RESOLUTION NO. 2011-84


The City Council of the City of Santa Maria finds as follows:

WHEREAS, the project applicant, Ms. Rebecca Sandoval, representing Chumash Financial Holdings No. 1, LLC, has applied for amendments to the General Plan Land Use Policy Map and Zoning Map, and a Planned Development Permit (PD-2011-002) for a 5.29 acre portion of a 9.76 acre property for construction of a park and ride facility at 1223 Fairway Drive, Assessor’s Parcel Number 111-580-007; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA), Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et. seq., as amended, require the evaluation of environmental impacts in connection with proposals for discretionary projects; and

WHEREAS, after consultation with all relevant agencies, an Initial Environmental Study was prepared for this project; and

WHEREAS, the Initial Environmental Study identified potentially significant effects on the environment; and

WHEREAS, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was drafted for this project; and

WHEREAS, the required notices were published and the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated for public review, sent to every responsible agency with jurisdiction over the project and placed in a public location; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Maria held a duly noticed public hearing on June 1, 2011, for the purpose of receiving evidence and considering Initial Environmental Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, E-2011-013; and

WHEREAS, after considering all evidence, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. 2587, did recommend to the City Council approval of Mitigated Negative Declaration E-2011-013 on a 5 -0 vote; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 15073.5 and 15074.1 of the CEQA Guidelines, when a proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration has been circulated for public review, the lead agency may conclude that certain mitigation measures identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration are infeasible or otherwise undesirable, and prior to approving the project may delete or substitute (additional) the mitigation measures which the lead agency determines are equivalent or more effective; and
WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Santa Maria held a regularly scheduled public hearing on July 5, 2011, for the purpose of considering approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, notices of said public hearing were made at the time and in the manner required by law; and

WHEREAS, at the completion of the public hearing, the City Council duly considered all evidence presented at said hearing; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Santa Maria has reviewed and considered Initial Environmental Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration E-2011-013; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Santa Maria has reviewed and considered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration E-2011-013, incorporated herein by reference for the project, GPZ-2011-002, PD-2011-002, including the substitute (additional) mitigation measures which the City Council determines are equivalent or more effective; and

WHEREAS, the mitigation measures contained in E-2011-013, including the substitute (additional) mitigation measures, are recommended to be included as conditions of project approval and will be monitored in accordance with Section 8 of the City of Santa Maria Environmental Procedures and the mitigation monitoring program for the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration E-2011-013; and

WHEREAS, the mitigation measures set forth in Mitigated Negative Declaration E-2011-013 are fully enforceable and will be implemented using the mitigation monitoring program attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit B; and

WHEREAS, there is no substantial evidence in the record supporting a fair argument that the project, as described in the Initial Environmental Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration E-2011-013, will have a significant effect on the environment; and

WHEREAS, the Initial Environmental Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration E-2011-013, reflects the City Council's independent judgment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Santa Maria, that:

1. The above findings are true.

2. The mitigation monitoring program for the project, Exhibit B, is hereby adopted.

3. The records of these proceedings are located in the Planning Department of the City of Santa Maria, 110 South Pine Street, Santa Maria, California 93458.

4. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to file a notice of determination with the Clerk of the Board.
PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Santa Maria held on this 5th day of July, 2011, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

ATTEST:

________________________
Chief Deputy City Clerk

Exhibit A – Initial Environmental Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
Exhibit B – Mitigation Monitoring Program

________________________
Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________
SR. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY

________________________
DEPARTMENT HEAD

________________________
CITY MANAGER
CITY OF SANTA MARIA
INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
April 13, 2011

FOR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 1, 2011
1223 Fairway Drive

APPLICANT: Steven E. Reese
Anton and Associates
115 E. College Avenue, Suite 5
Lompoc, CA 93436

PROPOSED USE: Bus park and ride lot for bus shuttle service between Santa Maria and the Chumash Casino Resort in Santa Ynez, California. The park and ride facility consists of a 359 space parking lot, a security office, bus shelters, restrooms, and associated landscaped areas

PROPERTY OWNER OF RECORD: Chumash Financial Holdings No. 1, LLC
c/o Carol Clearwater
585 McMurray Road
Buellton, CA 93427

LOCATION: 1223 Fairway Drive

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 111-580-007 (portion)

SIZE OF PROPERTY: 5.29 acre portion of a 9.76 acre parcel

GENERAL PLAN CLASSIFICATION: Existing: LI (Light Industrial) on 4.22 acres and CF (Community Facilities) on 1.07 acres
Proposed: CF (Community Facilities) on 5.29 acres

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: Existing: PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) on 4.22 acres and PF (Public Facilities) on 1.07 acre
Proposed: PD/PF (Planned Development/Public Facilities) on 5.29 acres.

PROCEDURE: Planning Commission review of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, General Plan amendment/zone change, and Planned Development Permit
## Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Description</strong></th>
<th>Construction of a park and ride lot for bus shuttle service between Santa Maria, and the Chumash Casino Resort in Santa Ynez, California. The park and ride facility consists of a 359 space parking lot; a security office, bus shelter, restrooms, and associated landscaped areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>1223 Fairway Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor's Parcel No.</strong></td>
<td>111-580-007 (portion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Plan Designation</strong></td>
<td>&lt;br&gt; <strong>Existing:</strong> LI (Light Industrial) on 4.22 acres and CF (Community Facilities) on 1.07 acres  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Proposed:</strong> CF (Community Facilities) on 5.29 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
<td>&lt;br&gt; <strong>Existing:</strong> PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) on 4.22 acres and PF (Public Facilities) on 1.07 acres  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Proposed:</strong> PD/PF (Planned Development/Public Facilities) on 5.29 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Site</strong></td>
<td>5.29 acre portion of a 9.76 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present Use</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>Two (2) driveways off Fairway Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrounding Uses/Zoning</strong></td>
<td>&lt;br&gt; North: Pacific Gas and Electric corporation yard; PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing)  &lt;br&gt; South: C&amp;D Zodiac; PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing)  &lt;br&gt; East: Verizon Telephone Company; PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing)  &lt;br&gt; West: City of Santa Maria Corporate Yard; PF (Public Facilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related files/actions</strong></td>
<td>Tract 5972, Verizon Lot Line adjustment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Proposed: 359 parking spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Front:** | Required: 15 feet  
Proposed: *8 feet (security structure)* |
| **Side:** | Required: 10 feet  
Proposed: 165 feet to easterly property line; 100 feet to westerly property line |
| **Rear:** | Required: 10 feet  
Provided: 450 feet  
*Required setback may be reduced by the Planning Commission through the PD Permit. |
| **Height** | Maximum: 35 feet  
Proposed: 11 feet |
| **Building Coverage** | Approximately 500 sq. ft. (Less than one percent) |
| **Landscape Area** | Required: 15%  
Proposed: 15.8% or 36,500 square feet |
| **Storm Water Retardation** | Storm water retardation for the site shall meet the grading and Drainage Standards of the City of Santa Maria. In addition, site design includes bioswales with underdrain in parking islands to infiltrate and pre-treat stormwater. |
| **Fencing** | A six foot high wall on the western property line. A two-foot concrete wall with six-foot chain link fence along the northern property line. A decorative three foot slumpstone landscape wall within front setback area. |
GENERAL AREA DESCRIPTION:

