property is designated in the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use map for General Commercial (GC). GC land uses are "*characterized by a mixture of retail, wholesale, service, and office uses, usually located along major transportation corridors. This category includes a variety of commercial intensities.*" The site has a corresponding zoning designation of Commercial Planned Development with a Residential Overlay (CPD/R). The CPD zoning district provides "*appropriately located areas for office uses, retail stores, service establishments, and wholesale businesses, offering commodities and services required by residents of the City and its surrounding market area.*" The Residential (R) Overlay allows for the opportunity for the site to be developed with a residential-only development in an otherwise commercial zoning district. Permissible commercial land uses, subject to Development Plan approval in the CPD zoning district, include hotels and motels.

The property is also located in the Flood Hazard (FH) Overlay due to its designation on the current FIRM panel as being located within the 100-year floodplain (Zone A), and the Coastal Appeals (CA) Overlay due to the presence of the "creek" drainage feature onsite. The CA Overlay requires the project to obtain a discretionary Coastal Development Permit that would be appealable to the California Coastal Commission.

### **Project Specific Impacts:**

a. *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

#### ***No Impact***

The proposed project involves the redevelopment of an existing developed property in an urbanized part of the City into a 72-guestroom hotel. The project is consistent with the types and intensities of land uses anticipated in this part of the City, and no improvements are included in the project description, such as new roads, that would divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b. *Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

#### ***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

The site is designated General Commercial (GC) by the City of Carpinteria General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The project has a corresponding zoning designation of CPD/R which allows for commercial development, including hotels and motels, subject to approval of a Development Plan and Coastal Development Permit. Additionally, the site is subject to the FH and CA Overlay Districts, which include specific development standards (for the FH Overlay) and permit process requirements (for the CA Overlay) that the project would be required to comply with. The proposed project would be consistent with the land use designation and zoning for the site, as well as the applicable development standards outlined in the City's Municipal Code.

The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan contains a number of policies in the Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Open Space/Conservation/Recreation, Safety, Noise, and Public Facilities/Services Elements that any proposed development must comply with in order to be approved. Incorporation of the identified mitigation measures in the MND would ensure that all potential inconsistencies with the policy requirements of the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan would be mitigated to less than significant levels.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City's General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to land use impacts. However, based on the analysis above, the project's contribution to cumulative land use impacts would not be considerable.

**Required Mitigation Measures:**

The identified mitigation measures for Aesthetics, Agriculture/Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Hydrology/Water Quality, Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources would reduce all potentially significant environmental effects to less than significant levels.

**Residual Impact:**

The project will have no residual impacts on mineral resources or mineral recovery sites.

<b>12. MINERAL RESOURCES</b>  <b>Would the project:</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

**Existing Environmental Setting:**

Oil is the only mineral resource known in the Carpinteria area in significant quantities. Historically in the Carpinteria area, oil mining and extraction activities have been limited to offshore drilling and extraction platforms, onshore oil storage facilities, a crew boat base, product transportation terminal and an oil and natural gas processing plant; many of these activities have been discontinued at this time. No other mineral resources are known to exist in the project area.

**Environmental Thresholds**

The City of Carpinteria’s Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as Amended (1997) does not provide thresholds related to mineral resources. The CEQA Guidelines Appendix G thresholds in the checklist above are applied in this analysis.

**Project Specific Impacts:**

- a. *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*
- b. *Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other Land Use Plan?*

**No Impact**

The California Department of Conservation website was accessed to review potential mineral resources and mineral recovery sites within the project area (<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mineralresources/>). The web site revealed no such resources within the project area. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of available mineral resources or a mineral recovery site. No impacts to mineral resources would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

The project will have no impact, cumulatively, on mineral resources or mineral recovery site.

**Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures required.

**Residual Impact:**

The project will have no residual impacts on mineral resources or mineral recovery sites.

13. NOISE  Would the project result in:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a				

private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
---	--	--	--	---

In 2016, a 45dB.com conducted a Noise Assessment study for this project (45dB.com, 2016). A copy of the assessment report is provided in Appendix G. The findings from the analysis are incorporated into the discussion of potential noise impacts, by reference.

**Environmental Thresholds**

The City's CEQA Threshold Guidelines provide thresholds for the analysis of noise impacts. The Guidelines establish both interior and exterior thresholds for noise compatibility, as well as thresholds for construction-related noise generation. The maximum interior noise exposure for residential uses is 45 Decibels Adjusted (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) when doors and windows are closed. The exterior noise level threshold is 65 dBA CNEL for exterior living space. Exterior living space includes yards and patios, pool areas, balconies, and recreation areas. Exterior usable areas do not include residential front yards or balconies unless the balconies are part of the usable open space calculation for multi-family units. Temporary construction noise which exceeds 75 dBA CNEL for 12 hours within a 24-hour period at residences would be considered significant.

**Existing Environmental Setting:**

The project site is located between the 55 to 60 dBA noise contours, according to the City's Existing Noise Contour Map. The predominant noise source impacting the site is U.S. Highway 101 traffic. To ascertain the existing sound levels at and adjacent to the project site, field monitoring was conducted for a 24-hour period during June 21/22, 2016 (45dB.com, 2016). Sound levels were measured continuously near the Via Real boundary of the property, south of the proposed building site. By observation it was noted that ambient noise within the project area is characterized and heavily dominated by U.S. Highway 101 traffic running parallel to the boundary south of the proposed building site.

Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include residential development immediately to the east, west and north of the project site. The nearest multi-family development is located to the west of the project site, approximately 92 feet, and to the east of the project site, approximately 105 feet. Single family residential housing exists immediately to the north and northeast of the of the project site, along Trieste Lane, less than 10 feet from the edge of the property boundary to the north. The nearest school, Aliso Elementary, is located more than 2,873 feet southeast of the project site. The nearest Medical Facility, Sansum Clinic Carpinteria Family Medicine, is located approximately 1.2 miles southeast of the project site.

**Noise Background**

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Noise level measurements include intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence. Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-

weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound pressure levels to be consistent with that of human hearing response, which is most sensitive to frequencies around 4,000 Hertz (about the highest note on a piano) and less sensitive to low frequencies (below 100 Hertz).

Sound pressure level is measured on a logarithmic scale with the 0 dBA level based on the lowest detectable sound pressure level that people can perceive (an audible sound that is not zero sound pressure level). Based on the logarithmic scale, a doubling of sound energy is equivalent to an increase of 3 dBA, and a sound that is 10 dBA less than the ambient sound level has no effect on ambient noise. Because of the nature of the human ear, a sound must be about 10 dBA greater than the ambient noise level to be judged as twice as loud. In general, a 3 dBA change in the ambient noise level is noticeable, while 1-2 dBA changes generally are not perceived. Quiet suburban areas typically have noise levels in the range of 40-50 dBA, while areas adjacent to arterial streets are the 50-60+ dBA range. Normal conversational levels are in the 60-65 dBA range, and ambient noise levels greater than 65 dBA can interrupt conversations.

Noise levels typically attenuate (or drop off) at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance from point sources (such as industrial machinery). Noise from lightly traveled roads typically attenuates at a rate of about 4.5 dBA per doubling of distance. Noise from heavily traveled roads typically attenuates at about 3 dBA per doubling of distance. Noise levels may also be reduced by intervening structures; generally, a single row of buildings between the receptor and the noise source reduces the noise level by about 5 dBA, while a solid wall or berm reduces noise levels by 5-10 dBA (Federal Transit Administration [FTA], 2006). The way homes in California are constructed generally provides a reduction of exterior-to-interior noise levels of about 25 dBA with closed windows (FTA, 2006).

