COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Planning and Development

www.sbcountyplanning.org

Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

Sanddew Residence, 501 Sand Point Rd.

Case Number 18CDH-00000-00007, 22NGD-00000-00011

October 27, 2022

Owner/Applicant
Sandew LLC.
c/o Nigel Copley
P.O.Box 50206
Santa Barbara,CA 93150

Agent
Jennifer Siemens
Siemens Planning
PO Box 591
Summerland, CA 93067

Staff Contact: Steve Conner, Development Review Division, Planner
Email: conners@countyofsb.org, Phone: (805) 568-2081

1.0 REQUEST/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is a request for a Coastal Development Permit to allow construction of a 3,256 net square foot (sf) residence, a 771 gross sf carport, a 338 net sf utility vault, 1,667 gross sf elevated deck area, an elevated pool, raised planter beds, a mechanical access area, and a trash enclosure. An existing gravel driveway will be replaced and enlarged with permeable pavers. Proposed grading includes 60 cubic yards (cy) of cut, 25 cy of fill, and 35 cy of net export. Landscaping using native plants is proposed. The proposed project includes habitat restoration as specified in the *Preliminary Habitat Restoration Plan for 501 Sand Point Road, Santa Barbara County*, prepared by Althouse and Meade Inc. (November 2020). Restoration will include removal of invasive vegetation and restoration of native species. The proposed project includes one acre of onsite restoration of terrestrial habitat. Wetland and alkali heath habitats (0.08 acre) will be preserved and non-native plants will be removed. A total of 1.00 acre will be revegetated and restored to replace weed-dominated habitat with native dune species. The proposed home will be located within a 0.20-acre (8,878 square feet) development impact area of the existing 8.95-acre parcel (389,862 sq. ft)— and the resulting impact area thus affects approximately 2.2% of the property, with the balance of the 2.89-acre biological study area being avoided or restored.

The project will be served by the Carpinteria Valley Water District and the Carpinteria Sanitary District. Access to the project site is provided via Sand Point Road, a private roadway. The project site is located at 501 Sand Point Road in the Carpinteria area, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 004-098-011 First Supervisorial District.

2.0 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is comprised of a 2.89-acre portion of APN 004-098-011 and is located at 501 Sandpoint Road in the Carpinteria area, First Supervisorial District. The 8.95-acre subject parcel extends beyond the project site into the Carpinteria Salt Marsh to the north and into the Pacific Ocean to the south.

2.1 Site Information	
Comprehensive Plan Designation	Coastal, Rural, Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood (EDRN), RES-3.3, 3.3 units per acre
Zoning District, Ordinance	Article II (Coastal Zoning Ordinance), 10-R-1, 10,000 sf minimum parcel size, Coastal Commission Appeals Jurisdiction, ESH Overlay, note: a portion of the seawall is located within California State Lands' jurisdiction
Site Size	8.95 acres (the majority of the parcel acreage is located within the Pacific Ocean and El Estero)
Present Use & Development	Undeveloped
Surrounding Uses/Zoning	North: Salt Marsh, Undeveloped South: Ocean East: Salt Marsh, Undeveloped West: 10-R-1, Single Family Residence
Access	Sand Point Road from Santa Claus Lane
Public Services	Water Supply: Carpinteria Valley Water District Sewage: Carpinteria Sanitary District

	Fire: Carpinteria-Summerland Fire District Police Services: Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 PHYSICAL SETTING

The project site is located on a sand spit at the southernmost point of Sand Point Road and is bounded on the west by existing single-family dwellings, on the north and east by El Estero and the Carpinteria Salt Marsh, on the southeast by an estuary outlet that connects the Santa Monica Creek to the Pacific Ocean, and on the south and west by a rock revetment and the Pacific Ocean. Southeast of Santa Monica Creek outlet is the Avenue Del Mar part of the Sandyland neighborhood within the City of Carpinteria. The project site is currently undeveloped. The project site is approximately 0.7 mile southeast of the intersection of Sand Point Road and Santa Claus Lane, which is immediately adjacent to the southbound U.S. Highway 101 on ramp.

An existing gravel driveway connects the terminus of Sand Point Road to the western portion of the project site. An existing pedestrian path continues from the gravel road to the terminus of the sand spit near the mouth of the estuary. The subject property and its vicinity contain a double-wall rock revetment that was originally placed in 1965, and expanded in 1983. Santa Barbara County Public Works is currently working with the Sandyland Protective Association to obtain Coastal Permits for the revetment expansion.

According to the Biological Assessment prepared for the project site (Althouse and Meade, 2020), terrestrial habitats include alkali heath marsh, sandy beach, dune mat, and ice plant mats, and coastal marine habitats include tidal non-wetland waters and revetment. Botanical surveys conducted in November 2017, May 2018, and July 2019 identified 45 species, subspecies, and varieties of vascular plant taxa on the project site. Native plant species account for approximately 43 percent of taxa on the project site; introduced species account for approximately 57 percent. At least 70 animal species could potentially occur on the project site, which includes at least 14 invertebrates, 1 amphibian, 4 reptiles, 34 birds, and 17 mammals.

Elevation on the project site ranges from approximately 0 to 16 feet above mean sea level. Soils on the project site are mapped as "fill (aquents)" and "beaches."

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

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

4.0 METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluates the cumulative impacts of the project by considering the incremental effects of the proposed project in connection with the effects of past, present, or probable future projects causing impacts related to those impacts caused by the proposed project. As discussed in Sections 5.1-5.15 of this document, the incremental effect of the proposed project is not cumulatively considerable for any issue area. For the purposes of CEQA analysis, reasonably foreseeable projects include those that have submitted a permit application or are currently in the permitting process. When determining whether to include a related project, the following factors have been considered: the nature of each environmental resource being examined, the location of the project, and the type of project. The geographic scope of the cumulative analysis has been limited to projects within the vicinity of the proposed project, and particularly along Sand Point Road. This geographic scope has been chosen because it defines the neighborhood where the project is located, and includes projects 625 Sand Point Road (Case

No. 20 CDH-00000-00004 renovations and additions to the existing 3,399 gross square foot single family dwelling and 634 gross square foot attached garage/ mechanical area, located 742 feet away), 645 Sand Point Road (Case Nos. 17CDH-00000-00042 and 21CDH-00000-00045 for demolition of an existing 600 gross square foot garage and the construction of a 675 gross square foot detached garage, a 385 gross square foot pool cabana, a 491 gross square foot guesthouse, an 88 gross square foot mechanical/utility bunker, a 113 gross square foot storage area, a 38' x 14' pool and spa, a 1,134 square foot raised deck, a 404 square foot trellis, and 215 square feet of raised planters, and construction of a new 4,010 gross square foot single family residence, located 1,000 feet away), 701 Sand Point Road (Case No. 19CDH-00000-00028 interior and minor exterior remodel of an existing single-family residence, located 1,450 feet away), 711 Sand Point Road (Case No. 17CDH-00000-00014, demolition of a 2,634 square foot residence and 384 square foot attached carport and the construction of a 7,683 gross square foot single family dwelling with a 2,403 gross square foot basement garage and 14' x 64' pool, located 1,700 feet away), 755 Sand Point Road (Case No. 13CDH-00000-00001, demolition of an existing 1,774 square foot dwelling and the construction of a new 5,995 square foot dwelling, with 5,800 square feet of lower level storage area, a 1,335 square foot attached garage, pool, and hot tub, located 2,200 feet away), and 721 Sand Point Road (Case No. 16CDH-00000-00031/18BDP-00000-01238, construction of a new two-story structure consisting of a 559 square foot detached garage as the ground floor and a 519 square foot accessory structure above, located 1,800 feet away), 821 Sand Point Road (Case No. 21CDH-00000-00046, conversion of 110 square feet of interior space into covered deck and interior remodel, located 2,900 feet away), 845 Sand Point Road (Case No. 18BDP-00000-00193, remodel 300 square feet of guest house, located 3,300 feet away), and 863 Sand Point Road (Case No. 17CDH-00000-00029, construction of three new groundwater monitoring wells, located 3,300 feet away).

5.0 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS CHECKLIST

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

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

Significant but Mitigable: Incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a Potentially Significant Impact to an Insignificant Impact.

Insignificant Impact: An impact is considered adverse but does not trigger a significance threshold.

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

Beneficial Impact: There is a beneficial effect on the environment resulting from the project.

Reviewed Under Previous Document: The analysis contained in a previously adopted/certified environmental document addresses this issue adequately for use in the current case and is summarized in the discussion below. The discussion should include reference to the previous documents, a citation of the page(s) where the information is found, and identification of mitigation measures incorporated from the previous documents.

5.1 AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Potent. Signif. and Unavoid.	Significant but Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public or the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?			X		
b. Change to the visual character of an area?			X		
c. Glare or night lighting which may affect adjoining areas?			X		
d. Visually incompatible structures?			X		

Existing Setting:

The project site contains coastal visual resources, including the Santa Monica Creek outlet to the ocean, sandy beach and surface waters within the Coastal Zone. The project site is located on Sand Point Road, a private roadway which extends along a sand spit. The project site is bounded on the west by existing single-family dwellings, on the north and east by El Estero and the Carpinteria Salt Marsh, and on the south by a rock revetment and the Pacific Ocean. Public views of the project site are primarily limited to beach visitors in close proximity to the site. Public access to the narrow beach area along Sand Point Road is only available in rare circumstances of extreme low tide by walking around the Casablanca seawall or if attempted by boat, thereby limiting views of the site from the beach area. However, distant views of the property are available from Highway 101 and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) (both located approximately ¼ mile away) and from public walking paths located on the southeastern edge of Carpinteria Slough, approximately one mile away. Existing homes on Sand Point Road are distantly visible from Highway 101 and the UPRR, but ocean views are generally not visible over the Sand Point Road community due to the distance, vegetation, existing residential development and topographic changes from Highway 101 to Sand Point Road. The standard speed of travel along Highway 101 and the UPRR also significantly limits views of the Sand Point Road community to travelers from these vantage points. As a result, the subject property is visible for approximately 5 seconds or less from Highway 101 when traveling at normal vehicle speeds. While the project site is visible from Sand Point Road, Avenue del Mar (a private road across the Santa Monica Creek outlet to the Pacific Ocean), and the immediate neighboring properties, these views are private, and therefore, are not analyzed under CEQA.

County Environmental Thresholds. The County's Visual Aesthetics Impact Guidelines classify coastal and mountainous areas, the urban fringe, and travel corridors as "especially important" visual resources. A project may have the potential to create a significantly adverse aesthetic impact if (among other potential effects) it would impact important visual resources, obstruct public views, remove significant amounts of vegetation, substantially alter the natural character of the landscape, or involve extensive grading visible from public areas. Evaluation of visual resources of the project site includes identifying the physical attributes of the site, the site's relative visibility, and the site's relative uniqueness. The guidelines address analysis of proposed development from public views, but private views are not addressed.

Impact Discussion:

(a) The project is for construction of a new single family residence on a vacant lot adjacent to the existing single family residences along Sand Point Road. Site visibility from nearby transportation corridors is limited due to the short viewing timeframe associated with the faster rates of vehicle travel along Highway

101 and the UPRR. The proposed dwelling would not significantly disrupt public views due to the lack of site visibility from distant vantage points. In addition, the proposed dwelling would blend in with the existing development and vegetation along Sand Point Road. The project does not include removal of significant amounts of vegetation or extensive grading visible from public areas. Therefore, the proposed development would not significantly obstruct public views from any public road or from a public recreation area to, and along the coast, and would not result in obstruction of a scenic vista.

(b, d) The proposed site plan design depicts the structure within a 0.21-acre development area near the western portion of the 8.95-acre property. This design approach was intentional. The new residence would be clustered with the other existing single family dwellings within the Sand Point Road neighborhood (as shown in Figure 1). The proposed project would be similar to the pattern of single family residences with two-story components located on their north elevations and raised finished floors for the dwelling's habitable area; although the proposed structure would be shorter and smaller scale in comparison to the majority of two-story residences along Sand Point Road. The eastern portion of the site would remain undeveloped and proposed landscaping would consist of low-growing native dune and salt grass species. The proposed structure height would be a maximum of 24 feet above existing grade. In an effort to soften the visual appearance of the structure, the proposed structure design would incorporate a green roof that includes plant species providing native wildlife habitat (for butterflies, bees and hummingbirds) and rock hardscape mimicking local sandstone formations.

The proposed residence would have a total habitable area of 3,256 net square feet and a site coverage of 0.84 % of the total 8.95-acre lot area (see Sheet G0.01 of the plans in Attachment 1). When factoring in total enclosed area (net living space + enclosed utility rooms, garage etc., the site coverage is 0.93%, or 2.8% when calculated using the 2.89-acre buildable area of the 8.95-acre parcel (see sheet SA.01 of the plans in Attachment 1). The site coverage of adjacent residences along Sand Point Road and Avenue Del Mar ranges from 8.5 to 31.6 %. At 2.8%, the proposed site coverage would be at the lower end of the existing site coverages along Sand Point Road and Avenue Del Mar. Sand Point Road was initially developed around the 1940's/50's with seasonal beach cottages and has been steadily redeveloped with larger homes over the years. As a result, the massing and architectural style of residences varies considerably among the 25 built-out parcels that constitute the Sand Point Road community. Architectural styles range from modern, Cape-Cod, Mediterranean, to California bungalow, and the massing of residences range from estate-sized dwellings to beach cottages. Existing residences along Sand Point Road range from 1,530 square feet (built in 1958) to 7,043 square feet (built in 2003). Generally, new residences and/or residential additions built more recently (within the last 20 years) are larger in square footage than older residences. At 3,256 net square feet, the proposed residence is well within the square footage range of existing residences. The South Board of Architectural Review (SBAR) reviewed the project on September 4, 2020. During SBAR's conceptual review, the project's architecture, mass, bulk, scale, and neighborhood compatibility were all evaluated. SBAR indicated the project was acceptable and could return for Preliminary and Final approval - pending approval by the Zoning Administrator (see SBAR minutes, included as Attachment 2). Therefore, the proposed project would not introduce a visually incompatible structure and the residence would be compatible with the character of its surroundings, which include low density residential neighborhoods in a rural setting.

(c) Glare is currently generated by the windows of the existing adjacent residences, vehicle windows, and other reflective surfaces in the area. Lighting on the exterior of the proposed project is designed to minimize light spillover to adjacent residences through the use of shielding, cut-off fixtures, or similar measures. In addition, all exterior project lighting would comply with applicable County regulations, and standard County conditions applied to the project would require that lighting be low-intensity, low-glare, and hooded to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties. The project would install downward-facing exterior lighting with shields that would prevent glare and light trespass outside of property lines (as

shown in Sheets E2.1 and E2.2 of the plans in Attachment 1). The proposed dwelling's exterior finish would be constructed with natural hue colors, including teak wood siding and a green roof, which do not produce high reflectivity. Overall, the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light that would adversely affect adjacent light-sensitive areas or a new source of glare that would substantially affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, project impacts associated with light and glare would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts:

Implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in any substantial change in the aesthetic character of the area since it is visually compatible with surrounding land uses and will not significantly obstruct public views from a public road or from a public recreation area. Therefore, the project's impacts would not cause a cumulatively considerable effect on aesthetics.

FIGURE 1 SIMULATION OF PROJECT FROM SOUTHEASTERN OVERVIEW PERSPECTIVE

5.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

5.3a AIR QUALITY

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

County Environmental Threshold:

Chapter 5 of the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (as revised in January 2021) addresses the subject of air quality. The thresholds provide that a proposed project will not have a significant impact on air quality if operation of the project will:

- emit (from all project sources, mobile and stationary), less than the daily trigger for offsets for any pollutant (currently 55 pounds per day for oxides of nitrogen [NO_X] and reactive organic compounds [ROC], and 80 pounds per day for PM_{10});
- emit less than 25 pounds per day of NO_X 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 Air Pollution Control District (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, or 1.0, for non-cancer risk); and
- be consistent with the adopted federal and state Air Quality Plans.