The 5.29 acre project site is located on the north side of Fairway Drive approximately 400 feet west of Skyway Drive (Exhibit A - Vicinity Map). The project site is surrounded by industrial uses in the PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) zoning district to the north, east and south. A Pacific Gas and Electric corporation yard is to the north. Verizon Telephone Company is adjacent to the east and the City of Santa Maria Corporate Yard is located in a PF (Public Facilities) zoning district to the west. Fairway Drive abuts the project site to the south. Other industrial buildings are located to the south across Fairway Drive. A 120,000 square foot industrial business park (Fairway Business Park) is under construction approximately 600 feet to the west, at the northeast corner of Skyway Drive and "A" Street. The Santa Maria Public Airport is approximately a half mile to the southwest. The nearest residential subdivision is approximately 600 feet northeast of the project site.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The undeveloped project site is 200 feet above sea level and is generally flat. A sixty (60) foot wide County of Santa Barbara Flood Control District’s drainage easement and flood control channel bounds the subject property on the north and a larger district flood control basin is adjacent to the northwest corner of the subject property.

The Resource Management Element of the Santa Maria General Plan does not identify significant habitat areas on the property. Based on site visits conducted by staff (in October 2010 and on March 18 and March 29, 2011), there appear to be no rare, endangered, or threatened plants, animals, or habitats on the subject site. In late fall/mid-winter 2010, fifteen blue gum eucalyptus trees of various sizes were removed to accommodate the project (Exhibit D, Tree Inventory). The trees were removed during the late-fall months to ensure full avoidance of any potential bird nesting season. Otherwise, with the exception of scattered weeds and brush, little vegetation is found on-site. As noted, the 5.29 acre site is an infill site surrounded predominantly by industrial development and is considered marginal for use and wildlife habitat.

The soil underlying the project site is classified as Betteravia loamy sand (BmA) with a 0 to 2 percent slope. Permeability and surface runoff are very slow, the hazard of water erosion is none to slight, and the hazard of soil blowing is high. This soil is a Class IV to VI soil. The soil information is from the USDA Soil Survey of the Northern Santa Barbara Area, July 1972. The site receives water, sewer, and trash service from the City of Santa Maria.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project is a General Plan Amendment FROM LI (Light Industrial) on 4.22 acres and CF (Community Facilities) on 1.07 acres TO CF (Community Facilities) on 5.29 acres; a zone change FROM PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) on 4.22 acres and PF (Public Facilities) on 1.07 acres TO PD/PF (Planned Development/Public Facilities) on 5.29 acres. The General Plan amendment, zone change and Planned Development Permit would facilitate the construction of a park and ride facility for the Chumash Casino Resort.
The Santa Maria Municipal Code specifies that facilities designed for public use and accommodation, including public/quasi-public facilities, such as the proposed park-and-ride lot, is a permitted use in the PF (Public Facility) zoning district. A Project Review (PR) Permit or a Planned Development (PD) Permit is required to allow construction of a site located in a PF (Public Facilities) zoning district.

In an effort to better accommodate employees and some of the guests who commute the 30 mile one-way distance daily from Santa Maria to the Santa Ynez resort, the Chumash Casino Resort is proposing to construct a permanent park and ride facility under its ownership. The Chumash Casino Resort currently leases a similar facility located at 3596 Skyway Drive. The proposed park and ride is planned to eventually replace the Skyway Drive facility. Employees and guests will park in the proposed parking lot and be shuttled for the 30 mile trip to the Chumash Casino Resort. Buses will arrive to the project site fifteen (15) minutes after the hour, every hour, twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week. Three (3) guest shuttles to and from the Chumash Casino Resort will also be provided Monday thru Saturday with only two (2) operating on Sundays. The average amount of ridership per trip is typically seven (7) with a high of approximately thirty (30) riders.

The facility would consist of a 359 parking space parking lot, a 450 square foot security office and restrooms, bus shelters and, associated landscaped areas and lighting (Exhibit B – Site Plan). The proposed project provides approximately sixteen percent, (15.8%) landscape coverage. Predominately native species of plants such as Quercus tomentella (Island Oak), Ceanothus ‘Dark Star’ (Wild lilac), Arctostaphylos (Manzanita), and Cistus (Rockrose) have been selected (Exhibit C – Landscape Plan). The predominate landscape plantings will occur in the parking lot medians that are typically nine (9) feet wide. These medians will also be used as bioswales to mitigate storm water onsite.

Storm water retardation for the site shall meet the City's Grading and Drainage Standards. In addition, site design includes a series of on-site bioswales located in the parking lot medians. The bioswales would infiltrate and pre-treat stormwater runoff on-site. Water and sewerage service is provided by the City’s existing lines in the area.

PROJECT REVIEW:

The environmental impacts associated with the development of the site were determined using the City of Santa Maria Staff Project Environmental Checklist (attached), on-site inspection, various computer models, aerial photographs, an analysis of recently approved development in close proximity to the subject site, and information provided by the applicant. Potentially significant adverse environmental impacts were identified in the area of biological resources and hydrology and water quality.
Based on the above mentioned sources, no adverse impacts are associated with aesthetics/visual resources, agriculture and forest resources, air quality, noise, population and housing, hazards and hazardous materials, geology and soils, cultural resources, land use and planning, mineral resources, public facilities, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems.

**IMPACT SUMMARY TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Site</strong></td>
<td>5.29 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Buildings</strong></td>
<td>450 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Demand (1)</strong></td>
<td>3.32 acre-feet per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewage Generation (1)</strong></td>
<td>187 gallons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Daily Trips (2)</strong></td>
<td>425 trips per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.M. Peak Trips (2)</strong></td>
<td>45 peak hour trips per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unmitigated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term Emissions: (3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive Hydrocarbons</td>
<td>1.32 pounds/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
<td>1.06 pounds/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Information provided by project applicant.
(2) Light Industry Land Use (LI) from ITE Manual.
(3) URBEMIS2007 Model (Version 9.2.4).

**Air Quality**

The long term emissions for the proposed project were conducted on URBEMIS 2007 (Version 9.2.4). The project was viewed for air quality based on the amount of trips to and from the Chumash Casino Resort, the distance to the Chumash Casino Resort from the project site, and the type of vehicle used. The study was done based on information provided by the Chumash Casino Resort and ridership numbers collected from another park and ride location within the City of Santa Maria. The proposed project site will become the only park and ride facility for the Chumash Casino Resort from the City of Santa Maria.