Vibration is a unique form of noise. It is unique because its energy is carried through buildings, structures, and the ground, whereas noise is simply carried through the air. Thus, vibration is generally felt rather than heard. Some vibration effects can be caused by noise; e.g., the rattling of windows from passing trucks. This phenomenon is caused by the coupling of the acoustic energy at frequencies that are close to the resonant frequency of the material being vibrated. Typically, groundborne vibration generated by manmade activities attenuates rapidly as distance from the source of the vibration increases. The ground motion caused by vibration is measured as particle velocity in inches per second and is referenced as vibration decibels (VdB) in the U.S.

The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Most perceptible indoor vibration is caused by sources within buildings such as operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or the slamming of doors. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible groundborne vibration are construction equipment, steel wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks, and outdoor recreation areas are more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses. The City of Carpinteria defines noise-sensitive receptors to be land uses that are sensitive to noise, with the most-sensitive uses generally considered residences, schools, churches, hospitals, and convalescent care facilities (City of Carpinteria, 2003). These uses are considered sensitive because the presence of excessive noise may interrupt normal activities typically associated with their use.

### **Project Specific Impacts:**

Sound level monitoring was performed using a Larson Davis Model 820, Type 1 integrating sound level meter. The Larson Davis meter was programmed in A-weighted “slow” mode to record the sound pressure level at Leq = 10-second intervals. The sound level meter and microphone were mounted approximately five feet above the ground and equipped with a windscreen during all measurements. Weather data was collected periodically at the measurement locations. Weather data was also correlated with weather conditions at the closest weather station. The sound level monitoring location was selected in order to measure the existing noise source impacting the project site and to provide a baseline for any potential noise impact that may be created by construction, development and operation of the proposed project. The existing sound level measurement includes a typical workday commute time period. Recorded sound level data consist of average Leq 1 hour sound levels, dBA. (45dB.com, 2016).

- a) *Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

Short-term Construction Noise Impacts

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated**

Short-term noise impacts could potentially occur during project construction activities from either the noise impacts created from the transport of workers and movement of construction materials to and from the project site, or from the noise generated on-site during demolition and ground clearing activities; excavation, grading, and similar ground-disturbing activities; and construction activities. Project construction is anticipated to utilize a mix of construction equipment on the project site, including tractors for excavation and grading activities, backhoes for trenching, earth rollers for compaction, and asphalt rollers for paving. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Roadway Construction Model (RCNM Version 1.1), allows the preliminary prediction of construction noise levels for a variety of construction operations based on a compilation of empirical data and the application of acoustical propagation formulas.

Table 13-1 Construction Equipment Noise Levels, shows the calculated noise levels at 150 feet for typical items of equipment to be utilized on the project site. The results of modeling show that the average (Leq) noise level of the backhoe, paver, and roller are less than 60 dBA. The tractor will generate a noise level of 64 dBA Leq, just below the 65 dBA standard for sensitive receptors.

**Table 13-1. Construction Equipment Noise Levels**

Equipment	<i>calculated dBA at 150 feet from source</i>	
	<b>Lmax</b>	<b>Leq</b>
Backhoe	62	58
Paver	61	57
Roller	65	57
Tractor	69	64
Total	69	65
<i>Source: FHWA Roadway Construction Model, RCNM ver. 1.1, 2012</i>		

A typical eight-hour construction day may generate 84 dBA CNEL at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. Typical operating cycles may involve a short period of full power operation followed by a longer period at lower power settings. Although there would be potential for a relatively high single-event noise exposure, resulting in potential short-term intermittent annoyances, the effect on long-term ambient noise levels would be nominal when averaged over a longer period. The noise assessment study identified that the maximum ambient noise levels in the project vicinity are already up to 82 dBA Lmax.

The Noise Study assessment calculated noise levels at 150 feet for typical items of equipment to be utilized on the project site. The results of modeling show that the average (Leq) noise level of the backhoe, paver, and roller are less than 60 dBA. The tractor was estimated to generate a noise level of 64 dBA Leq, below the 65 dBA standard for sensitive receptors (45dB.com, 2016). Although the modeling was calculated on noise levels 150 feet away, there are receptors closer to the site than 150 feet, including both adjacent multi-family and single family residences. For this reason, the mitigation measures N-1 through N-5, below, would be implemented to ensure impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

### Future Noise Levels

Future traffic noise on U.S. Highway 101 is expected to increase by the year 2035 at a 1.25 percent annual growth rate. The resulting sound level will be one to two decibels above existing sound level. The increase in surrounding traffic flow attributable to the proposed project would result in an increase in sound level less than one dBA and is therefore judged to be a less than significant increase.

### Operational Impacts

#### ***Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

The noise assessment study analysis indicated that the noise levels at the south elevation of the building are “conditionally acceptable.” Potential noise levels during hotel operation could exceed 65 dBA, which could be considered as significant impacts. Therefore, the project will be required to incorporate protective measures in the design and construction of the building envelope or wall / roof-ceiling on the south side of the proposed hotel in order to meet requirements of the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code, which governs exterior noise transmission requirements for construction in areas above 65 dBA. The following Noise Mitigation Measures N-6 to N-8 are proposed, which when implemented, will reduce the interior and exterior noise levels below a level of significance. Therefore, operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

#### ***Less Than Significant Impact***

Construction operations generally include a wide range of activities that can generate groundborne vibration. In general, blasting and demolition of structures generate the highest vibrations. Vibratory compactors or rollers, pile drivers, and pavement breakers can generate perceptible amounts of vibration at distances within 200 feet of the vibration sources. Heavy trucks can also generate groundborne vibrations, which vary depending on vehicle type, weight, and pavement conditions. Potholes, pavement joints, discontinuities,

differential settlement of pavement, etc., all increase the vibration levels from vehicles passing over a road surface. Construction vibration is normally of greater concern than vibration of normal traffic on streets and freeways with smooth pavement conditions. Trains generate substantial quantities of vibration due to the mass and momentum of their engines, vibration transmission from steel wheels to steel track, and heavy loads. Construction noise levels vary significantly based upon the size and topographical features of the active construction zone, duration of the workday, and types of equipment employed, as indicated in Table 13-2. Construction Equipment Vibration Levels.

**Table 13-2. Construction Equipment Vibration Levels**

Equipment	Peak Particle Velocity (inches/second) at 25 feet	Approximate Vibration Level (Lv) at 25 feet
Pile driver (impact)	1.518 (upper range)	112
	0.644 (typical)	104
Pile driver (sonic)	0.734 upper range	105
	0.170 typical	93
Clam shovel drop (slurry wall)	0.202	94
Hydromill (slurry wall)	0.008 in soil	66
	0.017 in rock	75
Vibratory Roller	0.210	94
Hoe Ram	0.089	87
Large bulldozer	0.089	87
Caisson drill	0.089	87
Loaded trucks	0.076	86
Jackhammer	0.035	79
Small bulldozer	0.003	58
Source: Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Federal Transit Administration, May 2006.		

Potential construction vibration from the project would be a localized event. Vibration impacts would be significant if they exceed the following thresholds, which were taken from the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA):

- 65 VdB where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operations, such as hospitals and recording studios
- 72 VdB for residences and buildings where people normally sleep, including hotels
- 75 VdB for institutional land uses with primary daytime use, such as churches and schools
- 95 VdB for physical damage to extremely fragile historic buildings
- 100 VdB for physical damage to buildings

Construction-related vibration impacts would be less than significant for residential receptors if they are below the threshold of physical damage to buildings and occur during the City’s normally permitted hours of construction. Because these construction hours are during the daytime, construction activities would not normally interfere with sleep. Construction hours for projects subject to discretionary review are set by the Planning Commission pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 15.16.180. For larger projects, such as what is

proposed, hours of construction are typically limited to between 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM Monday through Friday, no weekends or holidays.