Long-term/operational emissions thresholds, listed above, have been established to address mobile emissions (i.e., motor vehicle emissions) and stationary source emissions (i.e., stationary boilers, engines, and chemical or industrial processing operations that release pollutants).

The County does not have adopted thresholds for short-term air quality impacts associated with construction activities; however, the Santa Barbara County APCD uses 25 tons per year of ROC or NO_X as a guideline for determining the significance of construction exhaust emissions (Santa Barbara County APCD 2022). The proposed project would be required to comply with the County's Grading Ordinance and Santa Barbara County APCD Rule 345, which require standard dust control conditions for all projects involving grading activities to reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions.

Impact Discussion:

(a) Potential Air Quality Impacts

Short-Term Construction Impacts. Project construction would require site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities, which would temporarily produce air pollutant emissions. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2020.4.0 was used to estimate project construction and operational emissions. Emissions of ozone precursors (NO_X and ROC) and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) during project construction would result primarily from the on-site use of heavy earthmoving equipment during site preparation and grading. Grading activities and project construction would comply with Santa Barbara County APCD Rule 345 and the County Grading Ordinance, which would reduce the potential for fugitive dust and diesel exhaust emissions during project construction. Based on the CalEEMod results, maximum daily construction emissions of NO_X would be 10.5 pounds per day, emissions of ROC would be 9.8 pounds per day, emissions of PM_{10} would be 5.8 pounds per day, and emissions of $PM_{2.5}$would be 3.0 pounds per day. Annual project construction emissions of NO_X would be 0.4 ton and annual construction emissions of ROC would be 0.1 ton, which do not exceed the APCD's recommended 25 ton per year guideline for evaluating the significance of construction exhaust emissions. Standard County Conditions of Approval require implementation of dust control measures during construction, including use of water, sprinkler systems to keep soil moist, covering of soil stockpile areas, reseeding/revegetation of graded areas, etc. in order to control dust associated with temporary construction activities. Due to the limited period of time that grading activities would occur on the project site and the relatively minor amount of construction, construction-related emissions of NO_X and ROC would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operation Emissions. Long-term emissions would result from project-generated vehicle trips (i.e., mobile sources), natural gas and electricity consumption (i.e., energy sources), and the use of landscaping equipment and consumer products (i.e., area sources). Long-term emissions were estimated using CalEEMod version 2020.4.0. Total operational emissions of NO_X would be 0.04 pounds per day, emissions of ROC would be 0.17 pounds per day, and emissions of PM_{10} would be 0.04 pounds per day, which would not exceed the applicable thresholds of 55 pounds per day for NO_X and ROC, or 80 pounds per day for PM_{10}. Mobile source emissions of NO_X and ROC would each be 0.03 pounds per day, which would not exceed the applicable threshold for mobile source emissions of 25 pounds per day. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in criteria pollutant emissions that would contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard. In addition, the proposed project includes one single-family dwelling and would not result in substantial population growth that could conflict with the

population projections or assumptions contained in state or Federal Air Quality Plans. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant long-term impact on air quality.

Toxic Air Contaminants. Construction-related activities would result in short-term, project-generated emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) exhaust emissions from off-road, heavy-duty diesel equipment for site preparation, grading, building construction, and other construction activities. DPM was identified as a toxic air contaminant (TAC) by CARB in 1998. TACs can result in increased cancer risk and non-carcinogenic effects. The potential cancer risk from the inhalation of DPM outweighs the potential non-cancer health impacts (CARB 2022). Incremental cancer risk is the net increased likelihood that a person continuously exposed to concentrations of TACs resulting from a project over a 9-, 30-, and 70-year exposure period would contract cancer based on the use of standard Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) risk-assessment methodology (OEHHA 2015). According to the OEHHA, health risk assessments, which determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic emissions, should be based on a 30-year exposure period for the maximally exposed individual resident; however, such assessments should be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with the project (OEHHA 2015). However, pursuant to Santa Barbara County APCD, a health risk assessment is not required for short-term construction projects (Santa Barbara County APCD 2022). Rather, the project's TAC impacts from construction can be assessed qualitatively.

The maximum $PM_{2.5}$ emissions during construction, which is used to represent DPM emissions for this analysis, would be 3.0 pounds per day. These emissions would occur during grading activities, which would only occur for a short portion of the overall six-month construction period. Project construction would represent less than six percent of the typical health risk calculation period of 9-years, less than two percent of the 30-year health risk calculation period, and less than one percent of the 70-year health risk calculation period. In addition, the nearest sensitive receptors are approximately 100 feet from where construction would occur. Therefore, given the short duration of exposure and distance between construction and nearest receptors, DPM generated by project construction is not expected to exceed the Santa Barbara APCD health risk public notification thresholds at any nearby sensitive receptor.

Upon completion of construction, the proposed project would not include uses, such as industrial development, that would generate substantial TAC emissions during project operation. Additionally, the project site is not located in proximity to existing sources of TAC emissions, such as a freeway or stationary source of TACs. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not result in TAC emissions that would exceed the Santa Barbara APCD health risk public notification thresholds or place new sensitive receptors in areas subject to health risk from existing sources of TACs. Project impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

(b) Objectionable Smoke, Ash, and Odors. The occurrence and severity of potential smoke, ash, and odor impacts depends on a variety of factors. The nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; the wind speeds and direction; and the sensitivity of the receiving location each contribute to the intensity of the impact. Although offensive odors seldom cause physical harm, they can be perceived as a nuisance and cause distress among the public and generate citizen complaints.

Smoke and ash would not be generated during project construction, as typical construction practices for coastal residential development would not involve burning materials. Odors would be potentially generated from vehicles and equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project, which would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment, and architectural coatings. Such odors would disperse rapidly from the project site, generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people and would be limited to the construction period.

Project operation would involve typical single-family residential use. No large-scale burning of materials would reasonably be anticipated with the residential use of the project site, and the project would not generate objectionable smoke and ash during long-term operation of the proposed residence. The proposed residential use of the site would also not generate objectionable odors. Consistent with standard County practices for solid waste collection, solid waste generated by the residence would be stored in lidded trash cans and collected by a contracted waste hauler, ensuring that on-site waste would be managed and collected in a manner to prevent the proliferation of odors. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate substantial emissions of smoke, ash, or odors, and this impact would be less than significant.

(c) Extensive Dust Generation. The proposed project would generate dust primarily during project construction. As discussed under Checklist Item a., above, grading activities and project construction would comply with Santa Barbara County APCD Rule 345, which requires implementation of SBCAPCD Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize fugitive dust. With compliance with Santa Barbara County APCD Rule 345, project construction would result in a less than significant impact related to dust generation. Project operation would generate an estimated 0.04 pounds per day of fugitive dust, which is well below the threshold of 80 pounds per day. Therefore, project operation would not result in extensive dust generation, and this impact would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts:

The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the significance criteria for air quality. Therefore, the project's contribution to regionally significant air pollutant emissions would not be cumulatively considerable, and its cumulative effect would be insignificant.

5.3b AIR QUALITY - GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

Existing Setting:

Greenhouse gases (GHG) include carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6), and nitrogen trifluoride (NF_3) (California Health and Safety Code, § 38505[g]). These gases allow light to pass through but trap heat at the surface of the earth, preventing its escape into space. While this is a naturally occurring process known as "the greenhouse effect," human activities have accelerated the generation of GHG emissions above pre-industrial levels (U.S. Global Change Research Program 2018). The global mean surface temperature increased by approximately 1.8°F (1°C) in the past 80 years and is likely to reach a 2.7°F (1.5°C) increase between 2030 and 2050 at current global emission rates (IPCC 2018).

The largest source of GHG emissions from human activities in the United States is from fossil fuel combustion for electricity, heat, and transportation. Specifically, the Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gasses and Sinks: 1990-2020 (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2022) states that the primary sources of GHG emissions in 2020 included electricity production (25%), transportation (27%), industry (24%), commercial and residential end users (13%,), and agriculture (11%).

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

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

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

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

County Environmental Thresholds:

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

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

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

On January 26, 2021, the County adopted interim thresholds for land use projects and plans and all other non-industrial stationary sources in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines (e.g., Section 15183.5), recent case law (e.g., *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife*), and relevant guidance (e.g., OPR 2018).

The interim thresholds for land use projects and plans are based on the County's 2030 GHG emissions target (i.e., 50 percent below 2007 levels by 2030). The thresholds framework consists, first, of screening criteria and a numerical threshold (Screening Threshold) and, second, an efficiency threshold (Significance Threshold). The County based the Screening Threshold on the types of land uses that the County permitted over a 10-year period (2010 – 2019). The County set the Screening Threshold at a level that captures the "fair share" of emissions from new development consistent with its 2030 GHG emissions target. The County also adopted the "Size-Based Project Screening Criteria Table" that lists types and sizes of projects that typically emit less than the Screening threshold and can be qualitatively assessed. If a project's emissions would meet or exceed Screening Threshold, then the project emissions must be compared to the Significance Threshold. The County based the Significance Threshold on the targeted level of emissions from new development in 2030 and projected population and employment for the unincorporated county for the same year. These thresholds are provided below:

- Screening Criteria:
    - A project would have a less than significant impact if it would emit less than 300 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent ($MTCO_2e$) per year (Screening Threshold), or
    - Meets the criteria of the adopted "Size-Based Project Screening Criteria Table"
- Significance Threshold:
    - A project would have a less than significant impact if it would generate less than 3.8 $MTCO_2e$ per service population, per year of GHG. A numeric Screening and Significance Thresholds are applicable to development projects of various land use types, such as residential, commercial, and mixed-use. These numeric thresholds are the emissions level below which a project's incremental contribution to global climate change is less than "cumulatively considerable" (Santa Barbara County 2021).

In addition, the project would have a less than significant impact if it would be consistent with applicable plans, policies, regulations, and requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions, including:

- The California Air Resources Board (CARB) State Scoping Plan (CARB 2017)
- The Santa Barbara County Energy and Climate Action Plan (ECAP) (Santa Barbara County 2015)
- Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and Senate Bill (SB) 32
- SB 375 and Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) 2021 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) (SBCAG 2021)

Impact Discussion:

(a, b) The proposed project involves the construction of a new 3,256-sf single-family residence and appurtenant structures on an undeveloped project site, which would increase the residential density and associated GHG emissions on the project site. The County's "Size-Based Project Screening Criteria Table" includes a qualitative screening criterion of 62,000 sf for single-family residential land uses. The proposed residence would fall below this screening criterion. For informational purposes, construction and operational GHG emissions were estimated using CalEEMod. Project construction activities would emit

55.6 $MTCO_2e$. Amortized over a 30-year period, consistent with the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (2021), project construction would result in 1.85 $MTCO_2e$ per year. Project operation would result in 9.5 $MTCO_2e$ per year. Combined with the amortized construction emissions, the proposed project would emit 11.4 $MTCO_2e$ per year, which would not exceed the County's Screening Threshold of 300 $MTCO_2e$ per year. Therefore, the proposed project would not emit generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment.

In addition, the project would be consistent with the goals for energy efficiency, sustainability, and GHG reductions contained in AB 32 and SB 32, as outlined in the 2017 State Scoping Plan, the SBCAG 2021 RTP/SCS, and Santa Barbara County ECAP. The project design includes complying with the latest Title 24 Green Building Code and Building Efficiency Energy Standards, designing the project to be Smart Build Santa Barbara Tier-1 certified (exceeding the Title 24 standards by 30%), and installing PV solar panels, energy-efficient LED lighting, water-efficient faucets and toilets, and water efficient irrigation systems, and native, drought-tolerant landscaping. In addition, the proposed project would not substantially contribute to population growth and GHG emissions. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts:

The proposed project would not result in GHG emissions exceeding the Santa Barbara County Screening Criteria and Threshold (300 $MTCO_2e$/yr, equivalent to the operational GHG emissions associated with 62,000 sf of single-family residential uses). The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the significance criteria for GHG emissions. Therefore, the project's contribution to regionally significant GHG emissions is would not be cumulatively considerable.

5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

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

Existing Plant and Animal Communities/Conditions:

Background and Methods:

Santa Barbara County has a wide diversity of habitat types, including chaparral, oak woodlands, wetlands and beach dunes. Terrestrial and marine habitat types identified and mapped in the project area consist of alkali heath marsh, salt grass flats, dune mat, iceplant mats, road, and tidal non-wetland waters.

For this project, 16 site visits were conducted between 2017 and 2021 including botanical surveys, wildlife surveys, and jurisdictional delineations. The purpose, methods, and results of these surveys are described in detail in the Biological Report prepared by Althouse and Meade, Inc. in September 2021. A follow up site visit was conducted by Rincon Consultants on June 23, 2022 to confirm the conclusions of the 2021 Biological Report. Rincon confirmed during this site visit that the 2021 Biological Report was accurate in its evaluation of habitats present and potential sensitive species, jurisdictional resource mapping, rare plant mapping, potential project-related impacts, and mitigation measures. In addition, a Preliminary Habitat Restoration Plan was prepared by Althouse and Meade, Inc. in November 2020. The following analysis is based on the information contained in the 2021 Biological Report and 2020 Preliminary Habitat Restoration Plan.

Flora:

Vegetative communities on the 2.89-acre biological study area consists of alkali heath marsh, sandy beach, dune mat, and iceplant mats. Approximately 1.49 acres of the site is classified by the County as environmentally sensitive habitat (ESH), including alkali heath marsh (0.01 acre), sandy beach (0.07 acre), dune mat (0.46 acre), tidal non-wetland waters (0.95 acre), and iceplant mats (0.63 acre). The remainder of the project site consists of infrastructure that is not ESH, including the existing access road (0.11 acre) and revetment (0.67 acre). The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) indicates that the following special status plants have the potential to occur in the area: red sand-verbena (*Abronia maritima*), march sandwort (*Arenaria paludicola*), Ventura marsh milk-vetch (*Astragalus pycnostachyus* var. *lanosissimus*), Coulter's saltbush (*Atriplex coulteri*), Santa Barbara morning glory (*Calystegia sepium* ssp*. binghamiae*), southern tarplant (*Centromadia parryi* spp. *australis*), salt marsh bird's-beak (*Chloropyron maritimum* ssp. *maritimum*),

paniculate tarplant (*Deinandra paniculata*), Coulter's goldfields (*Lasthenia glabrata* ssp. *coulteri*), Gambel's watercress (*Nasturtium gambelii*), black-flowered figwort (*Scrophularia atrata*), and wooly seablite (*Suaeda taxifolia*). Of these species, red sand-verbena and wooly seablight were observed on the site, and there is high potential for salt marsh bird's-beak, southern tarplant, and Coulter's saltbush to occur.

Fauna:

Wildlife species with the potential to inhabit the site include at least 70 species, with at least 14 invertebrates, one amphibian, four reptiles, 34 birds, and 17 mammals. The CNDDB indicates that the following special status animal species have the potential to occur in the area: Northern California legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra*), obscure bumblebee (*Bombus caliginosus*), western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrines nivosus*), sandy beach tiger beetle (*Cicindela hirticollis gravida*), globose dune beetle (*Coelus globosus*), tidewater goby (*Eucyclogobius newberryi*), steelhead-southern California DPS (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*), wandering (saltmarsh) skipper (*Panoquina errans*), and Belding's savannah sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi*). None of these species were observed during the surveys conducted on the project site and the potential for these species to occur on the site is considered low.

Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands

The project site contains 0.96 acre of federal jurisdictional tidal non-wetland waters, also subject to state and local jurisdiction. In addition, the project site contains 0.01 acre of alkali heath marsh, which is exclusively under the jurisdiction of California Coastal Commission (CCC), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and Santa Barbara County (i.e., state wetlands). Therefore, the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 jurisdictional boundary is located at the higher high tide line (6.50 feet elevation) and the Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) Section 10 jurisdictional boundary is located at the mean high tide line (4.55 feet elevation, NAVD88 datum). These areas are in part estuarine subtidal and estuarine intertidal according to the Cowardin classification system. CWA Section 404 and RHA Section 10 waters are also within the jurisdiction of RWQCB, CCC, CDFW, and County of Santa Barbara.

Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Movement:

The project site is located in an ecologically complex area between the Pacific Ocean and the mouth of the Carpinteria Salt Marsh where shorebirds forage daily along the shores and mudflats and congregate along the revetment. Lack of infrastructure and limited human activity provides a flyway for birds moving between the salt marsh and the ocean. In addition, wildlife are able to move between the existing revetment on the site and the saltmarsh.

Thresholds:

Santa Barbara County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (2021) includes guidelines for the assessment of biological resource impacts. The following resource-specific thresholds are applicable to this project:

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

Coastal Salt Marsh: Project created impacts may be considered significant due to the potential to change species composition and habitat value through: substantial alteration of tidal circulation or decrease of tidal prism; adverse hydrologic changes; substantial increase of sedimentation, introduction of toxic elements or alteration of ambient water temperature; construction activity which creates indirect impacts such as noise

and turbidity on sensitive animal species, especially during critical periods such as breeding and nesting; disruption of wildlife dispersal corridors; or disturbance or removal of substantial amounts of marsh habitats.

Other Rare Habitat Types: The Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual recognizes that not all habitat-types found in Santa Barbara County are addressed by the habitat-specific guidelines. Impacts to other habitat types or species may be considered significant, based on substantial evidence in the record, if they substantially: (1) reduce or eliminate species diversity or abundance; (2) reduce or eliminate the quality of nesting areas; (3) limit reproductive capacity through losses of individuals or habitat; (4) fragment, eliminate, or otherwise disrupt foraging areas and/or access to food sources; (5) limit or fragment range and movement; or (6) interfere with natural processes, such as fire or flooding, upon which the habitat depends.

Impact Discussion:

(a) The project site contains 1.49 acres of habitat classified by the County as ESH, some of which would be temporarily and permanently impacted by development of the project. Not all of the communities included in the County's ESH classification are considered unique, rare or threatened plant communities. This analysis focuses on plant communities with special status conferred by the County of Santa Barbara (e.g., communities classified as ESH) as well as special status conferred by federal and state agencies (e.g., wetland habitat and native plant communities associated with special status plants with the potential to occur on the project site).

Temporary Construction Impacts. Indirect temporary impacts may occur during project construction due to fugitive dust, runoff, sedimentation, erosion, chemical pollution, and accidental clearing, grading, and trampling. Based on the results of the 2021 Biological Report, the project would not directly impact any federal or state wetland habitat. However, construction of the project would indirectly impact up to 0.11 acres of dune mat primarily due to access road and staging areas that would be utilized during project construction. This temporary construction impact would be potentially significant. MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-8 require stormwater BMPs, pile installation that would avoid dewatering or soils piles, ESH impact minimization measures, a 20-foot impact avoidance setback from federal and state wetland habitat, construction worker training, construction equipment BMPs, concrete washout management, and compliance monitoring by an approved biologist during project construction. The project application includes a Preliminary Restoration Plan intended to permanently restore impacted dune mat habitat. MM-BIO-9 requires preparation of a Final Habitat Restoration Plan, based on the recommendations contained in the Preliminary Habitat Restoration Plan, that mitigates temporary disturbance of dune mat ESH at a 2:1 ratio. The Preliminary Habitat Restoration Plan proposes the permanent restoration of 0.75 acre of dune mat, which would meet this requirement. With implementation of these mitigation measures, indirect temporary impacts to unique, rare, or threatened plant communities during project construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Long-Term Impacts. The proposed structure and access road would be designed and located to minimize long-term impacts to special status plant communities, wetlands, and jurisdictional features. Approximately 1.41 acres (95 percent) of the existing ESH on the site would be preserved and protected from permanent impacts. Nonetheless, 0.08 acre of existing dune mat would be permanently impacted by the proposed development. This permanent impact would be potentially significant. MM-BIO-9 and MM-BIO-10 requires preparation of a Final Habitat Restoration Plan that mitigates permanent loss of special status plant communities (including dune mat ESH) at a 4:1 ratio, as well as permanent stormwater quality BPMs to be incorporated into the parking area and driveway design, and a maintenance program for stormwater BMPs. The Preliminary Habitat Restoration Plan proposes the permanent restoration of 0.75 acre of dune mat, which would meet this requirement. With implementation of these mitigation measures permanent impacts to unique, rare, or threatened plant communities would be reduced to a less than significant level.

(b) Two special status plant species were documented on the project site during surveys conducted between 2017 and 2021: one red sand-verbena and two wooly seablight. Both species have a California Rare Plant Rank of 4.2 indicating their limited distribution and status as moderately threatened in California (20-80 percent occurrences threatened/moderate degree and immediacy of threat). Both species are listed as locally rare species in Santa Barbara County. The red sand verbena has a bloom period from February through December, and the wooly seablight blooms year-round. At the time of the most recent special status plant species survey in 2021 the documented individuals of these two special status plant species are located outside of the footprint of disturbance for the proposed project. Nonetheless, the potential exists for the project to impact red sand-verbena and two wooly seablight if new individuals of these special status plant species should be identified within the footprint of disturbance, which would be a potentially significant impact. MM-BIO-15 requires a pre-construction special status plant survey that prioritizes avoidance and mitigates permanent loss of special status plant communities at a 4:1 ratio. With implementation of these mitigation measures the project's potential to result in a reduction in the numbers or restriction in the range of any special status plant species would be reduced to a less than significant level.

(c) Native vegetation on the project site includes alkali heath marsh (0.01 acre) and dune mat (0.45 acre). The alkali heath marsh is located outside of the project development footprint and would not be temporarily or permanently impacted by the proposed project. However, as discussed under Checklist Item a., the proposed project would temporarily disturb 0.11 acre of dune mat during construction and would result in the permanent loss of 0.08 acre of dune mat. This reduction in the quality and extent of native vegetation would be a potentially significant impact. MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-10 require stormwater BMPs, pile installation that would avoid dewatering or soils piles, ESH impact minimization measures, a 20-foot impact avoidance setback from federal and state wetland habitat, construction worker training, construction equipment BMPs, concrete washout management, construction compliance monitoring by an approved biologist, and a Final Restoration Plan that mitigates temporary disturbance of dune mat at a 2:1 ratio and permanent loss of dune mat habitat at a 4:1 ratio. Temporary and permanent impacts on native plant communities would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-10, which includes replacement at a 2:1 ratio for temporarily disturbed vegetation and 4:1 for permanently impacted vegetation. With implementation of these mitigation measures temporary and permanent impacts on native plant communities would be reduced to a less than significant level.

(d) The proposed project would remove non-native iceplant mats that do not provide substantial habitat value and replace the removed non-native plants with native dune mat habitat that provides increased habitat value consistent with the County's definition of ESH. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on non-native vegetation with habitat value.

(e) The proposed project would not result in the removal of any native trees. Therefore, there would be no impact.

(f) Operation of the project would involve typical residential activities and may introduce minor uses of residential herbicides and pesticides and new sources of light and noise associated with human habitation. These activities would be consistent with existing residential uses in the immediate project vicinity, and the proposed project has been designed to minimize the development footprint and the potential for impacts to habitat associated with human habitation. Proposed landscaping consists of a native, non-invasive planting palette consistent with the existing native habitat on the site, which would minimize the anticipated need for herbicides and pesticides. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact associated with the introduction of herbicides, pesticides, animal life, human habitation, non-native plants or other factors that would change or hamper the existing habitat.

(g) No documented occurrences of unique, rare, threatened, or endangered animal species have been identified on the project site, and the site does not include critical habitat for any special status fauna. However, special status fauna species have the potential to occur on the site, including northern California

legless lizard, obscure bumblebee, sandy beach tiger beetle, globose dune beetle, and wandering skipper. If special status animals that have potential to occur on the project site are present during project construction, individuals of these species may be injured or killed by construction activities, which would be a significant impact. MM-BIO-13 and MM-BIO-14 require completion of pre-construction surveys for these protected species and the appropriate treatment of any individuals discovered. In addition, the project would be required to minimize impacts to natural habitat areas and protected species through delineation of protected habitat areas, implementation of construction BMPs, construction compliance monitoring by an approved biologist, construction worker training, architectural window treatments to minimize bird collisions, nesting bird protections, and habitat restoration for areas temporarily and permanently impacted by the project, as required by MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-12. With implementation of these mitigation measures, potential impacts on rare, threatened or endangered species of animals would be reduced to a less than significant level.

(h) (i) (j) (k) Wildlife species expected to inhabit the site include at least 70 species, including 14 invertebrates, one amphibian, four reptiles, 34 birds, and 17 mammals. The proposed project would develop approximately 0.2 acres (2 percent) of the 2.7-acre site, converting primarily non-native iceplant mats that do not provide habitat value as well as approximately 0.08 acre of native dune mat habitat from the existing undeveloped condition. The project has been designed to minimize impacts to habitat and wildlife on the site through the siting and design of structures on the site, which would be clustered near existing nearby development on the western side of the property near existing property access infrastructure. However, the project would reduce habitat available for continued use by mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and invertebrate species currently inhabiting the site, and other wildlife residing at, feeding at or migrating though the mouth of the Carpinteria Salt Marsh. Noise and activity from construction activities and equipment would temporarily reduce available foraging, resting, and potential breeding habitat for birds because of their wariness of humans. Post-construction impacts would include increased human presence, light pollution that may affect nocturnal wildlife movement, and potentially fatal bird collisions with exterior windows. The project footprint would reduce marginal foraging habitat for Belding's Savannah sparrow. The proposed project also has the potential to affect bird movement between the salt marsh and the ocean. These are potentially significant impacts.

MM-BIO-12 would reduce the potential for construction impacts to nesting and breeding birds through pre-construction nesting bird surveys and avoidance of active nests. MM-BIO-11 requires the use of glass windows that score 70 or greater in Avoidance Index to prevent bird strikes that could harm migrating or resident bird species in the project area. MM-BIO-9 requires a Final Restoration Plan that mitigates permanent loss of special status plant communities (including dune mat habitat) at a 4:1 ratio, which would result in a net increase in the native habitat on the project site, and a permanent increase in native habitat that would exceed the amount of non-native and native habitat loss. In addition, the project would be required to minimize impacts to natural habitat areas and protected species through delineation of protected habitat areas, implementation of construction BMPs, construction compliance monitoring by an approved biologist, construction worker training, and habitat restoration for areas temporarily and permanently impacted by the project, as required by MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-12. With implementation of these mitigation measures potential impacts on the diversity or numbers of animals onsite, existing fish or wildlife habitat, wildlife movement, or other impacts to animals associated with human presence would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts:

Significant cumulative impacts to biological resources could occur if the combined effects of the proposed project along with approved and pending projects within the vicinity of the proposed project, and in particular along Sand Point Road (refer to Section 4.0, Methodology for Evaluating Cumulative Impacts) would result in substantial fragmentation of open space, the loss of sensitive habitats and species, and/or urban expansion

into natural areas. Cumulative development in the project site vicinity would increase the potential for potentially significant impacts to biological resources in the area through direct and indirect impacts to special-status flora and fauna and cumulative loss of habitat.

The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, the project has the potential to impact sensitive biological resources; however, implementation of required Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-15 would minimize the potential for the project to impact biological resources, and would ensure the project contribute considerably to the cumulative impacts to special-status flora and fauna and cumulative loss of habitat in in the project vicinity. Therefore, with implementation of required mitigation measures as described below, the project's contribution to any cumulative loss of habitat or other cumulative impact to biological resources in the project vicinity is not considerable, and is insignificant.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The following mitigation measures would reduce the project's impacts below the County's adopted thresholds of significance for biological resources:

MM-BIO-1: Where required by the latest edition of the California Green Code and/or Chapter 14 of the Santa Barbara County Code, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) and/or an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) that include documentation of and preparation for storm events and high tides shall be implemented as part of the project. Grading and erosion and sediment control plans shall be designed to minimize erosion during construction and shall be implemented for the duration of the grading period and until re-graded areas have been stabilized by structures, long-term erosion control measures or permanent landscaping. The Owner/Applicant shall submit the SWPPP, SWMP or ESCP) using Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to stabilize the site, protect natural watercourses/creeks, prevent erosion, convey storm water runoff to existing drainage systems keeping contaminants and sediments onsite. At a minimum, burlap straw wattles (no monofilament netting wattles) or comparably effective devices shall be placed on the downslope sides of the proposed work area which would direct flows into temporary sedimentation basins to protect the salt marsh. In addition, the SWPPP, SWMP, and/or ECSP shall identify how disturbed surface soils will be stabilized during and after construction (e.g., use of mulch, soil stabilizers, etc. that are compatible with salt marsh habitat/ sensitive species) to result in minimal erosion. Any disturbed areas shall be restored upon the completion of construction, and prior to final inspection. If the area is within 50 feet of the salt marsh, a compatible native seed mix shall be used to revegetate the restored area. The same vegetation treatment shall apply for any areas on the project site left undisturbed for more than 30 days.

The SWPPP or ESCP shall be a part of the Grading Plan submittal and will be reviewed for its technical merits by P&D. Information on Erosion Control requirements can be found on the County web site re: Grading Ordinance Chapter 14 (http://sbcountyplanning.org/building/grading.cfm) refer to Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Requirements; and in the California Green Code for SWPPP (projects < 1 acre) and/or SWMP requirements.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The grading and SWPPP, SWMP and/or ESCP shall be submitted for review and approved by P&D prior to Coastal Development Permit issuance. The plan shall be designed to address erosion, sediment, and pollution control during all phases of development of the site until all disturbed areas are permanently stabilized.

TIMING: The SWPPP requirements shall be implemented prior to the commencement of grading and throughout the year. The ESCP/SWMP requirements shall be implemented between November 1st and April 15th of each year, except pollution control measures shall be implemented year-round. Proof of re-vegetation and site stabilization will be provided to the County prior to final inspection.

MONITORING: P&D permit compliance and B&S staff shall perform site inspections throughout the construction phase. BMPs shall be checked and maintained after storm events to ensure that sedimentation control measures remain functional. For storm events that persist beyond 3 days, the contractor will inspect BMPs for effectivity every 72 hours until the storm event ends. A shipping label or seed mix bag tags of the native seed/plants used shall be provided to the county prior to final inspection.

MM-BIO-2: Project development plans shall provide a method of concrete pile installation that does not require dewatering or creating temporary spoils piles. Examples include the following:

- If Fluid (Super Mud) method is used, all drilling mud shall be pumped out into a tank as the concrete is inserted.
- If Casing method is used, a steel pipe shall bet into each hole as it is drilled, and fluids (if used), shall be pumped out into a tank.

A biological monitor shall be on site during concrete pile installation to verify minimization of impacts to protected habitats, and to document fluid disposal management protocol to avoid impacts to habitats and water quality.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The development plan notes shall indicate the method of concrete pile selected. The biological monitor shall document (e.g., photo documentation, field survey notes) pile installation and fluid disposal management protocol during construction.

TIMING: Development plans showing the concrete pile construction method shall be submitted to permit compliance and B&S staff prior to pile installation. Biological monitor shall be onsite and complete documentation of concrete pile installation throughout the construction period and shall provide collected documentation to permit compliance staff.