A total of 425 riders are anticipated to utilize the park and ride facility each day. If each rider was to drive separately (which is unlikely) and drive a distance of thirty miles each way to the Chumash Casino Resort and back to Santa Maria using a standard size automobile or a light truck, a total of 1.32 pounds/day of reactive hydrocarbons and a total of 1.06 pounds/day of nitrogen oxides would be released as a result.
The proposed project would eliminate these 425 trips and replace them with twenty-six (26) bus trips per day, to and from, the Chumash Casino Resort carrying the 425 riders. This would reduce the total reactive hydrocarbons to 0.14 pounds/day and the total nitrogen oxides to 0.68 pounds/day. The worst case scenario has been provided in the Impact Summary Table above. In either case, the project is well below twenty-five (25) pounds per day allowed by the standards of the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD). This impact has been found not to be significant.

**Biological Resources**

A site visit and inventory of the project site was conducted on March 19, 2011. Fifteen (15) Eucalyptus trees formally located on the project site had been removed prior to the commencement of nesting season. No other trees were present on the project site. The predominant shrub located on-site was Baccharis pilularis (Coyote Bush). The remainder of flora found on-site was various species of grasses and weeds. No fauna was seen on-site during the site visit, nor were any burrows, holes, or nests found.

No candidate, sensitive species, or special status species were identified at the site and federally protected wetlands or other sensitive natural communities are not known to occur on the project site. Based on the Resources Management Element of the Santa Maria General Plan (Figure RME-3) the potential for rare, endangered, threatened or significant vegetation or animals were identified as negligible.

A biological survey prepared for the nearby Fairway Industrial Park, dated July 1, 2004, concluded that the Fairway Business Park site did not represent suitable upland breeding habitat for California Tiger Salamanders (CTS) and the nearest known CTS breeding pond is located over two-miles away on Santa Maria Public Airport District property. However, the possibility of California red-legged frogs living within the nearby drainage facilities may still exist.

To insure that no significant impacts occur, mitigation measures are required for the project that: (1) establish a twenty foot buffer to prohibit the disturbance of the storm water drainage basin during the construction or operation of this site and maintain access for the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District to the drainage basin; (2) a two foot tall vertical masonry wall with a six foot tall chain link fence shall be erected along the northern site boundary, and (3) a six foot tall architecturally treated slumpstone (or equivalent) masonry wall will be constructed along the westerly property line. The twenty-foot setback would be established between the development site and the top of bank of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District’s drainage channel. The vertical wall located on the northerly project perimeter would preclude the encroachment of red-legged frogs or other special status species onto the project site. In a similar manner, the six foot tall masonry wall on the westerly property line would serve the dual purpose of a visual barrier and a barrier to prohibit the encroachment of red-legged frogs onto the project site. These measures would prevent any kind of disturbance to the drainage channel and any protected species residing in the drainage facility. Therefore, the measures included into the project design would result in a less than significant impact to biological resources.
According to the Tree Survey prepared for the project (Exhibit D), fifteen Blue Gum Eucalyptus trees of varying sizes have been removed to accommodate future development of the project site. To avoid nesting seasons, the trees were removed in late fall (November 2010). The project includes a Tree Replacement Plan in accordance with Santa Maria Municipal Code Section 12-44.04. A total of 70 24-inch box replacement trees will be provided as a part of the landscape plan to fully mitigate the removal of the existing trees on site.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures will reduce impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level:

BIO-1: All ground disturbances shall be provided in a 20 foot setback from the top of the bank of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District's channel and basin and the proposed development. During all construction and grading activities, the setback area shall be fenced with sediment barrier fence. The fencing type and location shall be as determined to be acceptable to the Community Development Department. Plan Requirements: The 20 foot setback area shall be shown on the grading, site and landscape plans. Timing: The fencing shall be installed prior to any earth movement.

Monitoring: The Community Development Department shall perform site inspections throughout the construction phase.

BIO-2: To avoid impacts to possible California red-legged frogs in the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District's drainage channel, adjacent to the northern property line, the following mitigation measures are required:

a. A two-foot-tall vertical concrete wall with a four foot chain link fence shall be constructed along the northerly project perimeter between the project site and the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District easement and along the western property line for 95 feet, beginning at the northwest corner of the parcel.

Plan Requirements: The walls and fences shall be shown on the grading, site and landscape plans and shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for approval. The walls and fences shall be installed in substantial compliance with the approved plans. Timing: The walls and fences shall be installed prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park and ride facility.

Monitoring: The Community Development Department shall review the grading, site and landscape plans for the walls and fences, and shall perform site inspections of the walls and fences throughout the construction phase.
BI0-3: Tree Replacement: To replace the trees that were removed; a minimum of seventy (70) 24-inch box canopy trees shall be incorporated into the landscape design and planted on-site. Plan Requirement: The replacement trees shall be shown on the final landscape plans and shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for approval. Landscaping shall be installed in substantial compliance with the approved plans. The landscaping shall be maintained as installed in accordance with the Standard Condition for landscape maintenance. Timing: The replacement trees shall be planted prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park and ride facility.

Monitoring: The Community Development Department shall review the final landscape plans for the replacement trees, and shall perform site inspections of the replacement trees prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park and ride facility.

The mitigation measures noted above would prevent any kind of disturbance to the drainage channel or encroachment onto the site by any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore this adverse impact is significant, but can be feasibly mitigated or avoided.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

The project would not violate any current or existing water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. However, the proposed project would introduce roughly 182,300 square feet of impervious surface, including the asphaltic concrete parking lot, concrete driveways, pedestrian walks, and buildings on the undeveloped 5.29 acre site.

Under the direction of the Region 3, (Central Coast) Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), the City of Santa Maria is participating in a joint effort with other co-permitees in the region. The joint effort is anticipated to provide numerous environmental benefits, and other benefits, by developing criteria and improving regional consistency in hydro-modification control implementation (maintaining historic storm water flow, duration and intensity rates from a project site when impervious surfaces have been added).

As a part if its participation in the joint effort, the City of Santa Maria is encouraging Low Impact Development (LID) measures to be incorporated into applicable new development and redevelopment projects. Although these Interim LID Measures are not an established requirement at this time, the project has included LID measures to protect channels (although man made in this vicinity), retain, infiltrate, transpirate and evaporate storm water resulting from the project. LID Best Management Practice (BMP) measures to be included in the project design are as follows:

HYDRO 1: As proposed, the applicant shall include the following components in the project description to reduce potential impacts to hydrology and water quality:
a. A twenty (20) foot wide (11,662 square-foot) setback shall be maintained from the top of the bank of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District's channel adjacent on the north and the regional basin located to the west and the park-and-ride lot. The twenty foot separation would provide for access by the Flood Control District and would provide a separation buffer between the activities occurring within the park and ride facility and the drainage facilities.

b. 36,500 square feet of beneficial (permeable) landscaped area.

c. Approximately 70 ornamental canopy trees to diffuse, transpirate and evaporate a portion of the rainfall onto the project site.

d. A series of vegetated bioswales located between rows of parking spaces to capture, infiltrate and pre-treat parking lot storm water runoff.