A vibration impact would be generally considered significant if it involves any construction-related or operations-related impacts in excess of 78 VdB at sensitive receptors. The construction and operations-related vibration impacts have been analyzed separately below. Construction activities can produce vibration that may be felt by adjacent uses. The construction of the proposed project would not require the use of equipment such as pile drivers, which are known to generate substantial construction vibration levels. The project site is relatively small—approximately 2.20 acres—and will not utilize many pieces of construction equipment. The primary source of vibration during project construction would likely be from a bulldozer (tractor), which would generate 0.089 inch per second PPV at 25 feet with an approximate vibration level of 87 VdB.

The City of Carpinteria does not have any specific provisions regarding vibration that would be applicable to the project site as currently zoned; nonetheless, the increase in off-site vibration generated by on-site construction activities would represent only a nominal increase whose impact would not be considered significant. Therefore, impacts associated with construction vibration would be considered less than significant.

c) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport Land Use Plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

**No Impact**

The project site is located over 17 miles from the nearest airport, the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. Noise related to airplanes would not be significant at the project site and people residing at the project site would not be exposed to excessive airport-related noise levels. There would be no impact related to airports and private air strips.

**Required Mitigation Measures:**

The following mitigation measures would reduce exterior noise impacts on sensitive receptors.

**N-1. Construction Hours.** Construction activity for site preparation and for future development shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. No construction shall occur on State holidays (e.g. Thanksgiving, Labor Day). Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions.

**Plan Requirements:** Two signs stating these restrictions shall be provided to the applicant and posted on site.

**Timing:** Signs shall be in place prior to the beginning of and throughout all grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits.

**Monitoring:** Building Inspector shall spot check and respond to complaints.

**N-2. Mechanical Equipment.** Construction equipment shall be properly maintained and all internal combustion engine driven machinery with intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, as applicable, shall be in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation. Whenever feasible, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools rather than diesel equipment. The developer shall require all contractors, as a condition of contract, to maintain and tune-up all construction equipment to minimize noise emissions.

**Plan Requirements:** The notes on all building and grading plans shall include these requirements.

**Timing/Monitoring:** CDD shall monitor implementation of this measure throughout building and grading.

**N-3. Construction Vehicles.** Construction vehicles and equipment shall not be left idling for longer than five minutes when not in use.

**Plan Requirements:** The notes on all building and grading plans shall include these requirements.

**Timing/Monitoring:** CDD shall monitor implementation of this measure throughout building and grading.

**N-4. Stationary Equipment.** Stationary construction equipment that generates noise that exceeds 60 dBA Leq at the boundaries of the nearby residential uses shall be shielded.

**Plan Requirements:** Temporary noise barriers used during construction activity shall be made of noise resistant material sufficient to achieve a Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of STC 40 or greater, based on sound transmission loss data taken according to ASTM Test Method E90. Such a barrier may provide as much as a 10 dB insertion loss, provided it is positioned as close as possible to the noise source or to the receptors. To be effective, the barrier must be long and tall enough (a minimum height of eight feet) to completely block the line-of-site between the noise source and the receptors. The gaps between adjacent panels must be filled-in to avoid having noise penetrate directly through the barrier. The recommended minimum noise barrier or sound blanket requirements would reduce construction noise levels by at least 10 dB.

**Timing/Monitoring:** The equipment area with appropriate acoustical shielding shall be designated on building and grading plans. Equipment and shielding shall remain in the designated location throughout construction activities.

**N-4. Sound Curtains.** Temporary sound curtains shall be installed for the closest sensitive receptors if construction-related noise would exceed City thresholds. A sound curtain shall be installed and maintained along the easterly and northerly property lines throughout the duration of all construction activities on the project site.

**Plan Requirements:** The notes on all building and grading plans shall include these requirements. Applicant shall provide an acoustical analysis prepared by a licensed acoustical engineer to demonstrate whether earthwork and/or construction activities would exceed City noise thresholds for nearby sensitive receptors.

**Timing:** The acoustical analysis shall be submitted prior to issuance of any building or engineering permits. If the use of a sound curtain is found to be necessary to mitigate construction-related noise, the sound curtain(s) shall be in place prior to the beginning of and throughout all demolition, grading, and construction activities.

**Monitoring:** CDD shall be responsible for receipt and review of the acoustical analysis. If sound curtains are required, CDD shall ensure sound curtains are in place prior to start of construction. Building inspector shall spot check and respond to complaints.

**N-5. Noise Monitor.** A disturbance coordinator shall be designated by the contractor. The noise disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The noise disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g. starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented.

**Plan Requirements:** A telephone number for the disturbance coordinator shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site.

**Timing/Monitoring:** CDD shall monitor implementation of this measure throughout building and grading.

**N-6. Exterior Walls Construction.** The exterior wall construction shall consist of wood frame, composed of 7/8" stucco, 30 lb felt vapor barrier, 6" studs with R-13 or thicker batt insulation and two layers of 5/8" type X gypsum board wall for the interior face, with a minimum Outside Inside Transmission Class (OITC) 40 (comparable to STC 50).

**Plan Requirements:** The exterior wall specifications shall be shown on all building construction plans.

**Timing:** Final exterior wall specifications shall be provided to CDD for verification, prior to initiation of project construction activities.

**Monitoring:** CDD/Building Inspector check plans prior to issuance of grading permit.

**N-7. Ceiling/Roof Construction.** Standard construction techniques shall be implemented (roofing, 30 lb. felt, truss or joists, R-30 insulation and 5/8" gypsum board) to provide the necessary 20 dBA noise reduction.

**Plan Requirements:** The construction techniques/specifications shall be shown on all building construction plans.

**Timing:** Construction techniques for ceiling/roof shall be provided to CDD for verification, prior to initiating project construction activities.

**Monitoring:** CDD/Building Inspector check construction techniques/specifications prior to issuance of grading permit.

**N-8. Windows/Doors Specifications.** Glazing for all sound rated windows shall be of unequal thickness, or with one glazing light of laminated glass, in order avoid harmonic resonance at certain low frequencies. The windows should have the performance characteristics listed below to provide the required (or recommended) noise reduction for the south elevation. In addition to specifying the required Sound Transmission Class of building assemblies, flanking paths for noise should be reduced by sealing all potential leaks in construction by use of acoustical sealant and putty pads. Notes and details shall be included on the design drawings to insure that the construction details achieve the sound insulation potential of the basic building assemblies. The following are recommended additional notes and details that shall be followed:

- Use permanently non-hardening acoustical sealant around perimeter of window frames and at joints of all wall and roof/ceiling building assemblies. Gypsum board seams and joints should be sealed with acoustical sealant to prevent all air leaks. If double-layer gypsum board is used, panels should be staggered.

- Select window assemblies with effective, airtight, nonporous gaskets or weatherstripping to minimize air infiltration and sound leakage.
- Provide airtight construction at all exterior walls with acoustical sealant at interior and exterior of sole plates and sill plates, headers and top plate, where warping and drying may open construction joints over time.
- Use door jamb and head gasketing and door bottom gasketing at entry doors to seal solid core doors against weather and sound. Caulk entry door thresholds as they are placed, provide rubber-seal door thresholds, such as those by Trademark Hardware.

Some of the above steps are also necessary for compliance with CCR Title 24 Thermal Insulation requirements.

**Plan Requirements:** The windows/doors specifications shall be shown on all building construction plans.

**Timing:** Final exterior wall specifications shall be provided to CDD for verification, prior to initiation of project construction activities.

**Monitoring:** CDD/Building Inspector check plans prior to issuance of grading permit.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City’s General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to noise impacts. However, the project’s contribution to cumulative noise impacts would not be considerable and temporary noise impacts would be further reduced by the required mitigation measures.

**Residual Impact:**

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

<b>14. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>  <b>Would the project:</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

## **Environmental Thresholds**

Neither the City of Carpinteria nor the County of Santa Barbara have identified significance thresholds for population and housing impacts. Therefore, the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G thresholds listed above are applied in this analysis.