MONITORING: P&D permit compliance monitoring staff and B&S staff shall review development plans and perform site inspections throughout the construction phase.

MM-BIO-3: The Project Biologist shall ensure that removal or disturbance of environmentally sensitive habitat (ESH) habitats, particularly coastal strand, is minimized through the following:

- Prior to initiation of construction, construction fencing shall delineate construction access to include the area of proposed development, vehicle access path south of building envelope and staging area southeast of area of proposed development. The rest of the property shall be off-limits for all construction-related activities.
- During construction, the project shall clearly delineate alkali heath habitat and sandy beach habitat along the driveway with minimum length 5-foot posts, orange construction fencing (minimum 4 feet high), and signage explaining the presence of protected habitat.
- During construction, the project shall employ wood mats where vehicles traverse dune mat habitat to reduce compaction of soil.
- When construction or demolition is required within ESH habitat, the smallest equipment feasible shall be used to accomplish the task.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The ESH habitat areas and construction limits shall be shown on all grading plans.

TIMING: Fencing shall be installed prior to any earth movement. Wood mats shall be maintained throughout construction.

MONITORING: P&D compliance monitoring staff shall perform site inspections throughout the construction phase and shall confirm fencing installation prior to the start of construction.

MM-BIO-4: Except for the existing gravel driveway on the parcel, and removal of iceplant mats onsite, all ground disturbances and vegetation removal shall be prohibited within a 20-foot setback from federal and state wetland habitat (intertidal zone of CSM), as delineated by construction fencing surrounding development and staging area. The area shall be fenced with a fencing material and in a location acceptable to P&D.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The wetland habitat area shall be shown on all building and grading plans.

TIMING: Fencing shall be installed prior to any earth movement and prior to the start of construction.

MONITORING: P&D compliance monitoring staff shall confirm installation prior to the start of work and perform site inspections throughout the construction phase.

MM-BIO-5: The Owner/Applicant shall submit to P&D compliance monitoring staff the names and contact information for approved biologists prior to commencement of construction. The biologist shall be onsite for grading, concrete work, earth disturbance, and vegetation clearance activities, all construction activities which may impact environmentally sensitive habitat (ESH) resources, and any night work, due to proximity to Carpinteria Salt Marsh. The approved biologist shall ensure compliance with County conditions of approval and conduct a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training for construction staff. The WEAP shall:

- Identify sensitive species and habitats.
- Describe the regulatory status and general ecological characteristics of sensitive resources, and review of the limits of construction and avoidance measures required to reduce impacts to biological resources within the work area.
- Include a fact sheet conveying this information that shall be distributed to all contractors, their employees, and other personnel involved with construction of the project.

All employees shall sign a form confirming that they have received training provided by a qualified biologist documenting they have attended the and understand the information presented to them.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The Owner/Applicant shall submit to P&D compliance monitoring staff the name and contact information for the approved biologists. The WEAP shall comply with the above requirements and a form with employee signatures confirming receipt of the WEAP training shall be provided to P&D compliance monitoring staff.

TIMING: Approved biologists will be identified prior to commencement of construction/pre-construction meeting. The biologist shall complete the WEAP prior to the commencement of construction and shall be present onsite throughout construction work.

MONITORING: P&D compliance monitoring staff shall check the WEAP signature form prior to the commencement of construction and shall perform site inspections throughout the construction phase to ensure the biologist is present during activities which may impact ESH resources.

MM-BIO-6: During construction, heavy equipment and vehicles shall be operated in accordance with standard Best Management Practices (BMPs). All equipment used onsite shall be properly maintained such that no leaks of oil, fuel, hydraulic fluid, or residues occur. Provisions shall be in place to remediate any accidental spills, in both the terrestrial and marine environments. All equipment shall only be stored in the designated equipment staging area. Construction vehicles shall be confined to a pre-defined equipment access path no greater than the minimum width necessary to complete necessary construction activities.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The Owner/Applicant shall designate the P&D-approved locations for equipment access and storage areas on all permit plans.

TIMING: The Owner/Applicant shall install the equipment staging area prior to commencement of construction and maintain the plan requirements throughout the project.

MONITORING: P&D compliance monitoring staff shall ensure compliance prior to and throughout construction. Storage of all chemicals, fuels, and paints shall be contained in properly secured containers that prevent leakage into the environment. Spill kits shall be onsite as a protective measure to address toxic chemical/fuel leaks in both, terrestrial and marine environments.

MM-BIO-7: The Owner/Applicant shall designate one construction equipment filling and storage area within the designated development to contain spills, facilitate clean-up and proper disposal and prevent contamination from discharging to the storm drains, street, drainage ditches, wetlands, or ocean. The area shall be no larger than 50 x 50 foot unless otherwise approved by P&D and shall be located at least 20 feet from any storm drain, wetland, or water body.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The Owner/Applicant shall designate the P&D-approved location on all development permit plans.

TIMING: The Owner/Applicant shall install the area prior to commencement of construction. MONITORING: P&D compliance monitoring staff shall ensure compliance prior to and throughout construction. Storage of all chemicals, fuels, and paints shall be contained in properly secured containers that prevent leakage into the environment. Spill kits shall be onsite as a protective measure to address toxic chemical/fuel leaks in both, terrestrial and marine environments.

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

MM-BIO-8: Perform washout of concrete mixers, delivery trucks, and other delivery systems in designated areas only. Wash concrete only from mixer chutes into approved concrete washout facility.

- Offsite. Due to the environmentally sensitive habitat (ESH) resources onsite, the Owner/Applicant shall designate one or more P&D-approved offsite washout areas for the washing of concrete trucks, paint, equipment, or similar activities to prevent wash water from discharging to the storm drains, street, drainage ditches, wetland, or ocean. Note that polluted water and materials shall be contained in these areas and removed from the site as needed. Washout areas shall be located at least 100 feet from any storm drain, waterbody, or sensitive biological resources.
- Onsite. If a temporary concrete washout is required to be used on site, the container shall provide impermeable containment and be placed over secondary containment. Temporary washout facilities shall have sufficient volume to completely contain all liquid and waste concrete materials generated during washout procedures. Temporary washout facilities used shall comply with EPA guidance. EPA provides guidance for metal washout containers (roll-off): The metal roll-off bin is designed to securely contain concrete washout water and solids and is portable and reusable. It also has a ramp that allows concrete pump trucks to wash out their hoppers. (Roll-off providers offer recycling services, such as, picking up the roll-off bins after the washout water has evaporated and the solids have hardened, replacing them with empty washout bins, and delivering the hardened concrete to a recycler, rather than a landfill. Other providers will vacuum off the washout water, treat it to remove metals and reduce the pH, then deliver it to a wastewater treatment plant for additional treatment. Either method is acceptable.)

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The Owner/Applicant shall designate the P&D-approved location for equipment washout on all coastal development permit plans.

TIMING: The Owner/Applicant shall identify and establish the area prior to commencement of construction and maintain that location throughout construction.

MONITORING: Environmental monitor shall ensure compliance prior to and throughout construction.

MM-BIO-9. The Owner/Applicant shall submit for P&D approval a Final Habitat Restoration Plan prepared by a P&D-approved biologist and landscape architect and designed to mitigate project-related habitat impacts, following the guidelines set forth in Santa Barbara County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. The minimum mitigation ratio for temporary impacts to all environmentally sensitive habitat (ESH) resources will be at a 2:1 ratio (habitat restored to habitat impacted). The minimum mitigation ratio for permanent impacts to ESH will be 4:1 (habitat restored to habitat lost). The Final Habitat Restoration Plan shall be designed to offset temporary and permanent impacts of development to ESH resources and including the following components:

- Description of the project/impact site (i.e., location, responsible parties, areas to be impacted by habitat type);
- Removal of non-native species, (e.g., iceplant, European sea-lavender, pampas grass, etc.);
- Location, habitat types and areas of habitat to be established, restored, or enhanced;
- Mitigation ratios for temporary and permanent impacts to ESH;
- Site preparation, planting plan with species lists, container sizes, and seeding rates, and implementation and monitoring schedule;
- Identification of a reference site for monitoring success criteria;
- Responsible parties and financial assurances;
- Restoration landscaping shall use locally sourced native dune species and seed stock for landscaping;
- Pursuant to Santa Barbara County Coastal Plan Policy 9-2, restoration of dune habitat shall be with native California plants propagated from the disturbed sites or from the same species at adjacent sites. Where possible, collect topsoil and native seed and plants from dune mat habitat prior to initiation of construction activities for use in onsite restoration;
- New plantings shall be irrigated with drip irrigation on a timer and shall be weaned off irrigation over a period of two- to three-years;
- Site maintenance for invasive plant management, specifically for freeway iceplant and pampas grass, and other species as needed;
- Post-construction use of the areas encompassing ESH and restoration for storage or activities that could result in site disturbance shall be precluded; and
- Annual reporting with a final report prior to project close-out.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The Owner/Applicant shall incorporate this requirement into a landscape plan to be prepared by a P&D-approved landscape architect. The Owner/Applicant shall post a performance security to ensure installation prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance and maintenance for five years.

TIMING: Landscaping shall be installed prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance. The owner shall maintain plants for five years (or until performance standards have been satisfied) following Final Building Inspection Clearance.

MONITORING: The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to P&D compliance monitoring staff that all required components of the approved plan(s) are in place as required prior to Final Inspection Clearance and maintained throughout maintenance period. The landscape architect shall verify to P&D compliance monitoring staff, in writing, using receipts, etc., the use of native seed stock on the property prior to release of performance security. P&D compliance monitoring staff signature is required to release the installation security upon satisfactory installation of all items in approved plans and maintenance security upon successful implementation of this plan.

MM-BIO-10: To minimize pollutants impacting downstream waterbodies or habitat, the parking area and associated driveway shall be designed to minimize degradation of storm water quality. Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as landscaped areas for infiltration (vegetated filter strips, bioswales, or bioretention areas), designed in accordance with the California Stormwater BMP Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment (California Stormwater Quality Association) or other approved method shall be installed to intercept and remove pollutants prior to discharging to the storm drain system, wetland, or ocean. The BMPs selected shall be maintained in working order. The landowner is responsible for the maintenance and operation of all improvements and shall provide annual maintenance records. A maintenance program shall be specified in an inspection and maintenance plan and include maintenance inspections at least once a year. Long term maintenance shall be the responsibility of the landowner. A maintenance program shall be recorded with the Clerk of the Board. The plans and a copy of the long-term maintenance program shall be submitted to P&D and Public Works, Water Resources Division staff, for review prior to approval of coastal development permits. BMP maintenance is required for the life of the project and transfer of this responsibility is required for any subsequent sale of the property. The condition of transfer shall include a provision that the property owners conduct maintenance inspection at least once a year and retain proof of inspections.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The BMPs shall be described and detailed on the site, grading and drainage and landscape plans, and depicted graphically. The location and type of BMPs shall be shown on the site, building and grading plans.

TIMING: The plans and maintenance program shall be submitted to P&D for approval prior to issuance of coastal development permit and implemented throughout the project.

MONITORING: P&D compliance monitoring staff shall site inspect for installation prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance. The landowner shall make annual maintenance records available for review by P&D upon request.

MM-BIO-11: Exterior glass window configurations shall score 70 or greater in Avoidance Index (AI). Use Guardian Glass Bird1st with SN68 and inboard lamination (AI Score 74), and/or Bird1st with SN 68 and outboard lamination (AI Score 70), and/or Bird1st with SNX 62/27 and outboard lamination (or equivalent documented by the American Bird Conservancy). In addition, architectural window design products and homeowner options shall be applied to minimize bird collisions with picture windows throughout building (American Bird Conservancy 2017).

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: Project development plans shall indicate the window architectural designs and AI scores. Receipts and/or product specification sheets for exterior windows shall be documented.

TIMING: The plans shall be submitted to P&D for approval prior to issuance of a Coastal Development Permit. Window specification sheets and/or receipts documenting that the exterior windows meet the required AI score shall be provided to P&D for approval prior to window installation.

MONITORING: P&D compliance monitoring staff shall site inspect the documentation prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance.

MM-BIO-12: To avoid disturbance of nesting birds, including raptorial species, protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC), the removal of vegetation, ground disturbance, exterior construction activities, and demolition shall occur outside of the bird nesting season (February 1 through August 31) whenever feasible. If these activities must occur during the bird nesting season, then a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be performed by a County-qualified biologist. Pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall occur within the area to be disturbed and shall extend outward from the disturbance area by 500 feet. The distance surveyed from the disturbance may be reduced if property boundaries render a 500-foot survey radius infeasible, or if existing

disturbance levels within the 500-foot radius (such as from a major street or highway) are such that project-related activities would not disturb nesting birds in those outlying areas. If any occupied or active bird nests are found, a buffer shall be established and demarcated by the biologist with bright orange construction fencing, flagging, construction lathe, or other means to mark the boundary. The buffer shall be 300 feet for non-raptors and 500 feet for raptors, unless otherwise determined by the qualified biologist and approved by P&D. Buffer reductions shall be based on the known natural history traits of the bird species, nest location, nest height, existing pre-construction level of disturbance in the vicinity of the nest, and proposed construction activities. All construction personnel shall be notified as to the location of the buffer zone and to avoid entering the buffer zone during the nesting season. No ground disturbing activities or vegetation removal shall occur within this buffer until the County-qualified biologist has confirmed that nesting is completed, the young have fledged and are no longer dependent on the nest, or the nest fails, and there is no evidence of a second nesting attempt; thereby determining the nest unoccupied or inactive. If birds protected under MBTA or CFGC are found to be nesting in construction equipment, that equipment shall not be used until the young have fledged and are no longer dependent on the nest, and there is no evidence of a second nesting attempt.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: Active nests shall be monitored by the biologist at a minimum of once per week until it has been determined that the nest is no longer being used by either the young or adults, and there is no evidence of a second nesting attempt. The qualified biologist shall prepare weekly monitoring reports, which shall document nest locations, nest status, actions taken to avoid impacts, and any necessary corrective actions taken. Active nest locations shall be marked on an aerial map and provided to the construction crew on a weekly basis after each survey is conducted. Active nests shall not be removed without written authorization from USFWS and CDFW.

TIMING: If construction must begin within the nesting season, then the pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted no more than one week (7 days) prior to commencement of vegetation removal, grading, or other construction activities. Bird survey results and buffer recommendations shall be submitted to County Planning and Development for review and approval prior to commencement of grading or construction activities.

MONITORING: P&D shall be given the name and contact information for the biologist prior to initiation of the pre-construction survey. Permit Compliance and P&D staff shall review the survey report(s) for compliance with this condition prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities and perform site inspections throughout the construction period to verify compliance in the field.

MM-BIO-13: Surveys for legless lizards shall be conducted in proposed work areas immediately prior to and during ground-breaking activities that would affect potentially suitable habitat, as determined by the project biologist. Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist familiar with legless lizard ecology and survey methods. Approval from CDFW to relocate legless lizards shall be obtained, if required. A qualified biologist shall assist the project applicant with completing the following:

- Prepare a legless lizard relocation plan in coordination with CDFW and University of California Natural Reserve System Carpinteria Salt Marsh Reserve (UCNRS CSM) to relocate legless lizards to upland Carpinteria Salt Marsh habitat.
- Install coverboards in the Study Area for long-term monitoring of legless lizard.
- Monitor construction activities during all new ground-disturbance activities located within legless lizard habitat.
- Approved biologist shall relocate legless lizards to an appropriate location.
- Letter reports shall be submitted to Agencies within 30 days of legless lizard relocation.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: Pre-construction legless lizard surveys shall be conducted two months prior to commencement of vegetation removal, grading, or other construction activities that would affect legless lizard habitat as determined by the project biologist. If legless lizards are present in construction areas, lizards shall be relocated consistent with the approved legless lizard relocation plan prior to commencement of construction activities. If legless lizards are relocated, the qualified biologist shall prepare a letter report consistent with the requirements of the approved legless lizard relocation plan and submit the report to CDFW, UCNRS CSM, and P&D staff within 30 days of legless lizard relocation. Legless lizards shall not be removed or relocated without approval of a relocation plan by CDFW and UCNRS CSM.