Plan Requirements: The hydrology and water quality components shall be shown on the grading, site and landscape plans and shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for approval. The hydrology and water quality components shall be installed in substantial compliance with the approved plans. Timing: The hydrology and water quality components shall be installed prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park-and ride facility.

Monitoring: The Community Development Department shall review the grading, site and landscape plans for the hydrology and water quality components, and shall perform site inspections of the components throughout the construction phase.

The mitigation measures noted above would exceed current or existing water quality design standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, this adverse impact is significant, but can be feasibly mitigated or avoided.

Traffic

The traffic generated by the proposed park and ride facility will not have a significant impact on the surrounding businesses and streets. In effect, the project is anticipated to reduce the number of vehicle trips that would otherwise occur if residents from Santa Maria and the surrounding area were to travel the 30 miles to and from the Chumash Casino Resort.

The traffic generation for the project was based on the historical number of trips occurring right now from the park and ride facility located in Santa Maria. The existing facility would be abandoned and the proposed facility would serve the existing and future increase in the ridership program. The methodology for the calculation of trip generation was reviewed and approved by the City of Santa Maria Public Works Department, Engineering Division.
The Bus Schedule Chart (Table 1) listed below provides the daily bus trips to and from the project site. The total number of buses departing from and arriving to the project site is twenty-seven (27). The majority of the riders using the park and ride facility are employees with a ratio of ninety percent (90%) employees to ten percent (10%) guests. A total of approximately 425 riders will use the park and ride facility daily.

**TABLE 1**

**BUS SCHEDULE CHART**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASINO SCHEDULE CHART</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASINO EMPLOYEE SHUTTLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departs Casino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departs Santa Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 hours a day, 7 days a week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASINO GUEST SHUTTLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chumash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria at:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* these runs are scheduled to return empty

All guest runs are per reservation (please call 1-877-642-7748 to make a reservation)

Since a majority of these riders will be employees (90%), the main ridership will occur around the employee shift schedules of the Chumash Casino Resort. The Employee Shift Chart below (Table 2) indicates the only bus carrying employees after a shift change during peak hours is at 5:00 p.m., when employees will be arriving to the project site. The bus used for this specific trip seats approximately forty (40) riders and historically has transported approximately twenty (20) riders. If all riders drove separately, the trips generated from the project site during peak hours would be under the threshold of fifty (50).
TABLE 2
EMPLOYEE SHIFT CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shift</th>
<th>Shift Hours</th>
<th>Pick-up @ Lot</th>
<th>Drop-off @ Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td>8:00am - 4:00pm</td>
<td>7:00am</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>4:00pm - 12:00am</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>1:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>12:00am - 8:00am</td>
<td>11:00pm</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the total daily number of riders anticipated to be under five hundred (500) and the total number of riders during peak hours to be under fifty (50), the need for a traffic study was determined to be unwarranted. This impact has been found not to be significant.

ENVIRONMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the information available at the time of preparation of this report and without benefit of additional information which may come to light at the public hearing, the Environmental Officer recommends that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be filed for GPZ-2011-002 and PD-2011-002 based upon information contained in E-2011-013.

PREPARED BY:

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

Neda Zayer, Environmental Analyst
Date 4/13/11

Lawrence W. Appel, Environmental Officer
Date 4/13/11
1. **Project Title:**
Chumash Park and Ride Lot

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
City of Santa Maria
Community Development Department
110 South Pine Street, #101
Santa Maria, CA 93458

3. **Contact Person/Preparer of the Initial Study:**
Neda Zayer
805-925-0951, x244

4. **Project Location:**
1223 Fairway Drive
Assessor Parcel No. 111-580-007 (portion)

5. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:**
Steven E. Reese
Anton and Associates
115 E. College Avenue, Ste 5
Lompoc, CA 93436

6. **General Plan Designation:** LI (Light Industrial) and CF (Community Facilities)

7. **Zoning Designation:** PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing), PF (Public Facilities)

8. **Brief Description of Project:** A General Plan amendment for a 4.22 acre portion of a 5.29 acre site from LI (Light Industrial) to CF (Community Facilities) [a 1.07 acre portion of the project site is already designated CF (Community Facilities) and would remain under CF (Community Facilities)] Land Use designation; a zone change for a 4.22 acre portion of a 5.29 acre site from M-1 (Light Manufacturing) to PD/PF (Planned Development/Public Facilities) zoning district, and a 1.07 acre portion from PF (Public Facilities) to PD/PF (Planned Development/Public Facilities); and, a Planned Development Permit to facilitate the construction of a new park and ride lot to transport employees and guests to and from the Chumash Casino Resort in Santa Ynez, California. The park and ride facility would consist of a parking lot comprised of approximately 359 parking spaces; outdoor passenger loading/waiting area, a 450 square foot security office and restrooms, bus shelters, and associated landscaped areas and lighting on a 5.29 acre project site. Twenty-seven (27) buses will transport approximately 405 employees and guests within a twenty-four (24) hour period to and from the Chumash Casino Resort.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is mainly surrounded by industrial uses located in the PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) zoning district. Verizon, a general telephone company, is located to the east. A City of Santa Maria corporate yard is located to the west in a PF (Public Facilities) zoning district. A Pacific Gas and Electric corporate yard is located to the north and an industrial business park to the south across Fairway Drive within a PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) zoning district. A 120,000 square-foot industrial park (Fairway Business Park) is under construction roughly 600 feet to the west. A Santa Barbara County Flood Control District's drainage channel and easement is adjacent to the north and east of the project site.
1. **AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES**

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

**Discussion:**

a. The project site is located within an already urbanized portion of the City. No scenic views or vistas would be affected by development of the project site. The site is generally surrounded by industrial development located within the PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) and PF (Public Facilities) zoning districts.

b. The nearest state highway is more than a mile away from the proposed project site. The segments of the State highways that pass through the City of Santa Maria are not identified as being scenic routes. In addition, no historic buildings are located on or near the project site. According to the City's General Plan, there are no scenic resources on the site; this was confirmed during a site visit conducted on March 19, 2011.

c. The site is currently zoned PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) and PF (Public Facilities) and is currently vacant. No trees are present on the subject property and existing vegetation is limited to scattered weeds, brush and grasses. The addition of substantial ornamental landscaped area is anticipated to add to the visual character of the project site and its surroundings. Approximately 70 ornamental trees are included into the conceptual landscape plan. The development will provide a uniform and maintained street front appearance to Fairway Drive.

d. As a part of the project design any lighting fixtures would be designed and located as necessary to minimize light and glare to off-site locations in accordance with the Santa Maria Municipal Code (SMMC) Section 12-33.307 (Glare) and the Public Works Department, Engineering Division standard specifications (S-106 Streetlights).

**Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project:** None.
2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

a. According to the map prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, for Santa Barbara County dated 2008, the project site is located in an area identified as urban and built-up land, which is predominated by structures and having an overall a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10 acre parcel. Therefore, no farmland of any kind would be affected by the proposed project. The project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), to non-agricultural use.

b. The proposed project site is zoned PD/M-1 (Planned Development/ Light Manufacturing) and is surrounded by existing industrial buildings and uses in an industrial zoning district. The project site has not been used for agricultural uses nor is it zoned for agricultural use. No Williamson Act contract exists on the project site.

c,d. This project is on land zoned predominantly for PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) use and is proposed to be rezoned to PF (Public Facilities) uses. The site does not currently, nor in the past, support the growth, production, or harvesting of native or commercial trees. By definition of the Public Resources Code sections 12220(g) and 4526, or Government Code section 51104(g) the project site is not considered “Farm Land”, “Timberland”, or a “Timberland Production Zone.” No adverse impacts would result from the loss of important forest land.

e. The proposed project site is zoned PD/M-1 (Planned Development/ Light Manufacturing) district and is surrounded by existing industrial buildings in an industrial zoning district. No agricultural or forest land uses surround the project site.

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None
3. **AIR QUALITY**

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

**Discussion:**

a.b. The URBEMIS 2007 (version 9.2.4) air quality model identifies a net increase of less than 25 pounds per day of reactive organic gases and less than 25 pounds per day of nitrous oxide over the baseline land uses. At a worst case scenario, the project would generate approximately 1.32 pounds/day for ROG's (reactive organic gas) and 1.06 pounds/day for NOx's (nitrous oxide). This is a less than significant impact to air quality, as described in the standards of the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD). Refer to the initial study for further discussion. No significant impacts to air quality result from the daily operations of the development proposal.

Construction of the proposed project phases would result in temporary air quality impacts. These impacts are associated with dust generated by onsite grading and as a result of emissions from heavy construction vehicles. The project site is relatively flat; therefore, the need for imported fill material would be minimal. Standard construction related measures as recommended by the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) will be incorporated into the project conditions of approval. The project would not individually or cumulatively result in a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant or adversely affect any applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
c. The URBEMIS 2007 (version 9.2.4) air quality model identifies a net increase of less than 25 pounds per day of reactive organic gases and less than 25 pounds per day of nitrous oxide over the baseline land uses. Therefore, the air quality impacts would be less than significant at the project and cumulative levels of measurement. Refer to the response to Item a and b, above. Assuming that only half of the 425 daily passengers that use the shuttle service were to otherwise drive their private vehicles, it is assumed that roughly 213 vehicles would then make the daily 30 mile trip to the Chumash Resort in Santa Ynez, California. Therefore, the operations of the proposed park and ride shuttle facility are anticipated to significantly reduce overall emissions resulting from private vehicles trips.

d. The project site is surrounded primarily by industrial uses in the PD/M-1 (Planned Development/ Light Manufacturing) zoning district and PF (Public Facilities) zoning district. A residential subdivision, located more than 600 feet northeast of the project site, is the closest residential use within the project vicinity. No sensitive receptors occur on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e. The proposed park and ride facility would not be expected to generate substantial odors that would affect the existing or future surrounding uses. The odors associated with the project would be of normal car and bus emissions. Since the emissions are less than what is allowable by SBCAPCD the impacts, if any, would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None**
### 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

a,b,c. The proposed project site is currently vacant and surrounded by industrial uses. The negligible size, limited vegetation cover and lack of trees renders the site as minimal to marginal for use as wildlife habitat. The project site is an infill property surrounded by industrial zoning designations and development. Based on the field investigations conducted between November 2010, and March 2011, staff found no candidate or sensitive species, or special status species present at the site. No federally protected wetlands or other sensitive natural communities have been identified on the subject property. No rare, endangered, threatened or significant vegetation or animals are located or expected to inhabit the project site based on the Resources Management Element of the Santa Maria General Plan (Figure RME-3).

Although no rare or endangered plants or animals appear to inhabit the project site, there is a drainage channel located within a Santa Barbara County Flood Control District’s easement adjacent to the northern side of the property. Additionally, a larger regional storm water detention basin is located to the west of the project site. The drainage facilities are owned and operated by the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

Given the proximity to these drainage facilities, the possibility of California red-legged frogs living within the drainage facilities exists. To insure that no significant impacts occur, mitigation measures would be required that would prohibit the disturbance of the storm water basin during the construction or operation of this site and preclude future encroachment onto the site by California red-legged frogs, as follows: a two-foot-tall vertical masonry wall with a six-foot tall chain link fence will be erected along the northern boundary of the project site; and (2) a six foot tall masonry (dual purpose visual and habitat buffer) wall will be constructed along the westerly boundary of the project site. These measures would prevent encroachment of protected species onto the project site.

d. Based on the Resources Management Element, pp. RME-9 through RME-11 and including Figure RME-3, the vicinity does not appear to have been identified as being within any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or resident or migratory wildlife species. A biological survey prepared for the nearby Fairway Industrial Park, dated July 1, 2004, concluded that the sites in this vicinity did not represent suitable upland breeding habitat for California Tiger Salamanders (CTS). Furthermore, the nearest known breeding ponds were over two miles from the subject vicinity. However, the possibility of California red-legged frogs living within the nearby drainage facilities may still exist.
e. Currently, no trees are present on the site. According to a Tree Survey prepared for the project, fifteen Blue Gum Eucalyptus trees were removed from the site to accommodate the project. The trees were removed in late fall/early winter of 2010, to ensure their removal would be outside of any bird nesting season. No ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance exists for the project site. However, Santa Maria Municipal Code 12-44.04 requires replacement of trees that have been removed, or will be removed.

f. There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans for or near the project.

**Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project:** Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures will reduce impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level:

**BIO-1:**
All ground disturbances shall be provided in a 20 foot setback from the top of the bank of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District's channel and basin and the proposed development. During all construction and grading activities, the setback area shall be fenced with sediment barrier fence. The fencing type and location shall be as determined to be acceptable to the Community Development Department.