## **Existing Environmental Setting:**

The current (2020) population of Carpinteria is approximately 13,283. Carpinteria covers a land area approximately 2.6 square miles, with a density of approximately 5,132.80/square mile. The City's population is currently declining, with a growth rate of -0.38%, but it's population is projected to increase by 1.86 % (The City's population is projected to increase to 14,792 by 2040 (United States Census Bureau, accessed December 2021; <https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/2016/demo/pepopt/total-cities-and-towns.html>).

The project site is located on Via Real just north of the U.S. 101 Freeway as it transitions from residential to the east to hotels/inns and agricultural to the west and north, within unincorporated County of Santa Barbara. The project site is located within an urbanized part of the city zoned for commercial and residential uses and is currently developed as a church, which currently sits unused. The California Department of Conservation's California Important Farmland Finder (CIFF) Map designates the project site as "Urban and Built-Up Land." The northern (rear) property line boundary of the project site comprises the City of Carpinteria municipal boundary, and abuts agricultural lands zoned AG-I-5 in unincorporated Santa Barbara County. Water, sewer, electric, and telephone services are available to currently serve the parcel.

## **Project Specific Impacts:**

- a) *Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

### ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The project site is currently developed with a church, playground, and storage shed. The project proposes to construct a new 72-guestroom hotel, demolishing the existing church. None of the rooms proposed would be used as permanent dwelling units. Therefore, the project would result in a net addition of zero new residences. Minor population growth could be attributable to new employment opportunities at the proposed hotel. However, it is likely that both short-term construction employment and operational employment would draw primarily from the local, existing labor pool, such that substantial population growth is not expected. Hotel staffing is anticipated at 12 employees per eight-hour shift, with three shifts occurring per day.

The proposed 72-guestroom hotel would increase the number of people within the city at any given time, but not the population of official full-time residents. The influx of visitors would be temporary with a consistently changing number of visitors who remain in the City for varying short periods of time. This increase in visitors, but not residents, will not pertain to the City's and Census Bureau population estimates and forecasts. This addition of transient guests is foreseen within the adopted General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

Utility improvements required as part of the project include installation of a new eight-inch water line underneath the eastern hotel drive aisle to connect the existing main line in Via Real to the water line north of the project site in the Trieste Lane right-of-way. New water meters and connections for the building, irrigation system and fire protection system would tie the proposed hotel into the new water line. A new fire hydrant would be constructed toward the rear northeast corner of the hotel; the existing hydrant at the project's southeast corner would remain. A new eight-inch sewer line would run through the eastern drive aisle toward the northeast corner of the property and continue a northerly route up Trieste Lane, connecting to an existing main line on Venice Lane. A new underground pump station would be placed at the northeast corner of the hotel's parking lot, underneath a parking space. An existing sewer pump house and force main would be removed during site demolition and prep. Proposed offsite and frontage improvements include re-constructing the driveway curb cut and apron at the project entrance, new street lane striping to allow for left-hand turn movements into- and out of the project site and restriping the bicycle lane across the project frontage. Existing on-street parking spaces in front of the subject property would be eliminated to accommodate the proposed re-striping.

Although a new sewer main would be installed as part of the project, and the sewer capacity would be increased by the new larger main line, there are no planned/pending developments in the area that would access the extension and no population growth is anticipated beyond the project's nominal individual contribution. The sewer improvements would not place pressure on existing agricultural land to be converted to non-agricultural uses and would not induce or create potential growth induced impacts. Project impacts to population growth would be less than significant.

*b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact**

The project site is currently developed with a church building, which is not operating. The church building would be removed, and a 72-guestroom hotel would be built in its place. No one currently resides on this parcel; thus, the project would not displace any existing housing or people. This impact would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City's General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to population and housing impacts. However, the project's contribution to cumulative population and housing impacts would not be considerable.

**Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures required.

**Residual Impact:**

The project will have no impact, residually, on Population and Housing.

<b>15. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>  <b>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need or provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
Fire protection?			X	
Police protection?			X	
Schools?				X
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?			X	

**Environmental Thresholds**

Neither the City of Carpinteria nor the County of Santa Barbara have identified significance thresholds for public services impacts. Therefore, the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G thresholds listed above are applied in this analysis.

**Existing Environmental Setting:**

This property is approximately 2.6 acres in area and consists of a church building, play structure, and a shed. The church is not currently operational. The parcel is currently served by the Carpinteria Valley Water District for municipal water service and the Carpinteria Sanitary District for municipal sewer service. The project is located within the boundaries of, and served by, the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District. The project site is also served by the Santa Barbara County Sherriff’s Department. The project site is located within the Carpinteria Unified School District.

**Project Specific Impacts:**

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need or provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection?*

### **Less Than Significant Impact**

As indicated under Section 14. Population and Housing, utility improvements for the project include installation of a new eight-inch water line, new water meters and connections for the building. Irrigation systems and a fire protection system would tie the proposed hotel into the new water line. A new fire hydrant would be constructed toward the rear northeast corner of the hotel, while an existing hydrant at the project's southeast corner would remain.

Fire services would continue to be provided by the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District, with auxiliary service from the Santa Barbara County Fire Department. The District is an "All Risk" emergency response agency, with experienced/trained personnel ready to respond 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The operations division is composed of a Battalion Chief and six Fire Captains who deliver service through six engine companies (2016). The closest fire station to the property is the Carpinteria Fire Station, approximately 1.4 miles away. In a Standards of Response Cover and Headquarters Staffing Adequacy Study produced by Citygate Associates, the District is currently meeting some, but not all, of its needs through its own fire response resources (Citygate, 2016). Development of the project would incrementally increase demand for fire service to the site but would not expand the service area or create a need for new fire facilities.

As part of the City of Carpinteria Development Impact Mitigation Fees, new Resort/Hotel properties would be subject to open space, fire, city and school fees/taxes. These funds would go toward select capital improvements/programs as part of a mitigation process for the introduction of new development and residents to the City of Carpinteria. The required fees/taxes would ensure that the proposed development would marginalize its impacts on community infrastructure and bring potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need or provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?*

### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department currently provides police protection services to the site. The Patrol Division is commanded by a Police Captain, and staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The Patrol Structure has seven teams of officers who continually serve the County and provide specialized service. The Carpinteria City Hall and Sheriff's sub-station is located approximately 2.2 miles southeast of the site. The project site is currently developed with a church, playground, and storage shed. Development of the project would incrementally increase demand for sheriff and police service to the site but would not expand the service area or create a need for new sheriff or police facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need or provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?*

### **No Impact**

Carpinteria is served by the Carpinteria Unified School District. The project is a hotel and as such, the development of the project would entail only temporary patrons of the hotel, occupying the facility on a short-term basis. Employment by the hotel would be minimal (estimated at twelve employees per eight-hour shift), with most employees being drawn from the local, existing labor force. The project would therefore not contribute to a substantial increase in student numbers and therefore, there would be few or no new students that would attend the local schools, including Aliso Elementary School, Carpinteria Middle School and Carpinteria High School, resulting from this project. The Carpinteria Unified School District would not need to make accommodations for an influx of students because no hotel guests will be attending Carpinteria schools unless said guests dwell in a permanent residence within the city. New construction fees of \$0.56 per new square foot are required to be paid to Carpinteria Unified School District. Based on these conditions and the payment of the new construction fee, there would be no impacts.

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need or provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks?*

### **Less Than Significant Impact**

Refer to Section 16, Recreation, for objectives for parks and recreation space. Impacts would be less than significant.

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need or provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for other public facilities?*

### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The Carpinteria Library is located at 5141 Carpinteria Avenue and is operated by the City of Carpinteria. Based on numbers from the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and population estimates, (referenced in Section 14, Population and Housing), the city will maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, and other performance objectives for public facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts:**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City's General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to public service impacts. However, the project's contribution to cumulative public service impacts would not be considerable partially due to the payment of Development Impact Fees (DIFs). Conditions of approval will require the applicant to pay DIFs and all special district fees. Any fees required as part of a new development would reduce the project's cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

**Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures required.

**Residual Impact:**

The project will have no impact, residually, on Public Services.