TIMING: Coverboards for legless lizard monitoring shall be installed six months prior to the start of construction. Two months prior to the start of construction a qualified biologist will survey the covered area weekly and relocate legless lizards if found. The results of the pre-construction survey shall be documented in a report and provided to P&D staff prior to the start of construction activities.

MONITORING: P&D shall be given the name and contact information for the biologist prior to initiation of the pre-construction survey. Permit Compliance and P&D staff shall review the survey report(s) for compliance with this condition prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities and perform site inspections throughout the construction period to verify compliance in the field.

MM-BIO-14: Conduct appropriately timed pre-construction surveys for special status invertebrates on the Special Animals list (CDFW July 2020).

- Obscure bumble bee surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist four times, spaced evenly during the months of June and July (prior to the start of construction or during the first year of construction) to maximize likelihood of detecting bumble bees. If obscure bumble bee is found colonizing in the work area, an avoidance buffer shall be established and maintained until the colony disperses naturally under the direction of the biologist. If the species is observed colonizing or foraging in the work area, surveys for obscure bumblebee shall continue as described above for subsequent construction years or more frequently, outside of the June-July period per direction of the surveying biologist. Survey protocols shall follow methods outlined in Survey Protocols for the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (USFWS 2018). Survey effort shall be at minimum 1-person hour per 3 acres (1 hour of search time). The colony dissolves by October, so if obscure bumble bee is found onsite, postponing ground disturbing activities until late October would avoid impacts to this sensitive ground-nesting species.
- Sandy beach tiger beetle surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction during optimal conditions for adult sandy tiger beetle activity: sunny with temperature above 70° F. Surveys shall be conducted in the high tide line and the dry sand above, including any beach wrack piles. A minimum of two visual encounter surveys shall be conducted.
- Globose dune beetle surveys shall be performed no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction by a qualified biologist that can differentiate globose dune beetle from the common ciliate dune beetle (*Coelus ciliates*) with a magnifying scope. Surveys may be conducted any time of year. Surveys shall include surveying the sand for the distinctive tracks (5 mm wide lines in sand). Sand should be scooped at the base of dune plants from near the surface down to 15 cm (6 inches) deep. Place scooped sand in sieve and shake out loose sand. Key out dune beetle species observed.
- To protect potential wandering skipper habitat, a barrier construction fence shall be installed around alkali heath marsh habitat. (There are no proposed impacts to sandy beach or alkali heath marsh habitats.) Wandering skipper surveys for adults and larvae shall be performed by a qualified biologist between July and September. Timing of surveys should be conducted between 1000-1500 hours, when temperatures are between 65–90° F and wind speed less than 10 mph. The "checklisting" butterfly survey method (Royer, Austin & Newton 1988) involves walking a meandering transect through coastal habitat until an individual skipper is observed. If an individual is discovered, the biologist walks in expanding concentric circles around the individual until no additional individuals are observed.

If special-status invertebrates are discovered during pre-construction surveys, they shall be protected in place where practicable. A minimum 15 ft buffer shall be placed near the special status insect. If discovered in an area to be impacted, work shall be delayed until that insect moves to another location, or a relocation plan shall be developed in coordination with CDFW and University of California Natural Reserve System Carpinteria Salt Marsh Reserve (UCNRS CSM) to relocate special-status invertebrates within the Carpinteria Salt Marsh habitat prior to disturbance of occupied habitat.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The results of the pre-construction surveys shall be documented in a report and provided to P&D staff. If special-status invertebrates are discovered, a minimum 15-foot buffer shall be fenced off around the insect to prevent construction activities in that area, if practicable. If discovered in an area to be impacted, construction in that area shall be halted until the biologist determines that the insect is no longer present or until the approved relocation plan has been developed, approved by CDFW, and implemented. If special-status invertebrates are relocated, the qualified biologist shall prepare a letter report consistent with the requirements of the approved relocation plan and submit the report to CDFW, UCNRS CSM, and P&D staff within 30 days of special-status invertebrate relocation. Special-status invertebrates shall not be removed or relocated without approval of a relocation plan by CDFW and UCNRS CSM.

TIMING: Construction fencing shall be installed around alkali heath marsh habitat prior to commencement of construction. Pre-construction obscure bumble bee surveys shall be conducted four times, spaced evenly during the months of June and July prior to the start of construction or during the first year of construction, as applicable. Regardless of the month during which construction begins, one survey must be conducted no more than two weeks prior to commencement of vegetation removal, grading, or other construction activities. Sandy beach tiger beetle and globose dune beetle surveys shall be conducted a maximum of 30 days prior to the commencement of construction activities. Wandering skipper surveys shall be conducted a maximum of 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities.

MONITORING: P&D shall be given the name and contact information for the biologist prior to initiation of the pre-construction surveys. Permit Compliance and P&D staff shall review the survey report(s) for compliance with this condition prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities and perform site inspections throughout the construction period to verify compliance in the field.

MM-BIO-15: Conduct an appropriately-timed pre-construction survey for special status plant species, including the red sand verbena and wooly seablight, within the project footprint of disturbance and work area during the blooming season prior to the start of construction. If special status plant species are not observed in areas that would be disturbed by construction activities, no further mitigation would be required.

If special status plants are discovered during pre-construction surveys, the size and location of all identified occurrences shall be mapped on the final project plans, and impact acreages shall be quantified based on proposed limits of disturbance. If special status plants are discovered in the project area, the plants shall be avoided and protected in place where practicable. If avoidance and preservation is not feasible or plants are inadvertently damaged, a salvage and relocation plan shall be developed in consultation with CDFW and University of California Natural Reserve System Carpinteria Salt Marsh Reserve (UCNRS CSM) to relocate special-status plants within the Carpinteria Salt Marsh habitat prior to disturbance of occupied habitat. This impact acreage shall be used to determine the size of mitigation sites to be established for the project.

Mitigation for the permanent loss of special status plant communities shall be at a 4:1 ratio and temporary impacts to communities shall be at least at a 1:1 ratio to the disturbed area, or at a higher ratio determined by the resource management agencies (e.g., CDFW and UCNRS CSM). In addition, CDFW recommends a mitigation ratio of 5:1 for the loss of CRPR Rare or Endangered Species.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: This condition shall be printed on project plans submitted for Coastal Development Permit Issuance. The results of pre-construction special status plant surveys shall be documented in a report

and provided to P&D staff. If special status plants are discovered in an area to be impacted, construction in that area shall be halted until the approved salvage and relocation plan has been developed, approved by CDFW, and implemented. If special-status plants are relocated, the qualified biologist shall prepare a letter report consistent with the requirements of the approved relocation plan and submit the report to CDFW, UCNRS CSM, and P&D staff within 30 days of special-status plant relocation. Special-status plants shall not be removed or relocated without approval of a relocation plan by CDFW and UCNRS CSM.

TIMING: Pre-construction special status plant surveys shall be conducted during the blooming season prior to the start of construction or during the first year of construction, as applicable.

MONITORING: P&D shall be given the name and contact information for the biologist prior to initiation of the pre-construction surveys. Permit Compliance and P&D staff shall review the survey report(s) for compliance with this condition prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities and perform site inspections throughout the construction period to verify compliance in the field.

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

5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal:	Poten. Signif. And Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any object, building, structure, area, place, record, or manuscript that qualifies as a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?			X		
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric or historic archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?			X		
c. Disturb any human remains, including those located outside of formal cemeteries?			X		
d. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in the Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: 1) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or 2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X		

County Environmental Thresholds: Chapter 8 of the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (2008, revised January 2021) contains guidelines for the identification, significance evaluation, and mitigation of impacts to cultural resources, including archaeological, historic, and tribal cultural resources. In accordance with the requirements of CEQA, these guidelines specify that if a

resource cannot be avoided, it must be evaluated for importance under specific CEQA criteria. CEQA Section 15064.5(a)(3)A-D contains the criteria for evaluating the importance of archaeological and historic resources. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the significance criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources: (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage; (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. The resource also must possess integrity of at least some of the following: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. For archaeological resources, the criterion usually applied is (D).

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

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

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

Existing Setting:

For at least the past 10,000 years, the area that is now Santa Barbara County has been inhabited by Chumash Indians and their ancestors. The subject property is undeveloped and located at the far end of Sandpoint Road (southern tip), bounded on the east by El Estero, the Carpinteria Salt Marsh, and on the south and west by a rock revetment and the Pacific Ocean. Pursuant to a Phase 1 study (Brent Leftwich, May 2018) and CCIC records search, cultural resources are not located in the vicinity of the proposed project. The Phase I study *states "No cultural resources were observed during intensive archaeological investigations. Although the project area contains a substantial amount of marine shell, it sits upon several meters of fill soil and is the result of secondary deposition. It is not associated with prehistoric subsistence activities and it does not represent an intact archaeological site. The likelihood of undiscovered, significant*

cultural resources existing in the project areas is very low. No additional archaeological monitoring or additional cultural resource testing is recommended."

To date, Santa Barbara County has received two tribal requests, from the Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians and the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, for consultation to participate in government-to-government consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1 and Assembly Bill (AB) 52. On June 25, 2021 a formal notice of application completeness for the proposed project was sent to Julie Tumamait-Stenslie, Chair, Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians and Kenneth Kahn, Chair of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians. The notice provided notification of the opportunity for consultation under AB 52, and included a description of the proposed project and a copy of the Phase 1 study. On August 20, 2021, a formal consultation request was received from Kelsie Merrick, an Administrative Assistant with the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians. On October 29, 2021, County staff held a virtual meeting via Zoom with tribal representatives from the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, including Wendy Teeter, Cultural Resources Archaeologist, and Sam Cohen, Government Affairs and Legal Office. Brent Leftwich, Principal Investigator for the Phase I, the project architect, and the applicant's agent were also present at the meeting. Results of the Phase I and the soils analysis from the Geotechnical Report were presented at the meeting. Following the meeting, Ms. Teeter stated that she had no additional concerns with the project. No further communication or requests for additional consultation have been received to date. Therefore, tribal consultation has concluded.

Impact Discussion:

(a, b, c, d) As discussed above, no cultural resources were identified within or adjacent to the project area. As a result, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any historical resource, cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric or historic archaeological resource, disturb any human remains, or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. In order to comply with cultural resource policies, the development project would be conditioned with a standard archaeological discovery clause which requires that any previously unidentified cultural resources discovered during site development are treated in accordance with the County's Cultural Resources Guidelines [Chapter 8 of the *County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* (revised January 2021)]. Therefore, impacts related to cultural resources would be insignificant.

Cumulative Impacts:

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

References:

Phase 1 Archaeological Assessment: 501 Sand Point Road, Carpinteria Santa Barbara County, California, Leftwich Archaeology, Brent Leftwich, May 2018

5.6 ENERGY

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Substantial increase in demand, especially during peak periods, upon existing sources of energy?			X		
b. Requirement for the development or extension of new sources of energy?			X		

Impact Discussion:

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

Energy Use

Multiplier	Project Demand
Natural Gas (13.7 million BTU per capita[1])	54.8 million BTU per year (assuming a 4 person household)
Electricity (7.4MWh/yr/home PG&E; 6.9 MWh/yr/home SCE)[2]	6.9 megawatt hours per year

In summary, the project would have minimal long term energy requirements and a negligible effect on regional energy needs. No adverse impacts would result.

Cumulative Impacts:

The project's contribution to the regionally significant demand for energy is not considerable, and is therefore insignificant.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be insignificant.

[1] http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/states/residential.cfm/state=CA#ng

[2] http://enduse.lbl.gov/info/LBNL-47992.pdf

5.7 FIRE PROTECTION

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Introduction of development into an existing high fire hazard area or exposure of people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X		
b. Project-caused high fire hazard?			X		
c. Introduction of development into an area without adequate water pressure, fire hydrants or adequate access for fire fighting?			X		
d. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X		
e. Introduction of development that will substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan, emergency evacuation plan, or fire prevention techniques such as controlled burns or backfiring in high fire hazard areas?			X		
f. Development of structures beyond safe Fire Dept. response time?			X		

Impact Discussion:
(a-f) The project is not located within a High Fire Hazard Area. The project is located approximately 2.8 miles away from the nearest Carpinteria-Summerland Fire District Station and is therefore located in an area with an adequate response time from fire protection services. The project will include installation of a new fire hydrant to serve this property and other nearby properties at the end of Sand Point Road. Adequate access to the site is available via Sand Point Road. The Carpinteria-Summerland Fire District has approved the proposed driveway configuration and the project is required to comply with standard conditions of approval (fire sprinklers, water flow, etc.) as outlined in the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire District condition letter dated March 5, 2021.

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.

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

5.8 GEOLOGIC PROCESSES

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

Existing Geologic Conditions:

The subsurface conditions on the project site were explored in October 2009 by drilling two exploratory borings to depths of 21.5 and 51.5 feet below the existing ground surface. In November 2019 Earth Systems Pacific performed a site visit to verify current site conditions and compared them to those encountered in 2009. Earth Systems Pacific concluded that the current site conditions remain similar to those encountered in 2009. The purpose, methods, and results of these surveys are described in detail in the Geotechnical Engineering Reports prepared by Earth Systems Pacific in July 2020 and June 2021, on file with P&D. Earth

Systems Pacific's findings were peer reviewed and confirmed in July 2020 and October 2021 by GeoDynamics, Inc, on file with P&D. The following analysis is based on the information contained in the Geotechnical Engineering Reports.

Threshold

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

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

Impact Discussion:

(a) Potential to Result in Geologic Hazards. The project site is not underlain by any known active faults and is not at risk of ground failure or fault rupture (California Geological Survey [CGS] 2021). Likewise, the project site is relatively flat and has minimal risk of being affected by mudslides, landslides, and soil creep. Nonetheless, the site is in a seismically active region of California and is subject to risk from earthquakes, including ground shaking, liquefaction, and lateral spreading. Compliance with existing building regulations would reduce potential ground shaking impacts caused by movement along a distant fault to a less than significant level. However, the project site is subject to liquefaction and lateral spreading due to the presence of sandy soils and a high-water table. The project's risk of loss, injury, or death involving exposure to liquefaction or lateral spreading is a potentially significant impact. This impact would be reduced below the County's adopted thresholds of significance through implementation of MM-GEO-1, which requires that the building design and construction comply with all recommendations provided in the geotechnical engineering reports prepared for the project. Potential impacts related to expansive soils would be further reduced by the use of non-expansive engineered fill during project construction. MM-GEO-1 together with the normal building permit review and inspection process would ensure that all seismic and soils-related hazards would be reduced to a less than significant level.