**Plan Requirements:** The 20 foot setback area shall be shown on the grading, site and landscape plans.

**Timing:** The fencing shall be installed prior to any earth movement.

**Monitoring:** The Community Development Department shall perform site inspections throughout the construction phase.

**BIO-2:**
To avoid impacts to possible California red-legged frogs in the Santa Barbara Count Flood Control District's drainage channel adjacent to the northern property line, the following mitigation measures are required:

a. A two-foot-tall vertical concrete wall with a four foot chain link fence shall be constructed along the northerly project perimeter between the project site and the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District easement and along the western property line for 95 feet, beginning at the northwest corner of the parcel.

**Plan Requirements:** The walls and fences shall be shown on the grading, site and landscape plans and shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for approval. The walls and fences shall be installed in substantial compliance with the approved plans.
**Timing:** The walls and fences shall be installed prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park and ride facility.

**Monitoring:** The Community Development Department shall review the grading, site and landscape plans for the walls and fences, and shall perform site inspections of the walls and fences throughout the construction phase.

**BIO-3:**

Tree Replacement: To replace the trees that were removed, a minimum of seventy (70) 24-inch box canopy trees shall be incorporated into the landscape design and planted on-site.

**Plan Requirement:** The replacement trees shall be shown on the final landscape plans and shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for approval. Landscaping shall be installed in substantial compliance with the approved plans. The landscaping shall be maintained as installed in accordance with the Standard Condition for landscape maintenance.

**Timing:** The replacement trees shall be planted prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park and ride facility.

**Monitoring:** The Community Development Department shall review the final landscape plans for the replacement trees, and shall perform site inspections of the replacement trees prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park and ride facility.
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. Based on the Resources Management Element (Figure RME-5) of the Santa Maria General Plan, the likelihood of historical resources on the site is unlikely. The project site is in an area of low sensitivity.

b. Based on the Resources Management Element (Figure RME-5) of the Santa Maria General Plan, the likelihood of archaeological resources on the site is unlikely. The project site is in an area of low sensitivity.

c. Based on existing developments occurring in the area, the project should not destroy unique paleontological resources/geologic features.

d. Based on existing development in the area, the project should not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None
### 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong Seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined the most recent Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

a. Figure SE-2 of the City of Santa Maria's Safety Element of the General Plan indicates the closest fault line to the project site is more than two miles to the northeast. However, no buildings or structures of any significant size will occupy the park and ride facility. Furthermore, those buildings and structures shall be constructed under standard building code and structural requirements.

i. The City of Santa Maria uses the California Building Code (CBC) to engineer buildings to the seismic design category criteria for this area. Potential impacts as a result of ground failure or liquefaction are negligible.

ii. The City of Santa Maria uses the California Building Code to engineer buildings to the seismic design category standards for this area. Potential impacts as a result of ground shaking are negligible.

iii. The City of Santa Maria uses the California Building Code to engineer buildings to seismic design category standards for this area. Potential impacts as a result of ground failure or liquefaction are negligible.

iv. There are no steep slopes subject to landslides in the project area. The project scope would result in less than significant impacts for earth moving and grading.

b. Based upon the Safety Element of the Santa Maria General Plan, no soil impacts or other geologic related hazards are known to exist on the subject site. The soil underlying the project site is classified as Betteravia loamy sand (BmA) with a 0 to 2 percent slope. This soil is a Class IV to VI soil (Source- USDA Soil Survey of Northern Santa Barbara Area July 1972). The majority of the subject site is generally flat. Development of the site would incorporate a landscape plan that would include planting of ground trees, shrubs and groundcover, which would improve soil stability and lessen the chance of blowing dust or erosion over the existing condition. Standard engineering and construction techniques will be incorporated into any development to lessen potential geo-hazard impacts to negligible.

c. The soils are stable and hazardous conditions created by landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse, and have not occurred in the proposed project vicinity. Therefore, due to the application of building code standards, the potential of such geologic impacts occurring would be less than significant.

d. According to Figure SE-2 of the City of Santa Maria's General Plan, there are no expansive soils within the project boundaries. Due to the application of building code standards, the potential of such earth movement impacts occurring at this location would remain less than significant.

e. The City's Municipal Code requires all proposed development to connect to the City sewer system, which was installed as the urban area developed. According to the Public Works Department, sewer service connections are available to serve the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None
## 7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are inter-mixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a.b. The proposed project has been referred to the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas and Geothermal Resources and the Santa Barbara County Fire Department for review. Transmittal responses provided by each of these agencies have concluded that no oil wells or other sources of hazardous materials exist on the project site.

c. The project site is located over one (1) mile from the nearest school. This property is limited to the allowed and conditional uses as specified in the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) and the PF (Public Facilities) zoning designation of the Municipal Code. No hazardous materials, substances, or emissions are being proposed with this project.

d. As of March 25, 2011, the project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. [Link to website]

e.f. The project site is located approximately half a mile from the boundaries of the Santa Maria Public Airport. The project site is outside of the airport approach zone as identified in the Santa Maria General Plan. However, the project site is located within the Airport Influence Area as identified by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) and Santa Barbara County Airport Land Commission (ALUC) Airport Land Use Plan.

g. The proposed project would not impair emergency response or otherwise physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the size, scope, and nature of the proposed project are consistent with the surrounding uses, which do not preclude any emergency plan implementation within the City of Santa Maria.

h. The project is generally surrounded by urban uses which would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mud-flow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. Development and operation of the site will comply with all of the adopted water protection standards contained within Title 8 of the City of Santa Maria's Municipal Code as well as the City's Grading Ordinance. Furthermore, in accordance with the Region 3 Water Quality Control Board's interim Low Impact Development (LID) directive to "encourage LID measures into new development and re-development projects, a series of vegetated bioswales will be located between rows of parking spaces to capture, infiltrate and pre-treat parking lot stormwater runoff. Additionally, the landscape plan shall incorporate approximately 70 canopy trees into the landscape scheme. Therefore, all future uses and activities that will result from the proposed development shall be consistent with, or exceed the current or prevailing water quality standards as established by the Region 3, Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City of Santa Maria's Municipal Code. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

b. The City would generally provide municipal water without the use of groundwater supplies. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The uses and activities associated with the industrial uses would have a negligible impact on groundwater resources. On-site retardation basins and substantial permeable landscaped open space areas are anticipated to provide some degree of groundwater recharge capability.

c,d,e. The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, would not result in flooding on- or off-site or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off. Development of the project site shall be in full conformance with the City of Santa Maria Grading Ordinance and the requirements of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District to ensure post-project run-off rates do not exceed pre-project run-off rates. On-site retardation basins and substantial permeable landscaped open space areas are anticipated to provide some degree of on-site infiltration and treatment.
f. The project at the construction phase and the post-construction phase will not substantially degrade water quality. As stated, the project shall be in full compliance with the current stormwater discharge standards of the City of Santa Maria and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. No adverse impacts to water quality would result from the project.

g. No housing is proposed on the project site.

h,i. According to the National Flood Insurance Program Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the project site is located outside a 100-year storm event.

j. The project is approximately 18 miles from the Pacific Ocean and over 200 feet above sea level. There is little or no danger of inundation by a seiche or tsunami.