16. RECREATION	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

**Environmental Thresholds**

The City of Carpinteria’s and County of Santa Barbara Guidelines for the implementation of CEQA do not provide specific thresholds related to impacts to recreation from development projects. The CEQA guidelines Appendix G thresholds listed above are to be used to determine impact significance.

**Existing Environmental Setting:**

The City of Carpinteria has a total of 97.6 acres of City Parks, along with Carpinteria State Beach. As of 2020, City population is approximately 13,283 and with approximately 28.8 acres of parks and 80.81 acres of open space in the city inventory, there are approximately 7 acres of space per 1,000 residents (City of Carpinteria, 2003).<sup>8</sup> The region’s other public open spaces (e.g. beaches and mountains) available to the public also provide recreational areas.

**Project Specific Impacts:**

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

---

<sup>8</sup> Source: City of Carpinteria Parks and Recreation Department, information gathered by phone call, December 13, 2021.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

***Less Than Significant Impact***

The project includes the demolition of an existing church, and the construction of a 72-guestroom hotel with various amenities. The City of Carpinteria is home to many parks and other outdoor recreational services. Located just across the U.S. 101 Freeway is the Carpinteria Salt Marsh Nature Park Nature Preserve. Approximately 1.5 miles away, is Memorial Park, a public area for children’s play and outdoor activities. The increase in visitors to the city could result in an increase in the demand for parks and other recreational facilities. However, since the guests at the proposed hotel are only temporary visitors and not permanent community members, parks and other recreational services will not see a permanent influx of users that would cause degradation to recreational services. Additionally, the hotel will offer features that would provide onsite recreational space for project guests, such as an outdoor pool. In addition, as part of a required mitigation measure to offset impacts to protected onsite biological resources and to improve storm water runoff, the project proposes to construct a small wetland habitat along a greenway belt, in the front of the facility and restore the protected 50-foot creek buffer with riparian habitat. This wetland feature and “greenbelt” would provide a small-scale recreational opportunity for hotel visitors as well. As stated in Section 14, Public Services, the applicant would also be required to pay the Development Impact Fees for Land Acquisition for additional Parks and Recreational Facilities, Parks and Recreational Facilities Development and Aquatics Facilities. Thus, the project would have less than significant impact on recreational resources.

**Cumulative Impacts:**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City’s General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to recreation impacts. However, the project’s contribution to cumulative recreation impacts would not be considerable especially considering the Development Impact Fees that would be paid to support additional recreational facilities throughout the City.

**Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are necessary.

**Residual Impact:**

The project would not have any residual impacts to recreational resources.

<sup>1</sup> Source: City of Carpinteria Parks and Recreation Department, information gathered by phone call, December 13, 2021.

17. TRANSPORTATION  Would the project:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X

Associated Transportation Engineers conducted a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis for the project (Associated Transportation Engineers, 2021). A copy of the report is attached in Appendix H. The analysis and results contained in the report is incorporated in this section, by reference.

On December 28, 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted proposed revisions to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 and Appendix G: Environmental Checklist Form, Section XVII, Transportation. Section 15064.3 includes new criteria for determining the significance of a Project’s transportation impacts. Specifically, Section 15064.3(a) states, “vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the most appropriate measures of transportation impacts.” Therefore, the following thresholds reflect the specific guidance set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 regarding the estimating of VMT and developing thresholds of significance for VMT and the significance of transportation impacts. According to the Appendix G thresholds, a significant transportation impact will occur when:

- (a) **Potential Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy.** A significant impact occurs if a project conflicts with the overall purpose of an applicable transportation and circulation program, plan, ordinance, or policy, including impacts to existing transit systems, and bicycle and pedestrian networks, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(1).
- (b) **Potential Impact to VMT.** The Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory and Caltrans guidelines contain screening criteria for land use transportation projects. Land use or transportation projects meeting any of the screening criteria, absent substantial evidence to the contrary will have less than significant VMT impacts and will not require further analysis. A single component project (e.g., residential, office, or retail) needs to meet one of the screening criteria. The screening criteria for a small project is a project that generates 110 or fewer average daily trips.
- (c) **Design Features and Hazards.** A significant impact occurs if a project will increase roadway hazards. An increase could result from existing or proposed uses, or geometric design features.
- (d) **Emergency Access.** A significant impact occurs if a project will potentially impede emergency vehicle access.

### **Existing Environmental Setting**

The Project site is currently zoned Commercial Planned Development District with a Residential Overlay (CPD/R) and has a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan designation of General Commercial (GC). The current Project includes the demolition of an existing church building and the construction of a 72-room hotel with guest amenities and support services. The hotel will operate with 12 employees daily working the following 3 shifts: Morning from 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM; Evening 3:00 PM to 11:00 PM; Overnight 11:00 PM to 7:00 AM. The Project is located along the Metropolitan Transit District route 20. An existing bus stop is located adjacent to the Project frontage on Via Real. The bus head ways during the PM (5:00 - 6:00) peak commute period are 15 minutes.

Carpinteria is served by a network of roadways, bikeways, the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transportation District and the Carpinteria Area Rapid Transit. The city is considered the gateway to recreational beaches within the County. Recreational traffic is a major element of transportation demand which must be served by the circulation system.

### **Project Specific Impacts:**

- a) *Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*
  
- b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

### **Less Than Significant Impact**

CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(b) indicates that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the most appropriate measure for transportation impacts. In December 2018, the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) provided an updated Technical Advisory to provide guidance regarding the evaluation of transportation impacts under CEQA. In particular, the advisory suggests that a project generating or attracting fewer than 110 one-way trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact (OPR 2018). If the above thresholds or policies are exceeded, construction of improvements or project modifications to reduce the levels of significance to insignificance are required.

The Project does not include any new or modified land uses that may create long-term demand for transportation facilities and would not conflict with local or regional transportation planning. The Project is forecasted to generate 602 ADT, 34 AM peak hour trips and 43 PM peak hour trips. The estimated trip generation includes employee, hotel guest and miscellaneous delivery trips that support the hotel operation. The 12 daily employees generate 24 ADT, these work-based employee trips are used to evaluate the Project's VMT impacts. The Project would therefore have a less-than-significant VMT impact based on the Caltrans screening criteria.

Hotel developments are unique in that most trips are generated by hotel guests from outside the community coming to visit the area for work and leisure purposes. These work and leisure trips would occur without the development of the hotel since the destination (Carpinteria/Southern Santa Barbara County) is the trip attractor not the hotel. The hotel is in effect capturing those work and leisure trips by providing lodging for travelers. This type of land use is not specifically identified in the State or Caltrans guidelines which address

per capita home base (residential) and employee work base (office) trips. Therefore, the VMT analysis addressed only the hotel work-based employee trips. The Project's 12 employees would generate 24 average daily trips. The Project would therefore have a have a less-than-significant VMT impact based on the screening criteria.

- c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

### ***Less than Significant Impact***

The Project driveway connection to Via Real will be designed and constructed to City and Fire department standards and therefore will not increase roadway hazards. Adequate sight distances are provided along Via Real at the driveway location. Levels of service calculations completed for the Project driveway show that vehicles turning into and out of the site would experience delays in the LOS A-B range (driveway). The driveway analysis shows that the site access system would accommodate project traffic and not impact operations along Via Real (Associated Transportation Engineers, 2021).

As part of the project, a new left-turn lane would be added to Via Real, to accommodate southbound left-turn movements into the project site. The new left turn lane in the center median will necessitate the shifting of the northbound travel lane to the north, eliminating existing on-street public parking in front of the project frontage. West of the project site, the westbound travel lane would return to its typical alignment. This change in traffic patterns would be designed in compliance with traffic and engineering standards.