(b, e, f, j) Potential for Grading-Related Impacts. The project would require the cut of approximately 60 cubic yards of soil from the site, approximately 25 cubic yards of which would be reused as fill on the site, with a net export of approximately 35 cubic yards. The potential for the erosion or loss of sand and topsoil would be reduced through implementation of an Erosion Control Plan during project construction, as required by Chapter 14 of the Santa Barbara County Code of Ordinances. Grading operations that would occur on the project site would remove vegetative cover and disturb the ground surface, thereby increasing the potential for erosion and sedimentation impacts, including the loss of sand, gravel, and topsoil. This would be a potentially significant impact. This impact would be reduced below the County's adopted thresholds of significance through implementation of MM-GEO-1 and MM-GEO-2, which require that the building and site design and construction comply with all recommendations provided in the geotechnical engineering reports and the Coastal Hazard & Wave Runup Study prepared for the project. Compliance with MM-GEO-1 and MM-

GEO-2 would ensure that the building and site design and construction are completed in accordance with the geotechnical engineer and coastal engineer's recommendations, accounting for the identified site-specific geotechnical and coastal hazards. Upon project completion, site soils would be stabilized with vegetation and the project would be required to develop and maintain stormwater BMPs during long-term operation as required by MM-BIO-10, thereby minimizing the potential for erosion. Therefore, potential grading, erosion, and sedimentation impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

(c) Exposure to Rising Sea Level. The project would not produce permanent changes in the topography of the site or other physical changes that would result in an increased exposure of the environment to impacts of bluff retreat or sea level rise. In California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2015) the California Supreme Court held that "agencies subject to CEQA generally are not required to analyze the impact of existing environmental conditions on a project's future users or residents. But when a proposed project risks exacerbating those environmental hazards or conditions that already exist, an agency must analyze the potential impact of such hazards on future residents or users. In those specific instances, it is the project's impact on the environment– and not the environment's impact on the project – that compels an evaluation of how future residents or users could be affected by exacerbated conditions." Because the project would not result in an impact on the environment, this impact would be less than significant.

For informational purposes, this analysis also includes a discussion of the potential for existing sea level risk conditions to impact the project. The project site is a sandspit between the Pacific Ocean and Santa Monica Creek and the site and access road are subject to risk from sea level rise, wash over by waves, and flooding. GeoSoils, Inc. (GeoSoils) prepared a Coastal Hazard and Wave Runup Study for the proposed project in March 2020, which was peer reviewed by GeoDynamics, Inc (GDI) (Geosoils 2020a, 2020b, 2020c, 2021; GDI 2020a, 2020b, and 2020c). The Coastal Hazard and Wave Runup Study and GDI peer review assess the potential and magnitude of flooding at the site with sea level rise over an assumed 75-year project lifespan based on the California Coastal Commission (CCC) Sea Level Rise Update Guidance and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) sea level rise models. The assessment considers flooding risk both with the existing unpermitted revetment on the project site and without it to assess the worst-case scenario.

According to the results of the Coastal Hazard and Wave Runup Study and GDI peer review, under the worst-case scenario (no revetment in place and using the most conservative CCC model of sea level rise), the site may experience flooding and wave run up due to sea level rise starting around the year 2060. Under these assumptions, the future flood level at the site would be up to 17.4 feet NAVD88[3] and the breaking wave height at the seaward row of piles supporting the residence would be up to 18.7 feet NAVD88. Under the more recent NOAA models of sea level rise for the Santa Barbara area, which the Coastal Hazard and Wave Runup Study and GDI peer review identify as more accurate based on the latest sea level rise research, flooding may not occur on the site during the 75-year project life span, with or without the existing revetment in place. The proposed finished floor elevation of the residence is 21.0 feet NAVD88 with an estimated 2 feet of horizontal structural beams below the finished floor tied to supporting piles (bottom of horizontal structural members at 19.0 feet NAVD88). This design was selected to protect the structure from the potential for flooding and would be above the highest flood level and breaking wave height under the most conservative assumptions using data from the latest sea level rise research for the project vicinity (Geosoils 2020a, 2020b, 2020c, 2021; GDI 2020a, 2020b, and 2020c).

Sand Point Road is also subject to flooding risk from sea level rise and storm events. While the location of the roadway on the lagoon side of the project site reduces this risk, based on the CCC modeling, Sand Point Road would be anticipated to experience flooding with 3.3 feet of sea level rise or 2.5 feet of sea level rise combined

[3] North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88) is the vertical datum for orthometric heights established for vertical control surveying in the United States of America based upon the General Adjustment of the North American Datum of 1988.

with the 100-year storm event. Sand Point Road and the site driveway may require improvements in the future (such as raising the roadway and improving erosion resistance) depending upon the extent of sea level rise over the course of the project lifetime.

Site-specific strategies have been incorporated into the site design, including real estate disclosure (provided by the Coastal Hazard and Wave Runup Study, review letters and responses), erosion protection for the access road and driveway, and monitoring and reporting of conditions on the property as required by the CCC. In addition, the proposed structures may be "red tagged" or "yellow tagged" if they are determined to be unsafe for occupancy by a government agency with legal jurisdiction, such as the State Lands Commission. A red or yellow tag would require the CDP permittee to discontinue or limit habitation within the structure and participate in any repair, maintenance, improvement, modification, or removal as may be required by the government agency with legal jurisdiction.

Compliance with these design strategies, State requirements, and permit compliance and B&S regulations would ensure that potential effects of sea level rise on the site and access road would not subject residents or occupants of the project site to a substantial risk or hazard. As discussed in the first paragraph of this discussion, it is the project's impact on the environment and not the environment's impact on the project that compels an evaluation of how future residents or users could be affected by exacerbated conditions. This discussion of the potential for existing sea level risk conditions to impact the project has been provided for informational purposes. Because the project would not result in an impact on the environment associated with sea level rise, this impact would be less than significant.

As described in Checklist Items a., b, e, f, and j., the project would implement MM-GEO-1 and MM-GEO-2, which would ensure the building and site design and construction are completed in accordance with the geotechnical engineer and coastal engineer's recommendations, accounting for the identified site-specific geotechnical and coastal hazards. These required mitigation measures would further reduce the risk of potential impacts to the project related to sea level rise.

(d) Unique Geologic Features and Paleontological Resources. There are no unique geological features located on the project site. There are no documented paleontological resources on the project site. Nonetheless, the site is in a coastal area with the potential for previously undiscovered paleontological resources in undisturbed, native soils. Ground disturbing construction activities have the potential to unearth and destroy paleontological resources, which would be a potentially significant impact. MM-GEO-3 requires implementation of proper protocol in the event that paleontological resources are uncovered during construction and would reduce potentially significant impacts below the County's adopted thresholds of significance.

(g, h, l) Other Potential Geological Hazards. The project would connect to the existing sanitary sewer system serving the project area and would not involve the use of septic systems. Likewise, the project would not involve mining activities or the creation of excessive spoils, tailings, or overburden Therefore, there would be no impact related to septic systems, mining, and spoils, tailings, or overburden.

(i) Grading on Slopes. The project would not involve grading on slopes exceeding 20% and project grading activities would be minimal. There would be no impact.

(k) Vibration. The project would not include stationary sources of significant vibration, such as heavy equipment operations, and there would be no long-term vibration impacts associated with the project. The use of heavy equipment during construction has the potential to produce vibration. However, construction activities would be temporary and intermittent and would not substantially affect nearby uses. The project involves concrete piles with aggregate piers. The proposed piers would be drilled in place concrete piers, rather than driven piles. Because the piers are not being vibrated or installed using percussion hammers, and the rotary motion of the auger does not produce substantial vibration in silt/sandy soil, impacts related to vibration would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts:

Significant cumulative impacts to geologic processes could occur if the combined effects of the proposed project along with approved and pending projects within the vicinity of the proposed project, and in particular along Sand Point Road (refer to Section 4.0, Methodology for Evaluating Cumulative Impacts) would result in substantial geologic hazards, erosion or loss of topsoil, impacts to paleontological resources, or construction vibration. Cumulative development in the project site vicinity would gradually increase population and jobs in the South Coast portion of Santa Barbara County, and therefore, gradually increase the number of people in the region exposed to potential geological hazards such as ground shaking, fault rupture, expansive soils, landslides, and liquefaction, and flooding hazards due to sea level rise. However, geologic and flooding hazards are generally site-specific, and individual developments do not create compounding impacts that affect geologic and flooding hazards on other sites. Similar to the proposed project, other development projects would be subject to CEQA review on a case-by-case basis and would be required to comply with existing building regulations and site-specific geotechnical requirements to minimize seismic and soils risks, as well as site-specific flooding risks. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to fault rupture, seismic shaking, liquefaction, landslides, expansive soils, and sea level rise would be less than significant.

Cumulative development would also increase ground disturbance in the vicinity of the project site, which would contribute to erosion and loss of topsoil in the region. However, cumulative development projects would be required to comply with Chapter 14 of the Santa Barbara County Code of Ordinances and prepare an Erosion Control Plan or obtain coverage under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit. These standard requirements would ensure that cumulative impacts associated with erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

Cumulative projects would also increase the potential for impacts to paleontological resources through construction activities in the area. The cumulative loss of paleontological resources is potentially significant. The project site has the potential to contain buried paleontological resources; however, implementation of MM-GEO-3 would minimize the potential for the project to impact paleontological resources, and would ensure the project would not contribute considerably to the cumulative loss of paleontological resources in Santa Barbara County. Therefore, with implementation of required mitigation measures, the proposed project would not contribute considerably to any cumulative geologic or paleontological resource impact in the project vicinity.

Construction vibration is localized and rapidly attenuates within an urban environment. There are no other projects located in close enough proximity to the project site such that vibration from construction activities would impact the same sensitive receivers. Therefore, no cumulative construction vibration impacts would occur.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

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

MM-GEO-1. Building design and construction shall comply with all recommendations from the Earth Systems Pacific "*Geotechnical Engineering Reports*" which include:

- Ground improvements to minimize the potential for down-drag forces, liquefaction, and lateral spreading extending at least 10 feet around the proposed building piers to a minimum depth of 38 feet below ground surface.
- Design requirements for the foundation piers to withstand site specific geotechnical concerns
- Foundation pier installation and construction requirements

- Slabs-on-grade requirements for appurtenant structures (e.g., trash enclosure, utility/mechanical room, storage vault)

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: Building Plans shall comply with the recommendations of the above-referenced reports. Recommendations shall be included as a notation on project plans. An approved geotechnical engineer shall be present during construction for observation and testing to ensure compliance with recommendations.

TIMING**:** P&D staff shall review Building Plans prior to Coastal Development Permit issuance and Building Permit issuance. An approved geotechnical engineer shall provide observation and testing services during site preparation, grading, and foundation construction.

MONITORING: P&D staff shall check plans for notations prior to permit issuance. B&S staff shall ensure compliance with recommendations during plan check review and in the field.

MM-GEO-2. Building and site design shall comply with all recommendations from the March 2020 GeoSoils, Inc. "*Coastal Hazard & Wave Runup Study*" which include:

- The project geotechnical engineer and civil engineer shall evaluate the existing erosion protection along the estuary channel and northern creek bank, and whether additional erosion protection is needed along Santa Monica Creek. Baseline design assumptions and recommendations shall be provided and incorporated into the final plans.
- The Design Beach Profile (DBP) and site-specific information such as current topographic survey, anticipated scour depth, offshore slope gradient, and mean high water line, shall be indicted on the DBP and included in the civil plans.
- The structural engineer shall incorporate recommendations from the coastal engineer as appropriate, including depth of scour and the design conditions the scour depth represents, in the structural design calculations for the piles, and reference the appropriate civil, geotechnical and or coastal project site studies for the design assumptions.
- The Applicant shall provide and incorporate into the project plans design beach contours and profiles that include: Storm Scour Beach Profile extending from surf zone to across Sand Point Road, Design Stillwater Elevation, Design Wave Run-Up Elevation Limit, Design Breaking Wave Height, and the Highest Tide Level with month and year on plans based on available historical surveys, storm surge and future sea level rise. Building plans shall depict all elevations, including the minimum finished floor elevation and minimum elevation of lowest structural member above Base Flood Elevation for design, in respect to NAVD88 datum.
- The name, address, and phone number of the project coastal engineering consultant shall be provided on the final plan and permit documents. Applications for grading and building permits shall be reviewed for adequacy relative to threats and impacts from hazards arising from flooding, tsunamis, beach erosion, and ground failure from soil liquefaction.
- The coastal engineer's recommendations shall be incorporated into the plans as notes and details and referenced on the project plans.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: Building Plans shall comply with all recommendations of the GeoSoils, Inc. Coastal Hazard & Wave Runup Study. This condition shall be included as a notation on project plans.

TIMING: Building plans shall be reviewed by P&D staff prior to Coastal Development Permit issuance and Building Permit issuance.

MONITORING: During Plan Check, P&D staff shall review plans for notations prior to permit issuance. B&S staff shall ensure compliance with recommendations during plan check review and in the field.

MM-GEO-3: Prior to the start of construction, a County-approved Qualified Paleontologist or their designee shall conduct a paleontological Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training for construction personnel regarding the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff.

In the event an unanticipated fossil discovery is made during construction of the project, construction activity shall be halted within 50-feet of the find, the County shall be notified, and a County-approved Qualified Paleontologist shall be retained to evaluate the discovery, determine its significance, and determine if additional mitigation or treatment is warranted. Work in the area of the discovery shall resume once the find is properly documented and authorization is given by the County to resume construction work. Any significant paleontological resources found during construction shall be prepared, identified, analyzed, and permanently curated in an approved regional museum repository under the oversight of the Qualified Paleontologist.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: Any fossils discovered shall be evaluated and document by a County-approved Qualified Paleontologist in the field. If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that a significant paleontological resource is present, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare and implement a treatment plan.

TIMING: The Qualified Paleontologist shall evaluate any unanticipated fossil discovery made during ground-disturbing activities on the project site.

MONITORING: The County and/or Qualified Paleontologist shall monitor compliance with the above mitigation measure in the event that resources are found.

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

5.9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/RISK OF UPSET

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. In the known history of this property, have there been any past uses, storage or discharge of hazardous materials (e.g., fuel or oil stored in underground tanks, pesticides, solvents or other chemicals)?			X		
b. The use, storage or distribution of hazardous or toxic materials?			X		
c. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (e.g., oil, gas, biocides, bacteria, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?			X		
d. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?			X		
e. The creation of a potential public health hazard?			X		

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
f. Public safety hazards (e.g., due to development near chemical or industrial activity, producing oil wells, toxic disposal sites, etc.)?			X		
g. Exposure to hazards from oil or gas pipelines or oil well facilities?			X		
h. The contamination of a public water supply?			X		

Threshold:

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.

Impact Discussion:

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

The proposed project would result in the development of one single-family dwelling. 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 are less than significant.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

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 County.

5.10 LAND USE

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Structures and/or land use incompatible with existing land use?				X	
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X		

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
c. The induction of substantial unplanned population growth or concentration of population?				X	
d. The extension of sewer trunk lines or access roads with capacity to serve new development beyond this proposed project?				X	
e. Loss of existing affordable dwellings through demolition, conversion or removal?				X	
f. Displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	
g. Displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	
h. The loss of a substantial amount of open space?				X	
i. An economic or social effect that would result in a physical change? (i.e. Closure of a freeway ramp results in isolation of an area, businesses located in the vicinity close, neighborhood degenerates, and buildings deteriorate. Or, if construction of new freeway divides an existing community, the construction would be the physical change, but the economic/social effect on the community would be the basis for determining that the physical change would be significant.)				X	
j. Conflicts with adopted airport safety zones?				X	

Impact Discussion:

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

(b) Coastal Plan Policy 9-9 requires a 100 foot buffer from wetlands. The project would not result in direct impacts to wetland, but development would occur within less than 100 feet from the wetland (a buffer from structures ranging from 25-38 feet is proposed). Article II, Section 35-97.9.4 states*, "Except for lots which abut the El Estero (Carpinteria Slough), a buffer strip, a minimum of 100 feet in width, shall be maintained in natural condition along the periphery of all wetlands."* Since the parcel abuts El Estero, it is specifically exempted by ordinance from the 100 foot buffer requirement of policy.

Despite the ordinance exemption from the 100 foot buffer policy requirement, potentially significant environmental impacts would result from development occurring less than 100 feet from the wetland. Wetland buffers provide separation of sensitive areas from human activity, pollutant runoff, invasive plants, etc., and a reduced setback raises these issues.