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project.

HYDRO 1: As proposed, the applicant shall include the following components in the project description to reduce impacts to hydrology and water quality:

a. A twenty (20) foot wide (11,662 square-foot) setback shall be maintained from the top of the bank of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District’s channel adjacent on the north and the regional basin to the west and the park and ride lot. The twenty foot separation would provide a separation buffer between the activities occurring within the park and ride facility and the drainage facilities.

b. 36,500 square feet of beneficial (permeable) landscaped area.

c. Approximately 70 ornamental canopy trees to diffuse, transpirate and evaporate a portion of the rainfall onto the project site.

d. A series of vegetated bioswales located between rows of parking spaces to capture, infiltrate and pre-treat parking lot storm water runoff.

Plan Requirements: The hydrology and water quality components shall be shown on the grading, site and landscape plans and shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for approval. The hydrology and water quality components shall be installed in substantial compliance with the approved plans.

Timing: The hydrology and water quality components shall be installed prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park-and ride facility.

Monitoring: The Community Development Department shall review the grading, site and landscape plans for the hydrology and water quality components, and shall perform site inspections of the components throughout the construction phase.
9. **LAND USE AND PLANNING**

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

**Discussion:**

a. Currently, the project site is vacant and surrounded by industrial development in PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) and PF (Public Facilities) zoning districts.

b. The project site is not affected by an adopted specific plan or a local coastal program.

c. There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans affecting the project site.

*Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None*
10. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

Discussion:

a,b. According to Figure RME-4 of the City of Santa Maria’s Resource Management Element (RME) of the General Plan, the project site is not located within areas of operational, existing, or abandoned oil facilities. The site is within MRZ-3, which is an area containing mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data.

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None
11. **NOISE**

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

**Discussion:**

a. The Noise Element of the General Plan identifies the evaluation criteria that are regulated through Section 5-5 of the Santa Maria Municipal Code. The new structures that meet energy conservation standards (CBC Title 24) also serve to reduce the intrusion of higher ambient noise levels. The application of building code standards and practices would sufficiently reduce potential noise impacts occurring at this location to within General Plan and Municipal Code standards.

b. The new construction would adhere to adopted noise and vibration standards for the development. Other buildings in the area do not experience any impacts, therefore, building design/construction standards reduce the potential impact to less than significant levels, and no mitigation is required.
c. The vehicles and operations associated with the park and ride facility would be anticipated to increase noise levels over the current baseline conditions of the vacant lot. However, given the general industrial character of the surrounding area, no significant adverse impacts to the surrounding area are anticipated to occur as a result of the project. No noise mitigation would be required.

d. Short-term ambient noise sources would not substantially increase because of the adjacent industrial uses to the area. Standard conditions of project approval limit the days and hours of construction.

e. The project site is approximately a half (1/2) mile from the Santa Maria Public Airport and is outside of the airport approach zones. The project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels based on Map SM-1 of the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan which shows that the noise contours do not cover the project site.

f. The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would therefore not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

**Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None**
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

Discussion:

a,b,c. The project site is currently vacant. No housing exists on-site and no housing is proposed.

   Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None


13. PUBLIC FACILITIES

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

Discussion:

a.  

i. The proposed project would require the same number of firefighters as any similar sized development allowed under the existing land use and proposed zoning designations. This is less than significant because the adopted growth impact fees would expand facilities and services at nearly the same rate as new development.

ii. As the primary law enforcement agency for the City of Santa Maria, the Police Department operates on a 24-hour basis and handles all service calls for the city with an appointed amount of sworn officers. The proposed project would require the same number of sworn police officers as any similar sized industrial development allowed under the existing land use and zoning designations. This is less than significant because the adopted growth impact fees would expand facilities and services at nearly the same rate as new development.

iii. California Government Code Section 65995 considers payment of approved school fees to be full mitigation to offset potential impacts to schools. The City of Santa Maria is not involved in this decision, according to State law.

iv. The impacts to parks would be mitigated to less than significant levels by the imposition of existing growth impact fees. This is less than significant because the adopted growth impact fees would expand facilities and services at nearly the same rate as new development.
v. The proposed project would not directly, or indirectly, intensify the use of the land such that it would, adversely affect other public facilities of the community. Therefore, this would not be a significant adverse impact of the project.

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None
14. **RECREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

a. This project will have minimal if any increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To this date, there will be no permanent residents on the site.

b. The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None**
15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

Discussion:

a. The City of Santa Maria Public Works Department has not identified any traffic impacts associated with the proposed project nor does the proposed project interfere with existing or proposed transportation routes. Based on the total daily number of riders anticipated to be under five hundred (500) and the total number of riders during peak hours to be under fifty (50), the traffic impacts resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant.
b. The Public Works Department has not identified any significant traffic impacts that would exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. The applicant shall pay into the City AB1600 traffic mitigation fee program.

c. The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks because the project site is not located in the airport traffic pattern in accordance with the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan airport traffic map.

d. The site is appropriately designed and reviewed by the Public Works Department (Engineering Division) to prevent any unsafe road conditions. No significant impacts identified based on the ITE manual.

e. The Fire Department has not indicated any concerns in regards to inadequate access.

f. The project does not conflict with policies supporting alternative transportation because of its location and zoning in the City.

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None
## UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

### Discussion:

a. With the application of standard grading and development requirements, the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and this impact would be less than significant.

b. Adequate wastewater treatment facilities are available to serve the project. The Santa Maria Public Works Department and Utilities Department have reviewed the project and have determined adequate sewer treatment capacity exists to convey and treat wastewater generated by full build-out of the proposed project.
c. Existing storm water drainage facilities have the capacity to support the project. Storm water retardation for the site shall meet the Grading Drainage Standards of the City of Santa Maria. In addition, site design includes bioswales with underdrain in parking islands to infiltrate and pretreat storm water.

d. The City’s 2005 Urban Water Management Plan (Plan) contains information regarding water supplies, projected water demands, alternative water supplies, and water conservation measures. Page 3-12, Table 3-6 of the plan presents the water supplies available to serve the project and (page 4-8, Table 4-5) the water demand resulting from population growth established using the forecast methodology contained in the Regional Growth Forecast 2005-2040, pp. 3-9. Copies of the plan are available on the City’s website at http://www.ci.santa-maria.ca.us/3111.html. Because the net water entitlements exceed forecasted water demand, the water supply impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.

e. The project was reviewed by the Public Works Department and it was determined sufficient wastewater treatment capacity would exist, thereby making this a less than significant impact of the project.

f. The proposed project was reviewed by the Public Works Department and determined to be adequately provided for with the current infrastructure. The City has initiated planning and permitting processes to establish a landfill site that would provide sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the long-term solid waste disposal needs of the City, thereby making this a less than significant impact of the project.