### **Cumulative Impacts:**

Although the project would add vehicle trips compared to the existing setting, no cumulatively considerable impacts would occur. The City of Carpinteria has established a Development Impact Fee (DIF) mitigation program to collect funds to implement long term improvements. The project would be required to contribute to future improvements via the fees. Impacts regarding cumulative impacts and levels of service would be less than significant.

### **Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are necessary.

### **Residual Impact:**

The project would not have any residual impacts to transportation resources.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance or a tribal cultural resource, defined in 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. 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</li> <li>ii. 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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</li> </ul>		X		

**Existing Environmental Setting:**

The project site has been previously disturbed by both agricultural and building development. Since the site was previously developed, any surficial cultural, archaeological, geological, or paleontological resources that may have been present at one time have likely been disturbed. Therefore, the topmost layers of soil in the project area are not likely to contain intact cultural resources. The possibility of encountering previously undisturbed cultural resources during project construction or impacting historical, or archaeological, resources is remote. However, due to large areas of the project site that are unpaved and undeveloped, intact cultural deposits could potentially be present.

**Project Specific Impacts:**

- a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance or a tribal cultural resource, defined in 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:*
  - i. *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*
  - ii. *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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

### ***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

Tribal cultural resources are defined in Public Resources Code 21074 as sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either:

- Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources
- Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1

Letters in support of AB52 consultation were sent by the City of Carpinteria on July 14, 2020 to the following Tribal representatives:

- Julie Tumamait-Stenslie, Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians
- Gino Altamirano, Coastal Bank of the Chumash Nation
- Julio Quair, Chumash Council of Bakersfield
- Mona Tucker, *yak tityu tityu yak tilhini*- Northern Chumash Tribe
- Fred Collins, Northern Chumash Tribal Council
- Mark Vigil, San Luis Obispo County Chumash Council
- Kenneth Kahn, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians

No comments indicating concerns regarding potential Tribal Cultural resources were received for the project site.

In addition to consultation regarding AB52, a request for records search was submitted to the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC), as indicated in Section 5-Cultural Resources. CCIC search indicated that the project site has no previously mapped archaeological resources for the site, but the parcel has a low to moderate potential for cultural resources.

The project involves construction and demolition which would require excavation and ground disturbing activities. Since the project involves ground disturbance and general construction activity, the potential to disturb tribal cultural resources is unknown, and this impact remains potentially significant. With incorporation of the mitigation measures CR-1, also discussed in Section 5- Cultural Resources; impacts to Tribal Cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

### **Cumulative Impacts:**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City's General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to public service impacts. However, the project's contribution to cumulative public service impacts would not be considerable partially due to the payment of Development Impact Fees (DIFs). Conditions of approval will require the applicant to pay DIFs and all special district fees. Any fees

required as part of a new development would reduce the project’s cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

**Required Mitigation Measures:**

Mitigation Measure CR-1, previously identified for Cultural Resources, would satisfactorily address and mitigate any potential impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources to a less than significant level.

**Residual Impact:**

The project will have no impact, residually, on Tribal Cultural resources.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS  Would the project:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?			X	
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X	
e) Comply with federal, state and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

**Environmental Thresholds**

Neither the City of Carpinteria’s nor County of Santa Barbara Guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provide thresholds related to utilities and service systems. The CEQA Guidelines Appendix A thresholds listed above are applied in this analysis.

**Existing Environmental Setting:**

Wastewater collection and treatment services are managed by the Carpinteria Sanitary District (CSD) and solid waste generated at the site is taken to the Gold Coast Recycling and Transfer Station in Ventura. Further discussion of the existing facilities, water supply, and applicable plans/policies are embedded within the analysis below.

Wastewater collection and treatment services are managed by the CSD. This community-wide service agency has the obligation of operating and maintaining this system for the transmission, treatment and disposal of sewage generated within this area. CSD is also responsible for providing treatment to the level necessary to meet various discharge requirements set by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and other state and federal agencies.

Water Reliability is a major issue with water systems anticipating success when dealing with water shortages, especially in California. In four year drought scenarios, the City of Carpinteria has implemented management practices to safeguard against dry years. The Carpinteria Valley Water District adopted Ordinance No. 21-1 in October 2021 declaring a Stage Two (2) Drought Condition with mandatory water use restrictions to cut usage by 20 percent (CVWD, 2021).

Electrical service is provided by Southern California Edison and natural gas is provided by the Southern California Gas Company.

The subject site is presently served by all of the above-described utilities and utility providers.

**Project Specific Impacts:**

- a) *Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

***Less than Significant Impact***

- b) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?*

***Less than Significant Impact***

The proposed project requires upgrades to the existing water and wastewater facilities that serve the property, and new onsite stormwater infrastructure. The new upgraded water facilities include, but are not limited to, replacing the existing two-inch water meter and service line for the subject property with a new three-inch meter and line; replacing the existing two-inch meter with a new one-inch irrigation meter; and constructing a new eight-inch water line to connect existing water lines in Via Real and Trieste Lane. Proposed wastewater facility upgrades include, but are not limited to, installing a new six-inch sewer line to serve the subject property; constructing a new eight-inch sewer main line to tie into the existing main line in Venice Lane; and installing a new sewer pump station to serve the subject project. The new onsite stormwater infrastructure is intended to serve the proposed project and includes, but is not limited to, a new onsite stormwater detention

basin and storm drain system. All of the proposed improvements would serve the new hotel project. The new eight-inch water line would improve connectivity within CVWD’s existing network of water main lines. The new eight-inch sewer line in Trieste Lane would address existing capacity issues with the existing wastewater collection system in this area. None of these new facilities would be growth-inducing in that the area affected by the proposed improvements is already fully developed. Construction of these facilities would occur either within the development footprint on the project site or within already developed public rights-of-way. Therefore, the provision of new or expanded water, wastewater, and stormwater facilities would result in less than significant impacts. The Carpinteria Valley Water District’s 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) reports total district water demand for 2020 was 4,105 acre feet (CVWD, 2020). Total district demand is projected to increase by 347-acre feet (or 8.45%) to 4,452 acre feet in 2040. The UWMP reports that projected water supply for 2040 is 5,586 acre feet, leaving a 1,134 acre feet per year surplus. Therefore, there would be adequate water supplies to meet future demand. Project water demand is estimated to be 120 percent of the wastewater generated. Based on the project’s estimated wastewater generation, project water demand is estimated at 10,368 gpd, while the existing use requires 0 gpd. This is an increase of 10,368 gpd or 11.62 acre feet per year, which is within the District’s water supply surplus projections. Project water demand would represent approximately 3.35% percent of the forecast districtwide increase in water demand. Based on the project’s incremental contribution to future demand, new sources of water supply would be not required to meet project water needs. The project would comply with applicable water use restrictions and water conservation requirements. Impacts to water supply would be less than significant.

- c) *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?*

**Less than Significant Impact**

The Carpinteria Sanitary District (CSD) owns and operates a municipal wastewater treatment plant capable of treating up to 2.5 million gallons of wastewater a day. Based on wastewater generation rates developed by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and shown below in Table 19-1, the proposed project would generate an estimated 8,640 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater.

**Table 19-1. Estimated Wastewater Generation**

Land Use	Quantity	Generation Factor	Amount (gpd)
<b>Proposed Hotel to Be Constructed</b>			
Guestrooms	72	120/du	8,640
<b>Existing Church to be Demolished</b>			
Church	1	0 (N/A: Abandoned building)	0
<b>Net Change (Proposed – Existing)</b>			8,640

gpd = gallons per day

Source: Los Angeles County Sanitation District Loadings for Each Class of Land Use

The Carpinteria Sanitary District currently treats approximately 1.2 million gpd. The proposed hotel project's increase of 8,640 gpd constitutes about 0.66 percent of the remaining available 1.3 million gpd wastewater treatment capacity. Thus, the project's wastewater generation would not exceed the capacity of the City's wastewater systems or require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities. This impact would be less than significant.

- d) *Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*
- e) *Comply with federal, state and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

**Less than Significant Impact**

The proposed project involves demolition of an existing church building and the construction of a 72-guestroom hotel. The Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual Guide contains solid waste generation rates for residences. The waste generation rates and totals are shown in Table 19-2.

**Table 19-2. Estimated Solid Waste Generation**

<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Quantity Guestrooms</b>	<b>Number of People Per Guestroom (Average)</b>	<b>Generation Factor (tons/guest/year)</b>	<b>Total Amount (tons/year)</b>
Proposed Hotel	72	2	0.80	115
<b>Total Proposed</b>				115
Existing Church to be Demolished	N/A	N/A	0 (Abandoned)	0
<b>Net Change (Proposed – Existing)</b>				115

Based on these rates, the project would generate an estimated 115 tons of solid waste per year and a net increase in waste of approximately 115 tons per year. In addition, the demolition phase of the project would generate debris in addition to the typical construction waste generated during a commercial project. The project would comply with all State waste diversion requirements including ensuring that at least 65% of the waste would be recycled.

Waste generated at the site is taken to the Gold Coast Recycling and Transfer Station in Ventura. It is then transferred to Toland Road Landfill in Santa Paula, a Class II municipal facility, which is managed by the Ventura Regional Sanitation District (Cal Recycle, 2016). The proposed project would generate 115 tons a year or approximately 0.3 tons per day, while the Toland Landfill has a maximum permitted throughput of 1,500 tons per day. The project would contribute about 0.01 percent to the current throughput capacity. Expansion in recent years has extended the lifespan of the landfill to 2027 and the landfill has a remaining capacity of 5.9 million tons. Based on the disposal capacity of the landfill serving the project site, the incremental increase in waste generation would not affect the availability of solid waste disposal capacity. This impact would be less than significant (Cal Recycle, 2016).

**Cumulative Impacts:**

Cumulative impacts have been addressed in the EIR prepared for the City’s General Plan and Coastal Plan (April 2003), herein incorporated by reference. Cumulative development throughout the Carpinteria Valley would incrementally contribute to utility and service impacts. However, based on the analysis above, the project’s contribution to cumulative utility and service impacts would not be considerable.

**Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures**

No mitigations measures are recommended or required.

**Residual Impacts**

No residual Impacts were discovered.

<b>20. WILDFIRE</b>  <b>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X	
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X	
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			X	

**Environmental Threshold**

Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District standards are applied in evaluating impacts associated with the proposed development. These standards may be located at the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District web site at <https://www.carpfire.com/carpinteria-fire-department-standards>. The web site provides

standards for private roads and driveways, fire hydrant spacing and flow rates, stored water fire protection systems, automatic fire sprinklers, automatic alarm systems, and vegetation management.

### **Existing Environmental Setting:**

Wildfires or “wildland” or “brush fires” are defined as those fires typically occurring in undeveloped areas commonly covered by heavy vegetation, typically in hills and canyons. This project site consists of approximately 2.6 acres in an urbanized setting, and includes a church, play area, garden, and storage sheds. The parcel is currently served by the Carpinteria Valley Water District and lies in the Local Responsibility Area (LRA), where neither the state nor the federal government has responsibility for providing fire protection. The project site is not located within a Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ), according to the Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map adopted by Cal Fire in 2007. However, 1.5 miles to the north lies a moderate severity zone, and over 2.5 miles further to the north lies a very high fire severity zone ([VHFHSZ] Cal Fire – Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map, 2007). The proposed Project is not located within lands mapped as VHFHSZ (CAL FIRE FHSZL MAP, Source: Office of the State Fire Marshal (<https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/>)).

With respect to fire protection resources, the Carpinteria Planning Area is serviced by the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District (CSFPD). The CSFPD covers 40 square miles along the Pacific Ocean including land area within the City and the County. The CSFPD is bordered on the east by the Santa Barbara/Ventura County line and to the west by the community of Montecito. The proposed project, which is situated on Via Real adjacent to the 101 Freeway, is not located within or adjacent to a high fire hazard area of the County. The project site and area are serviced by two fire stations, one located in the City of Carpinteria on Walnut Avenue, approximately 1.4 miles from the project site and another located in Summerland, approximately 1.2 miles from the project site. Current response times range from three to five minutes. All fire fighters (full-time and reserves) have EMT-1 training (City of Carpinteria, 2003).

### **Project Specific Impacts:**

- a) *Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*
- b) *Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*
- c) *Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*
- d) *Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?*

### **Less Than Significant Impacts**

The project is designed to meet all applicable Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District development standards, including those for access, water supply, building standards, and defensible space. The property is currently served by an existing two-inch Carpinteria Valley Water District meter that will need to be upgraded to a three-inch meter to serve the proposed project. A dedicated fire service line and new onsite fire hydrant will also be installed. The project site is not located in a very high, high or moderate fire hazard area, according to the most recent fire hazard severity zone maps published by the Office of the State Fire Marshall. As such, development of the proposed project would not hamper fire prevention techniques such as controlled burns or backfiring in high fire hazard areas. Emergency access to the site is easily available from Via Real Avenue.

Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

Emergency response and evacuation plans are typically considered to be impacted because of lane closures associated with construction activity. The project would not require lane closures thus emergency response and evacuation plans would not be affected.

CEQA requires an analysis of a project’s impact on the environment rather than the environment’s potential impact on a project. Because the nature of the project does not include any aspect that could make wildfire more likely upon project implementation, wildlife risks would not be exacerbated during either construction or operations.

All drainage changes on the site would be approved by the City and regulated with permanent BMPs as detailed in a SWPPP, as discussed above. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Since the project would not create significant fire hazards, it would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on fire safety within the County.

**Recommended/Required Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Residual impacts would be less than significant.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history?		X		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project		X		

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).				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

**Project Specific Impacts**

- a) *Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history?*
- b) *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).*
- c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated***

As presented in this Initial Study, development of the Via Real Hotel Project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment in several issue areas without the incorporation of mitigation measures. The following resources which have the potential to result in significant impacts and applicable proposed mitigation measures are discussed:

**Aesthetics** – Project architecture, colors, materials, and placement of mechanical equipment all have the potential to significantly degrade the aesthetics of the area and detract from public mountain views available in the area. Lighting and glare from the new hotel construction may also have a significant impact on aesthetics. Implementation of Mitigation Measures (MMs) AES-1 to AES-4 would reduce potential aesthetic impacts to less than significant.

**Agricultural & Forestry Resources** – The proposed development of the hotel is immediately adjacent to agricultural lands in unincorporated Santa Barbara County. Therefore, the potential exists for land use compatibility conflicts to occur with respect to odors, dust, noise or similar impacts associated with typical agricultural activities, which could threaten the long-term viability of agriculture on this property. With the implementation of MM AG-1, entailing publication of a disclosure notice to all hotel guests and staff, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

**Biological Resources** - The project site supports riparian trees which could potentially have nesting birds, including raptors, protected under the California Fish and Game Codes (CFGC) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The project could adversely affect raptors and other nesting birds if construction occurs while they are present on or adjacent to the site, through direct mortality or abandonment of nests. Implementation of MM BIO-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. The project site also supports a drainage swale that supports native riparian vegetation, recognized as ESH or Environmentally Sensitive Habitat. In addition, a segment of the swale meets the California Coastal Commission’s definition of a “Creek”. Project development could potentially have direct and indirect impacts on these protected habitats.

Implementation of measures BIO-2 and BIO-3 entails a 50-foot protective setback, habitat restoration of these riparian habitats, and creation of a stormwater wetland feature, that ensures protection of these habitats, and which would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Cultural Resources – The CCIC records search indicated that the project site has low to moderate potential for cultural resources. The project has the potential to uncover and disturb cultural resources during construction. Therefore, based on CCIC recommendations, MM CR-1, is proposed, entailing stoppage of work and conducting further consultation by a CDD qualified archaeologist and Native American Representative; if cultural resources are encountered during grading. With the implementation of this measure, potential impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

Geology & Soils – Geotechnical studies indicated that the soils on the project site have a potential for liquefaction. Even though the study concluded a low risk to humans occupying the hotel, mitigation measure GEO-1 is proposed, entailing compliance with all recommended measures from the geotechnical report. Stormwater runoff has the potential to cause significant erosion and sedimentation impacts given the size of the property and quantity of estimated earthwork. Measures WQ-1 through WQ-3 (discussed below) would address both construction phase and post-construction water quality impacts associated with the project.

Hydrology and Water Quality – Project development would increase net impervious surfaces and would contribute to stormwater runoff, which could potentially contribute to significant water quality impacts off-site to receiving waters. To reduce potential impacts from post development storm water runoff, and to comply with the City of Carpinteria’s Stormwater Management Plan (CMC 8.10) and Tier 3 Post-Construction Requirements (PCRs), the project will comply with Mitigation Measure WQ-1, which requires implementation of a variety of Low Impact Design (LID) measures. Measure WQ-2, requires conformance with NPDES permit requirements, and WQ-3, requires development and implementation of a Soil and Sediment Control Plan. Measure WQ-4 requires the hotel finished floor elevation to be at 17.0 feet, and for the applicant to obtain a Letter of Map Revision based on fill from FEMA. Finally, Measure WS-1 requires the project to comply with the project conditions and requirements imposed by the Carpinteria Valley Water District. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential storm water, flood hazard, and water supply/service impacts to levels below significance.

Noise – The noise analysis concluded that temporary construction noise could pose a significant impact to sensitive receptors located within 150 feet of the project site. Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-5 would address these impacts and reduce them to less than significant levels by limiting construction hours, requiring muffling and dampening of mechanical construction equipment, installing temporary noise curtains around the project boundary (if deemed necessary), and assigning a noise monitor to respond to and address any noise complaints. The noise assessment study conducted for the project also indicated that the noise levels at the south elevation of the building are “conditionally acceptable.” This means that the noise levels could potentially exceed interior and exterior noise level thresholds in the southern portion of the project site facing Via Real and US Highway 101, which could be a significant impact. Therefore, measures N-6 to N-8 are proposed, entailing construction specifications for exterior walls, ceiling/roof and windows/doors. With the implementation of these measures, noise impacts would be reduced to a level below significance.

## **22. RECOMMENDATION BY STAFF**

On the basis of this Initial Study, the staff of the City of Carpinteria:

\_\_\_\_\_ Finds that the proposed project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, recommends that a Negative Declaration (ND) be prepared.

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

\_\_\_\_\_ Finds that the proposed project WILL have a significant effect on the environment and recommends that an EIR be prepared.

Potentially significant unavoidable adverse impact areas:

\_\_\_\_\_ Finds that from existing documents (previous EIRs, etc.) that a subsequent document (containing updated and site-specific information, etc.) pursuant to CEQA §15162/15163/15164 should be prepared.

\_\_\_\_\_ With Public Hearing

\_\_\_\_\_ Without Public Hearing

### 23. ATTACHMENTS

1. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP)
2. Vicinity Map
3. Site Plan and Elevations
4. Engineering Design Plans

### 24. LITERATURE

Associated Transportation Engineers, 2021. *Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis for the Via Real Hotel Project – City of Carpinteria.*

Cal Recycle, 2016. "Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates." Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates. <<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates/>>.

Cal Recycle, 2016. "Facility/Site Summary Details: Toland Road Landfill (56-AA-0005)." Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (DRR). Cal Recycle. <<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/56-AA-0005/Detail/>>.

California Department of Conservation's California Important Farmland Finder (CIFF) Map, 2016. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/>. Website accessed December, 2021.

California Water Board GeoTracker, 2021. Clean Ups in my Community Map. Electronic database managed by the EPA. Website accessed November, 2021.

Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District Standards, <https://www.carpfire.com/carpinteria-fire-department-standards>, website accessed November 2021.

*Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District. Operations Division*, website accessed December 2016, <http://www.carpfire.com/carpinteria-fire-department-operations>.

CDFW (California Department of Fish and Wildlife), 2020. RAREFIND database. Electronic database managed by the *California Natural Diversity Data Base, Wildlife Data and Habitat Analysis Branch, California Department of Fish and Wildlife*. Sacramento, CA.

Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) records search, letter dated August 4, 2020.

Citygate Associates, 2016. Standards of Response Cover and Headquarters Staffing Adequacy Study. July 27, 2016. [https://s3.amazonaws.com/siteninja/multitenant/assets/21381/files/original/2016-07-27\\_Vol\\_1-Carpinteria-Summerland-FPD-Exec-Summary-FINAL.pdf](https://s3.amazonaws.com/siteninja/multitenant/assets/21381/files/original/2016-07-27_Vol_1-Carpinteria-Summerland-FPD-Exec-Summary-FINAL.pdf), website accessed December 2021.

City of Carpinteria Development Impact Mitigation Fee Schedule, 2021, <https://carpinteriaca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Admin-Procedures-Attachment-B-FY-2021-22-Development-Impact-Fees.pdf>, Website accessed December, 2021.

City of Carpinteria, 2003. *General Plan/Local Coastal Land Use Plan & Environmental Impact Report*. April 2003.

City of Carpinteria, 2017. *Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration -Green Heron Spring: 16-02960*, October 2017.

*City of Carpinteria Creeks Preservation Program Final Document, Volume -1*, September 2005.

CVWD (*Carpinteria Valley Water District*), 2020. Urban Water Management Plan, <https://cvwd.net/doc/4265/>. Website accessed December, 2021.

CVWD, 2015. Ordinance No. 15-2  
[https://cvwd.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view\\_id=1&clip\\_id=50&meta\\_id=3853](https://cvwd.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=50&meta_id=3853). Website accessed December, 2021.

Department of Finance (DOF), <https://www.dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates/>, website accessed December 2021.

EPA (US Environmental Protection Agency), 2021. CERCLIS Database. Electronic database managed by the EPA, SEMS Search. Database accessed November, 2021.

*Office of the State Fire Marshal*, <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/>, website accessed December 2021.

Pacific Materials Laboratory of Santa Barbara, Inc.; 2016. *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation – Proposed Hotel Development, 4110 Via Real, City of Carpinteria, California*. October 23, 2014; Revised April 12, 2016.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, <https://www.sbcapcd.org>, website accessed December 2021.

Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District & Water Agency, *Flood Hazard Determination*, 12/10/2015.

Stantec, 2016. *Via Real Hotel 4110 Via Real, Carpinteria Preliminary Drainage Report – Evaluation of BMPs and Drainage Improvements at 4110 Via Real in Carpinteria*. October 25, 2016 (Revised March 10, 2017).

Stantec, 2017. *Via Real Hotel Project Preliminary Jurisdictional Waters/Wetlands Delineation Report*.

Storror Environmental Services, LLC, 2017. *Wetland Delineation and Jurisdictional Determination Report for the Via Real Hotel Development project, Carpinteria, California*.

United States Census Bureau, <https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/2016/demo/popest/total-cities-and-towns.html>), website accessed December 2021.

VHFHSZ Cal Fire FHSZL Map, <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/>, Website Accessed December 2021.

Wolf Environmental, Inc. *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment. Hotel Development Project*. December 2021.

## **25. APPENDICES**

Appendix A – Proposed Project Plans

Appendix B – Vicinity Map

Appendix C – Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment

Appendix D – Wetland Delineation Reports and RECON's Tree Inventory Spreadsheet

Appendix E – Geotechnical Report

Appendix F – Drainage and Hydrology Reports

Appendix G – Noise Assessment Report

Appendix H – Traffic Study – VMT Analysis

Appendix I – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program