Impacts associated with development occurring less than 100 feet from the wetland would be addressed in two ways: First, the applicant has proposed a Preliminary Habitat Restoration Plan to restore native vegetation throughout the proposed development area (Attachment 4). The Preliminary Habitat Restoration Plan indicates that approximately 0.75 acre of restoration would occur on-site in order to mitigate permanent and temporary impacts to areas located less than 100 feet from the on-site wetland. This would provide for restoration at a ratio of 4:1 for permanent impacts and 2:1 for temporary impacts. Restoration would include removal of invasive plants, restoration using native plants appropriate to the region, and monitoring/ maintenance for 5 years. Second, biological mitigation measures (BIO-1 through BIO-15 in Section 5.4) require multiple approaches to reduce the project's impacts below the County's adopted thresholds of significance for biological resources, including:

- A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP), and/or an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) that include documentation of and preparation for storm events and high tides
- Methods of concrete pile installation that do not require dewatering or creating temporary spoils piles
- Project Biologist shall ensure that removal or disturbance of environmentally sensitive habitat (ESH) is minimized through use of construction fencing, wood mats for vehicle traverse, and using the smallest equipment feasible when construction or demolition is required within ESH
- Prohibition of ground disturbance or vegetation removal within a 20-foot setback from federal and state wetland habitat
- Creation and completion of a Worker Environmental Awareness Program for construction staff
- Compliance with Best Management Practices regarding operation and storage of heavy equipment and vehicles and spill containment of oil, fuel, hydraulic fluids, etc., including BMP maintenance for the life of the project
- Use of designated wash out areas to prevent pollution (e.g. cleaning concrete mixers) from entering storm drains, water bodies, or sensitive biological resource areas
- Installation of exterior window glass configurations that minimize bird collisions
- Pre-construction surveys and avoidance measures for nesting birds, legless lizards, and special status invertebrates and special status plants.

With implementation of the proposed biological mitigation measures, the adjacent wetland and ESH would be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values. The proposed site development and Preliminary Restoration Plan have been designed to prevent significant impacts to the adjacent wetland and restore degraded habitat. Therefore, the project does not cause a significant environmental impact that conflicts with Coastal Land Use Policy 9-9.

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

Cumulative Impacts:

The implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in any substantial change to the site's conformance with environmentally protective policies and standards or have significant growth inducing effects. Thus, the project would not cause a cumulatively considerable effect on land use.

5.11 NOISE

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

Setting/Threshold: Noise is generally defined as unwanted or objectionable sound which is measured on a logarithmic scale and expressed in decibels (dB(A)). The duration of noise and the time period at which it occurs are important values in determining impacts on noise-sensitive land uses. The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and Day-Night Average Level (L_{dn}) are noise indices which account for differences in intrusiveness between day- and night-time uses. County noise thresholds are: 1) 65 dB(A) CNEL maximum for exterior exposure, 2) 45 dB(A) CNEL maximum for interior exposure of noise-sensitive uses, and 3) an increase in noise levels by 3 db(A) – either individually or cumulatively when combined with other noise-generating sources when the existing (ambient) noise levels already exceed 65 db(A) at outdoor living areas or 45db(A) at interior living areas. Noise-sensitive land uses include: residential dwellings; transient lodging; hospitals and other long-term care facilities; public or private educational facilities; libraries, churches; and places of public assembly.

The proposed project site is located outside of 65 dB(A) noise contours for roadways, public facilities, airport approach and take-off zones. The existing adjacent single family residences are noise-sensitive uses.

Impact Discussion:

(a, c) The proposed project involves the construction of a single-family dwelling. Long-term noise generated onsite would not: 1) exceed County thresholds, or 2) substantially increase ambient noise levels in adjoining areas. Noise sensitive uses on the project site would not be exposed to or impacted by off-site noise levels exceeding County thresholds. Impacts would be insignificant.

(b) Noise generated from heavy equipment during grading and construction can temporarily exceed County noise thresholds of 65 dB(A) CNEL for a distance of up to approximately 1,600 feet. During grading and construction on the project site, construction could result in significant, short-term noise impacts, which would affect nearby residents. Mitigation Measure MM-Noise-02 would mitigate short-term construction-related noise impacts to a less than significant level by limiting construction hours. Further, short-term noise impacts would cease to occur upon project completion.

Cumulative Impacts:

The project would not result in long term noise impacts. Short term noise impacts associated with construction activities would be mitigated through implementation of construction hour limitations required by MM-Noise-02. This requirement would be applied to other construction projects in the vicinity as described in Section 4.0. Due to the finite and temporary nature of construction, a cumulative impact resulting from the combined effects from other projects would not be considerable. Therefore, the project's short-term noise impacts, with respect to the cumulative projects identified in Section 4.0 of this MND and the general project vicinity, are not cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: The following mitigation measure would reduce the project's noise effects to an insignificant level:

1. **MM-Noise-02 Construction Hours.** The Owner /Applicant, including all contractors and subcontractors shall limit construction activity, including equipment maintenance and site preparation, to the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. No construction shall occur on weekends or State holidays. Non-noise generating interior construction activities such as plumbing, electrical, drywall and painting (which does not include the use of compressors, tile saws, or other noise-generating equipment) are not subject to these restrictions. Any subsequent amendment to the Comprehensive General Plan, applicable Community or Specific Plan, or Zoning Code noise standard upon which these construction hours are based shall supersede the hours stated herein.

Plan Requirements: The Owner/Applicant shall provide and post a sign stating these restrictions at all construction site entries.

Timing: Signs shall be posted prior to commencement of construction and maintained throughout construction.

Monitoring: The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate that required signs are posted prior to grading/building permit issuance and pre-construction meeting. Building inspectors and permit compliance staff shall spot check and respond to complaints.

With the incorporation of this measure, residual impacts would be insignificant.

5.12 PUBLIC FACILITIES

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

Thresholds

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

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

Table 4.12.A: Typical Waste Generation During Construction

Commercial Development	Amounts in Pounds per Square foot
Remodel	40
Demolition	100
New construction	25
Residential Development	Amounts in Pounds per Square foot
Remodel	100
Demolition	60
New construction	15

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

Impact Discussion:

(a, b) The proposed project involves the construction of a 3,256 net sf single-family dwelling, a 771 sf carport, a 338 net sf utility vault, 1,667 sf elevated deck area, an elevated pool and spa, raised planter beds, a mechanical access area, and a trash enclosure. Proposed development on the project site totals 8,979 sf. This level of new development would not have a significant impact on existing police protection or health care services and existing service levels are sufficient to serve the proposed project. The project would not generate the number of students (approximately 20) that would require an additional classroom. Further, school fees would be paid as required by State Law. Therefore, the project would not result in significant impacts to public services or cause school capacity to be exceeded.

(c) The proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of County thresholds. Based on estimates shown in Table 4.12.A, new residential construction totaling 8,979 sf would generate approximately 67 tons of construction waste ([8,979 sf x 15 pounds/sf] / 2000 pounds/ton). As such, solid waste generated by project construction would not exceed the significance threshold of 350 tons. To calculate the project's long-term solid waste generation associated with the new single-family dwelling, the following formula is used: 3.01 people/unit x # of units x 0.95 tons/year = tons/year/project (*County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*). Therefore, project operation would generate an estimated 2.86 tons of solid waste per year, which would not exceed the significance threshold of 196 tons per year. Therefore, solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

(d, e) The project would not cause the need for new or altered wastewater treatment facilities as it is already in the service district, and the Carpinteria Sanitary District has adequate capacity to serve the project. Therefore, the project would have no impact to wastewater treatment facilities, either on a project-specific or cumulative basis.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

Cumulative Impacts:

The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the threshold of significance for public services.

Therefore, the project's contribution to the regionally significant demand for public services is not considerable, and is insignificant.

5.13 RECREATION

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

Setting/Threshold: The Thresholds and Guidelines Manual contains no threshold for park and recreation impacts. However, the Board of Supervisors has established a minimum standard ratio of 4.7 acres of recreation/open space per 1,000 people to meet the needs of a community. The Santa Barbara County Parks Department maintains more than 900 acres of parks and open spaces, as well as 84 miles of trails and coastal access easements.

The proposed project site is located at the southernmost point of Sand Point Road. No established recreational uses (including parks, biking, equestrian or hiking trails) are located on or immediately adjacent to the proposed project site.

Impact Discussion:

(a,b) The proposed project would result in the development of a single-family dwelling. Project implementation would not result in any conflicts with established recreational uses of the area, including biking, equestrian or hiking trails. Although the Carpinteria Salt March is located adjacent to the project site, the associated walking trails are not adjacent to or connected to the site, and implementation of the project would not impact their use. Impacts would be insignificant.

(c) The proposed project would result in the development of a single-family dwelling. The population increase associated with project implementation would result in insignificant adverse impacts on the quality and quantity of existing recreational opportunities, both in the project vicinity and County-wide.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

Cumulative Impacts:

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

5.14 TRANSPORTATION

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif. and Unavoid.	Signif. But Mitigable	Insignif.	No Impact / Beneficial Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?			X		
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?			X		
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X		

Thresholds:

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

- **a.** The project conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
- **b.** The project conflicts or is inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).
- **c.** The project substantially increases hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
- **d.** The project results in inadequate emergency access.

Impact Discussion:

(a) Potential Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy. The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) 2040 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SBCAG, 2013) and the County's Comprehensive Plan, zoning ordinances, capital improvement programs, and other planning documents contain transportation and circulation programs, plans, ordinances, and policies. A transportation 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). The proposed project involves construction of a single-family dwelling on a parcel zoned for residential development. The project will not result in conflicts with an applicable Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy related to transportation, and therefore, will result in an insignificant impact.

(b) Potential Impact to VMT. Many agencies, including the County, use "screening criteria" to identify projects that would result in less than significant VMT impacts without conducting detailed VMT analyses and studies. The OPR Technical Advisory contains screening criteria for land use and transportation projects. The County uses these screening criteria, as shown in Table 4.14.A.

Table 4.14.A: Screening Criteria for Land Use Projects

Screening Categories	Project Requirements to Meet Screening Criteria
Small Projects	A project that generates 110 or fewer average daily trips.[1]

Locally Serving Retail	A project that has locally serving retail uses that are 50,000 square feet or less, such as specialty retail, shopping center, grocery/food store, bank/financial facilities, fitness center, restaurant, or café. If a project also contains a non-locally serving retail use(s), that use(s) must meet other applicable screening criteria.
Projects Located in a VMT Efficient Area	A residential or office project that is located in an area that is already 15 percent below the county VMT (i.e., "VMT efficient area"). The County's Project-Level VMT Calculator determines whether a proposed residential or office project is located within a VMT efficient area.

[1]The County calculates a project's daily trips using the latest version of the Trip Generation Manual (Institute of Transportation Engineers) or locally valid trip rates approved by the County Public Works Department. Land uses with irregular or seasonal trip making characteristics, such as wineries or special event centers, should apply an annual average daily trip rate and provide a trip generation memo explaining how the project meets the screening criteria for small projects.

Source: Table 2, Screening Criteria for Land Use Projects, *County of Santa Barbara Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* (Revised January 2021).

The County presumes that land use projects meeting any of the screening criteria, absent substantial evidence to the contrary, would have less than significant VMT impacts and would not require further analysis. A single-component project (e.g., residence, office, or store) only needs to meet one of the screening criteria.

Using the County's VMT Tool, it was determined that the proposed project, which involves construction of a single-family dwelling, will result in fewer than 110 average daily trips. The project meets the screening criteria for small projects, and therefore, is presumed to have insignificant impacts related to VMT.

(c) Design Features and Hazards. The proposed project involves construction of a single-family dwelling and driveway improvements. The proposed driveway improvements are designed to be consistent with the County's driveway standards, and will not result in hazards due to a geometric design feature. Further, the proposed project involves construction of a single-family dwelling on a parcel zoned for residential development, and will not increase hazards due to incompatible uses. Therefore, the project will not result in hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses, and impacts will be insignificant.

(d) Emergency Access. The proposed driveway improvements included as part of the project are designed to comply with County and Carpinteria-Summerland Fire District standards and will not result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, impacts related to emergency access are insignificant.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

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

Cumulative Impacts:

The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level. In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the threshold of significance for transportation. Therefore, the project's contribution to the regionally significant transportation impacts is not considerable, and is insignificant.

5.15 WATER RESOURCES/FLOODING

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

l. Introduction of storm water pollutants (e.g., oil, grease, pesticides, nutrients, sediments, pathogens, etc.) into groundwater or surface water?		X			

Existing Conditions:

Watershed – Surface Water

Santa Monica Creek drains a watershed of approximately 3.8 square miles. The main channel of Santa Monica Creek has several unnamed tributaries. Through the mountains, the tributaries and main channel flow through relatively undisturbed National Forest lands. Through the foothills and coastal terrace, Santa Monica Creek is flanked by agricultural and urban areas. Santa Monica Creek empties into the Carpinteria Salt Marsh.

Water Quality Regulation

Santa Barbara County is within the jurisdiction of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB), which oversees the area extending from the Santa Barbara County/Ventura County line to the northern boundary of the Santa Cruz County, and from the coastline to approximately 40 miles inland. Per the requirements of the Clean Water Act (CWA), and the California Porter-Cologne Act, CCRWQCB has prepared a Water Quality Control Plan for the watersheds under its jurisdiction. The Central Coast Region Water Quality Control Plan characterizes watersheds within the Central Coast region, identifies beneficial uses that exist or have the potential to exist in each water body, establishes water quality objectives for each water body to protect beneficial uses or allow their restoration and provides an implementation program that achieves water quality objectives. Per the requirements of CWA Section 303(c), the Water Quality Control Plan is reviewed every three years and revised as necessary to address problems with the plan, and meet new legislative requirements. Beneficial uses that have been established by CCRWQCB in the Water Quality Control Plan for Carpinteria, Franklin, and Santa Monica Creeks and the Carpinteria Salt Marsh include municipal and domestic water supply, agricultural water supply, groundwater recharge, contact and non-contact water recreation, terrestrial wildlife habitat support, cold and warm freshwater habitat, fish migration and spawning, rare, threatened or endangered species support, estuarine habitat, and commercial and recreational fishing or shellfish harvesting (Padre 2005). Carpinteria Creek is listed as an impaired water body under Section 303(d) of the CWA (CCRWQCB 2006).

Water Quality

According to the California Department of Water Resources, groundwater in the Carpinteria Basin is predominantly calcium bicarbonate in character, with varying amounts of sodium. Water quality data from four public supply wells, as reported in the California's Groundwater Bulletin 118, indicated that none of the sampled wells had concentrations of inorganics, radiation, nitrates, pesticides, volatile organic compounds, or synthetic organic chemicals above primary Maximum Contaminant Levels. Three of the four wells sampled had concentrations of inorganics above the secondary Maximum Contaminant Level (Padre 2008). In general, local creeks have excellent water quality in their upper reaches within the relatively undeveloped Santa Ynez Mountains. Downstream through the foothills and coastal plain, the intensity of human development increases. As pollution inputs increase, creek water quality worsens, and beneficial uses of creeks are impaired to varying degrees. Also, because local creeks recharge groundwater and flow into the ocean, the quality of local groundwater and coastal ocean waters is degraded (Padre 2005).

Water Resources Thresholds

A project would have a significant effect on water resources if it would exceed established threshold values for an overdrafted groundwater basin, which are determined based on an estimate 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) would exceed the threshold adopted for the basin in the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (2021), the project's impacts on water resources would be considered significant. The County has not adopted thresholds of significance for basins that are not in overdraft condition (Santa Barbara County 2021). The proposed project would be served by the Carpinteria Valley Water District, which receives its water from the Carpinteria Groundwater Basin, the Cachuma Project, and the State Water Project. The Carpinteria Groundwater Basin is not an overdrafted basin; therefore, the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (2021) does not identify a threshold value for projects served by this groundwater basin.

Water Quality Thresholds:

A significant water quality impact would occur if the project:

- Would be located within an urbanized area of the county and the project construction or redevelopment individually or as a part of a larger common plan of development or sale would disturb one (1) or more acres of land;
- Would increase the amount of impervious surfaces on a site by 25% or more;
- Would result in channelization or relocation of a natural drainage channel;
- Would result in removal or reduction of riparian vegetation or other vegetation (excluding non-native vegetation removed for restoration projects) from the buffer zone of any streams, creeks or wetlands;
- Would be an industrial facility that falls under one or more of categories of industrial activity regulated under the NPDES Phase I industrial storm water regulations (facilities with effluent limitation; manufacturing; mineral, metal, oil and gas, hazardous waste, treatment or disposal facilities; landfills; recycling facilities; steam electric plants; transportation facilities; treatment works; and light industrial activity);
- Would discharge pollutants that exceed the water quality standards set forth in the applicable NPDES permit, the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) Basin Plan or otherwise impair the beneficial uses[4] of a receiving water body;
- Would result in a discharge of pollutants into an "impaired" water body that has been designated as such by the State Water Resources Control Board or the RWQCB under Section 303 (d) of the Federal Water Pollution Prevention and Control Act (i.e., the Clean Water Act); or
- Would result in a discharge of pollutants of concern to a receiving water body, as identified by the RWQCB.

Impact Discussion

(a, c) The project would not include alterations, such as new revetments or jetties, that could change the course or direction of water movements or activities, such as water withdrawals, that could change the amount of water in the surface water bodies surrounding the site.

(b, d, j, l) *Potential Temporary Impacts to Water Quality*. Project construction activities would result in temporary drainage and runoff changes as well as erosion and potential accidental spills of pollutants (e.g.,

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

fuels and equipment fluids) that could affect nearby surface water bodies, marsh habitat, and groundwater quality. These temporary impacts to water quality would be potentially significant. MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-9 include provisions for the retention of stormwater on the project site, measures to reduce the potential for erosion, and requirements for the proper storage and maintenance of construction equipment and materials, as well as cleanup procedures in the event of an accidental leak or spill. Implementation of these required mitigation measures would reduce the potential for temporary impacts to surface water bodies, marsh habitat, and groundwater quality during project construction. Implementation of these required mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to surface and ground water quality during project construction to a less than significant level.

Potential Long-Term Impacts to Water Quality. During project operation, permanent alteration of the amount of impervious surface on the project site and human habitation could alter drainage patterns, increasing runoff. In addition, the project could adversely affect surface and groundwater quality by introducing the use of fertilizers, pesticides, and household cleaners and chemicals to the site, as well as vehicle fluids, which could enter nearby water bodies and the groundwater. According to the Ashley & Vance Engineering Tier 1 Stormwater Control Plan, the project would result in up to 4,136 square feet of impervious surfaces, which would exceed the County's adopted significance threshold of a 25% increase in impervious surface. The Tier 1 Stormwater Control Plan (Ashley & Vance Engineering, Inc., June 4, 2020) (Attachment 5) includes provisions for runoff from impervious surface areas to be collected and directed to vegetated areas onsite. Upon project completion, site soils would be stabilized with vegetation, and stormwater flows would be directed to vegetated areas for capture, treatment, and percolation, as outlined in the Tier 1 Stormwater Control Plan. The project would not result in any increase in the potential for saltwater intrusion. However, due to the increase in impervious surface on the project site, the project's potential long term impacts to water quality would be potentially significant. MM-WAT-1 requires the Owner/applicant to prepare a Final Stormwater Control Plan/Stormwater Management Plan (SWCP/SWMP) for P&D review and approval that would develop and maintain stormwater BMPs to stabilize the site, protect natural watercourses/creeks, prevent erosion, convey storm water runoff to existing drainage systems keeping contaminants and sediments onsite, and meet requirements for post-development peak stormwater flows and BMPs and maintenance requirements to ensure that the project would not result in a net increase to on-site or off-site drainage.

In addition, MM-BIO-10 requires the Owner/applicant to develop and maintain stormwater BMPs during long-term operation, which would further reduce the potential for impacts to adjacent water bodies and groundwater. Implementation of MM-BIO-10 would further reduce the less than significant operational impacts related to stormwater drainage and water quality.

(e) The proposed residence has been designed on piers with a height and structural design sufficient to ensure the structure would allow stormwater flows to pass beneath the residence. No private or public flood control projects are included as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not impede the course or flow of flood water. This impact would be less than significant.

(f) As discussed in Section 4.8, Geological Processes, under Checklist Item c., the project site and access road are subject to flooding risk from storms and sea level rise, exposing the residence and future occupants to hydrologic hazards. The proposed residence has been designed on piers with a height and structural design sufficient to ensure the structure would not be flooded by storm events over the anticipated 75-year lifetime of the project, including with the added effects of sea level rise. The structure's design would allow stormwater flows to pass beneath the residence and would not impede the course or flow of flood water. Additionally, site-specific strategies have been incorporated into the site design, including real estate disclosure, erosion protection for the access road and driveway, and monitoring and reporting of conditions on the property as required by the CCC. The proposed single-family residential use of the site would not result in accelerated tsunamis, sea level rise, or seawater intrusion.

As discussed in Section 4.8, Geological Processes, under Checklist Items e. and f., grading operations that would occur on the project site would remove vegetative cover and disturb the ground surface, thereby increasing the potential for erosion and sedimentation impacts, including the loss of sand, gravel, and topsoil. This change may exacerbate potential flood hazards and runoff, which would be a potentially significant impact. This impact would be reduced below the County's adopted thresholds of significance through implementation of MM-GEO-1 and MM-GEO-2, which require that the building and site design and construction comply with all recommendations provided in the geotechnical engineering reports and the Coastal Hazard & Wave Runup Study prepared for the project. Compliance with MM-GEO-1 and MM-GEO-2 would ensure that the building and site design and construction are completed in accordance with the geotechnical engineer and coastal engineer's recommendations, accounting for the identified site-specific geotechnical and coastal hazards. Upon project completion, site soils would be stabilized with vegetation and the project would be required to develop and maintain stormwater BMPs during long-term operation as required by MM-BIO-10, thereby minimizing the potential for erosion. Therefore, potential impacts related to flooding and runoff would be less than significant with mitigation.

(g, h, i, k) The proposed project involves the construction of a single-family dwelling. Water use would be typical of residential uses, and the anticipated water use from one single-family dwelling would not result in a substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies. The project would be supplied with water from the Carpinteria Valley Water District, which receives its water from the Carpinteria Groundwater Basin, the Cachuma Project, and the State Water Project. As detailed in the 2020 *Urban Water Management Plan* (October 2021), prepared by Woodard & Curran, Inc., the District will have an estimated net positive supply of water from 2025 to 2045. The Carpinteria Groundwater Basin is not in a state of overdraft and would not be significantly impacted by the proposed project. Additionally, the project would not involve activities such as groundwater extraction that could result in the alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwater. The project's impact on water supplies and groundwater hydrology would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts:

Significant cumulative impacts to water resources could occur if the combined effects of the proposed project along with approved and pending projects within the vicinity of the proposed project, and in particular along Sand Point Road (refer to Section 4.0, Methodology for Evaluating Cumulative Impacts) would result in substantial impacts to drainage, increased water demand, or reduction in groundwater levels. Cumulative development in the South Coast portion of Santa Barbara would increase impervious surfaces throughout the region, redirect the drainage of surface flow during storm events, and increase pollutant loading, peak flows, erosion, sedimentation, and flooding. Cumulative development in the region would also gradually increase population and jobs in Santa Barbara County, increasing the number of people exposed to potential flooding hazards, including sea level rise. Required compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, local water quality requirements, and Santa Barbara County drainage standards would minimize these potentially significant cumulative impacts to drainage and surface water quality. Individual projects in Santa Barbara County are required to implement BMPs and drainage facilities designed to address drainage and surface water and groundwater quality protection. In addition, new development projects in areas subject to flooding risk are required to comply with existing building regulations, County Conditions of Approval, site-specific geotechnical requirements to minimize site-specific flooding risks and hazards. As a result of the regional project-specific requirements regulating potential impacts to water quality, drainage, flooding, and sedimentation, these impacts are not cumulatively significant.

Regional population growth associated with cumulative development in the areas served by the Carpinteria Valley Water District contributes to additional water demand on the Carpinteria Groundwater Basin. However, the Carpinteria Valley Water District has identified sufficient water supplies to serve

anticipated development in the District through the year 2045, and the Carpinteria Groundwater Basin is not in a state of overdraft. Furthermore, individual projects are reviewed by the County to ensure that adequate water supplies are available, such that water supplied from groundwater would not substantially decrease regional groundwater supplies.

The project water use would be typical of a single-family residence and would not have an individually significant impact or contribute considerably toward reducing groundwater levels in Carpinteria Groundwater Basin or otherwise contribute considerably to a decline in groundwater supply. Therefore, with implementation of required mitigation measures as described below, the proposed project would not contribute considerably to any cumulative water drainage, surface or groundwater quality, or water supply impact in the project vicinity.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The following mitigation measures would reduce the project's impacts below the County's adopted thresholds of significance for water resources/flooding:

MM-WAT-1. The Owner/Applicant shall submit for P&D approval a Final Stormwater Control Plan/Stormwater Management Plan (SWCP/SWMP) prepared by a P&D-approved engineer and designed to mitigate project-related drainage impacts, following the guidelines set forth in Santa Barbara County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. The Final SWCP/SWMP shall specify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) applicable to the project during construction and operation, which shall be designed in accordance with the California Stormwater BMP Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment (California Stormwater Quality Association) or other approved method to stabilize the site, protect natural watercourses/creeks, prevent erosion, convey storm water runoff to existing drainage systems keeping contaminants and sediments onsite. The Final SWCP/SWMP shall describe how the project design complies with existing County design guidelines, applicable SBCFCD requirements for post-development peak stormwater flows and BMPs and maintenance requirements to ensure that the project would not result in a net increase to on-site or off-site drainage.

The BMPs selected shall be maintained in working order. The landowner is responsible for the maintenance and operation of all improvements and shall provide annual maintenance records. A maintenance program shall be specified in an inspection and maintenance plan and include maintenance inspections at least once a year. Long term maintenance shall be the responsibility of the landowner. A maintenance program shall be recorded with the Clerk of the Board. The plans and a copy of the long-term maintenance program shall be submitted to P&D and Public Works, Water Resources Division staff, for review prior to approval of coastal development permits. BMP maintenance is required for the life of the project and transfer of this responsibility is required for any subsequent sale of the property. The condition of transfer shall include a provision that the property owners conduct maintenance inspection at least once a year and retain proof of inspections.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: The Owner/Applicant shall incorporate this requirement into a Final Stormwater Control Plan/Stormwater Management Plan to be reviewed and approved by P&D. The BMPs shall be described and detailed on the site, grading and drainage and landscape plans, and depicted graphically. The location and type of BMPs shall be shown on the site, building and grading plans.

TIMING: The Final Stormwater Control Plan/Stormwater Management Plan and maintenance program shall be submitted to P&D for approval prior to issuance of coastal development permit and implemented throughout the project.

MONITORING: The Owner/Applicant shall demonstrate to P&D compliance monitoring staff that all required components of the approved plan(s) are reflected on Final Grading Plans and in place as required prior to Final Inspection Clearance and maintained throughout the operational lifetime of the project.

P&D compliance monitoring staff shall site inspect for installation prior to Final Building Inspection Clearance. The landowner shall make annual maintenance records available for review by P&D upon request.

In addition, MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-10 would ensure that construction and operational impacts to surface water and groundwater hydrology and quality would be less than significant. With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be less than significant.

6.0 INFORMATION SOURCES

6.1 County Departments Consulted:

Fire, Flood Control/Project Clean Water, Community Services Department Parks Division, Public Works Transportation, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District

6.2 Comprehensive Plan*:*

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

6.3 Other Sources*:*

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

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf (accessed July 2022).

CARB. 2022. Overview: Diesel Exhaust and Health. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health (accessed July 2022).

California Geological Survey (CGS). 2021. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/ (accessed July 2022).

Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB). 2018 California Integrated Report (Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List and 305(b) Report). https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/303d/index.html (accessed July 2022).

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf (accessed July 2022).

Padre Associates, Inc. 2005. City of Carpinteria Creeks Preservation Program Final Document Volume One. https://carpinteriaca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/cd_creeks-report.pdf (accessed July 2022).

Padre Associates, Inc. 2008. Carpinteria Water District, El Carro Well Replacement and Central Zone Pipeline Improvements Project, Initial Study.

Santa Barbara County. 2015. Energy and Climate Action Plan. https://content.civicplus.com/api/assets/918f5d4c-a1be-41ce-9a45-82d3d13fbf98?cache=1800 (accessed July 2022).

Santa Barbara County. 2021. Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. Amended January 2021. https://cosantabarbara.app.box.com/s/vtxutffe2n52jme97lgmv66os7pp3lm5 (accessed July 2022).

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). 2022. Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents Limited Update. January 2022. https://www.ourair.org/wp-content/uploads/ScopeContentJanuary2022-LimitedUpdates.pdf (accessed July 2022).

Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). 2021. Connected 2050: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. http://www.sbcag.org/uploads/2/4/5/4/24540302/connected_2050_final.pdf (accessed July 2022).

U.S. EPA. 2022. U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2020. https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2022-04/us-ghg-inventory-2022-main-text.pdf (accessed July 2022).

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

The project would result in project-specific impacts that are significant but mitigable in the following issue areas: biological resources, geologic processes, noise, and water resources/flooding. The project would result in project-specific impacts that are less than significant in the following issue areas: aesthetic/visual resources, air quality, cultural resources, energy, fire protection, hazardous materials/risk of upset, land use, public facilities, recreation, and transportation. The project would result in no impacts in the following issue areas: agricultural resources. Mitigation measures applied to the project would ensure that the project would not result in any significant cumulative impacts.

8.0 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

1. Project specific biological resource and water quality impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures, as discussed in Section 4.4 (Biological Resources), Section 4.8 Geologic Processes, and Section 4.15 (Water Resources/Flooding). Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Further, as discussed in sections 4.3 (Air Quality), Section 4.6 (Energy) and Section 4.5 (Cultural Resources), the project would not contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions, to increased energy consumption, nor would it eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

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

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

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

10.0 RECOMMENDATION BY P&D STAFF

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

__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.

_____ With Public Hearing ____X__ Without Public Hearing

PREVIOUS DOCUMENT: NA

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Steve Conner **DATE:** 10/27/22

11.0 DETERMINATION BY ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING OFFICER

__X__ I agree with staff conclusions. Preparation of the appropriate document may proceed.

____ I DO NOT agree with staff conclusions. The following actions will be taken:

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

SIGNATURE: _____ **INITIAL STUDY DATE**: 10/18/22

SIGNATURE: _____ **NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE**: 10/27/22

SIGNATURE: _____ **REVISION DATE:** _____

SIGNATURE: _____ **FINAL NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE:** _____

12.0 ATTACHMENTS

1. Project Plans
2. South Board of Architectural Review Minutes, September 4, 2020
3. *Biological Report for Sanddew, 501 Sand Point Road Carpinteria, Santa Barbara County, California*, Althouse and Meade, Inc., November 2020 (Edited September 2021)

4. *Preliminary Restoration Plan for 501 Sand Point Road Santa Barbara County*, Althouse and Meade, Inc., November 2020

5. *Tier 1 Stormwater Control Plan, Sanddew 501 Sand Point Road*, Ashley & Vance Engineering, Inc., June 4, 2020