g. The proposed project does not conflict with state regulations, [California Code of Regulations, Title 14, sections 18100 through 18105.11, and Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations], related to solid waste. These regulations require separation of any solid waste which, because of its source of generation, physical, chemical or biological characteristics or unique disposal practices, is specifically conditioned in a solid waste facilities permit for handling and/or disposal. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s) incorporated into the project: None
### CONSULTATION SOURCES

#### City Departments Consulted
- [ ] Administrative Services
- X Fire
- [ ] Library
- [ ] City Manager
- X Police
- X Public Works
- X Recreation and Parks

#### County Agencies/Departments Consulted
- X Air Pollution Control District
- [ ] Association of Governments
- X Flood Control District
- [ ] Environmental Health
- X Fire (Hazardous Materials)
- LAFCO
- [ ] Public Works
- [ ] Planning and Development
- [ ] Other (list)

#### Special Districts Consulted
- Santa Maria Public Airport
- [ ] Airport Land Use Commission
- Cemetery
- Santa-Maria Bonita School District
- Santa Maria Joint Union High School
- Laguna County Sanitation District
- Cal Cities Water Company

#### State/Federal Agencies Consulted
- Army Corps of Engineers
- Caltrans
- CA Fish and Games
- Federal Fish and Wildlife
- FAA
- Regional Water Quality Control Bd.
- [ ] Integrated Waste Management Bd.
- [ ] Other (list)

### DATA SOURCES

#### General Plan
- X Land Use Element
- X Circulation Element
- X Safety Element
- X Noise Element
- Housing Element
- X Resources Management Element

#### Other
- X Agricultural Preserve Maps
- X Archaeological Maps/Reports
- X Architectural Elevations
- [ ] Biology Reports
- X CA Oil and Gas Maps
- X FEMA Maps (Flood)
- X Grading Plans
- X Site Plan
- [ ] Topographic Maps
- X Aerial Photos
- [ ] Traffic Studies
- X Trip Generation Manual (ITE)
- X URBEMIS Air Quality Model
- X Zoning Maps
- X Other- Site Visits
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Services Systems
DETERMINATION

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

- Finds that the proposed project is a Class __ CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION and no further environmental review is required.

- X Finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- Finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- Finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- Finds that the proposed project may have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to acceptable standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)/SUBSEQUENT EIR/SUPPLEMENTAL EIR/ADDENDUM is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- Finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to acceptable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Neda Zayer, Environmental Analyst

Lawrence W. Appel, Environmental Officer

04/13/11

4/13/11
The following environmental mitigation measures were incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for this project in order to mitigate identified environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. A completed and signed checklist for each mitigation measure indicates that this mitigation measure has been complied with and implemented, and fulfills the City's monitoring requirements with respect to Assembly Bill 3180 (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

1. **Biological Resources.** Following are the project specific construction mitigation measures required to be noted in the project conditions of approval in order to mitigate direct and indirect impacts to the biological resources located on-site:

**BIO-1:**
All ground disturbances shall be provided in a 20 foot setback from the top of the bank of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District's channel and basin and the proposed development. During all construction and grading activities, the setback area shall be fenced with a sediment barrier fence. The fencing type and location shall be as determined to be acceptable to the Community Development Department. A qualified biological monitor shall be present onsite during the installation of the sediment barrier fence in the setback area, and during grading of the project site to ensure California Red-legged frog are not present onsite.

**Plan Requirements:** The 20 foot setback area shall be shown on the grading, site, and landscape plans. **Timing:** The fencing shall be installed prior to any earth movement.

**Monitoring:** The Community Development Department shall perform site inspections throughout the construction phase, and a qualified biological monitor shall be present onsite during the installation of the sediment barrier fence and grading of the project site.

**BIO-2:**
To avoid impacts to possible California red-legged frogs in the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District's drainage channel adjacent to the northern property line, the following mitigation measures are required:

---
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a. A two-foot-tall vertical concrete wall with a four foot chain link fence shall be constructed along the northerly project perimeter between the project site and the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District easement and along the western property line for 95 feet, beginning at the northwest corner of the parcel.

**Plan Requirements:** The walls and fences shall be shown on the grading, site and landscape plans and shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for approval. The walls and fences shall be installed in substantial compliance with the approved plans. **Timing:** The walls and fences shall be installed prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park and ride facility.

**Monitoring:** The Community Development Department shall review the grading, site and landscape plans for the walls and fences, and shall perform site inspections of the walls and fences throughout the construction phase. A qualified biological monitor shall also inspect and monitor construction of the walls and fences throughout the construction phase.

**BIO-3:**

Tree Replacement: To replace the trees that were removed, a minimum of seventy (70) 24-inch box canopy trees shall be incorporated into the landscape design and planted on-site. **Plan Requirement:** The replacement trees shall be shown on the final landscape plans and shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for approval. Landscaping shall be installed in substantial compliance with the approved plans. The landscaping shall be maintained as installed in accordance with the Standard Condition for landscape maintenance. **Timing:** The replacement trees shall be planted prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park and ride facility.

**Monitoring:** The Community Development Department shall review the final landscape plans for the replacement trees, and shall perform site inspections of the replacement trees prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park and ride facility.

Type: Building Permit/Grading Plans

Monitoring Dept.: Community Development

Shown on Plans:

Verified Implementation:

Remarks:

2. **Hydrology and Water Quality.** Following are the project specific construction mitigation measures required to be noted in the project conditions of approval in order to mitigate direct and indirect impacts to the hydrology and water quality on-site:

**HYDRO 1:**

a. A twenty (20) foot wide (11,662 square-foot) setback shall be maintained from the top of the bank of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District's channel adjacent on the north and the regional basin to the west and the park and ride lot. The twenty foot separation would provide a separation buffer between the activities occurring within the park and ride facility and the drainage facilities.
b. 36,500 square feet of beneficial (permeable) landscaped area.

c. Approximately 70 ornamental canopy trees to diffuse, transpirate and evaporate a portion of the rainfall onto the project site.

d. A series of vegetated bioswales located between rows of parking spaces to capture, infiltrate and pre-treat parking lot storm water runoff.

Plan Requirements: The hydrology and water quality components shall be shown on the grading, site and landscape plans and shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for approval. The hydrology and water quality components shall be installed in substantial compliance with the approved plans. Timing: The hydrology and water quality components shall be installed prior to use or occupancy clearance of the park-and-ride facility.

Monitoring: The Community Development Department shall review the grading, site and landscape plans for the hydrology and water quality components, and shall perform site inspections of the components throughout the construction phase.

Type: Building Permit/Grading Plans

Monitoring Dept.: Community Development

Shown on Plans:
Verified Implementation:
Remarks: