

Section 3.11

Effects Found to be Less than Significant

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15128 requires a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR).

During the scoping process for this SEIR, it was determined that the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative, and the Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would have no impact on the following: Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Coastal Resources, Electromagnetic Fields, Geologic Resources, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, and Utilities and Service Systems.

3.11.1 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

According to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would have a significant impact on Agricultural Resources if the project:

- a) *Converted Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use*
- b) *Conflicted with existing zoning agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract*
- c) *Conflicted with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production*
- d) *Resulted in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.*

In addition, the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual utilizes a point system to assign relative values to particular characteristics of a site's agricultural productivity (e.g., soils, parcel size, water availability, land use designation, and a range of other issues) to determine whether a proposed project's impact on loss or impairment of agricultural resources will be considered to have a potentially significant impact.

The Project Site is not known to contain soils that have been designated as prime or unique agricultural soils, and agricultural activities have not historically occurred at the Project Site. The Project Site is not zoned for agricultural uses and is not under a Williamson Act contract. The Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not adversely impact prime or locally important agriculture, as none occur within the Project Site.

3.11.2 Coastal Resources

Potential thresholds of significance for coastal processes consider both the potential effects of a project on coastal processes as well as the effects of coastal processes on the project. The County's adopted Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual does not indicate specific thresholds of significance for impacts to coastal processes. However, based on policy guidance provided in the California Coastal Act (CCA) and County Coastal Land Use Plan, which balance maintenance of natural coastal processes with protection of development and coastal-dependent uses, and

suggested findings in CEQA Appendix G related to geology, hazards and hydrology, impacts to coastal processes were determined to be significant if the project would:

- a) *Cause erosion of adjacent beaches which exceeds a known or existing rate*
- b) *Result in substantially increased or decreased rates of beach erosion*
- c) *Substantially change surf characteristics*
- d) *Substantially inhibit naturally occurring coastal processes*
- e) *Expose existing development to substantial risk of loss, damage, or destruction or the public to risk of injury from coastal processes.*

Although the Project Site is located in the coastal zone, it is approximately 0.6 miles from the coast. Furthermore, the Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not include any development or construction activities that affect or would be affected by coastal processes (i.e., coastal erosion).

3.11.3 Electromagnetic Fields

According to the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, a project would have a significant impact if the project:

- a) *"... Expose humans to radiofrequency radiation (RFR) in excess of the IEEE-ANSI C95.1-1992 standard, through the siting of new projects next to RFR sources or through the siting of new RFR sources adjacent to sensitive receptors, then a potentially significant impact would occur. (If the FCC [Federal Communications Commission] rulemaking committee adopts a revised standard, said standard shall apply).*

The Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not introduce new sources of RFR. Additionally, no portion of the Proposed Project or the alternatives would result in the exposure of humans to RFR for any amount of time.

3.11.4 Geologic Resources

According to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would have a significant impact on Geologic Resources if the project:

- a) *Exposed people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earth quake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction, and/or landslides.*
- b) *Resulted in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil*
- c) *Was located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.*
- d) *Was located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property.*
- e) *Had soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water*

In addition, the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual considers an impact to Geologic Resources significant if:

- f) *The project site or any part of the project is located on land having substantial geologic constraints, as determined by the Planning and Development Department or the Public Works Department. Areas constrained by geology include parcels located near active or potentially active faults and property underlain by rock types associated with compressible/collapsible soils or susceptible to landslides or severe erosion. Special Problem Areas designated by the Board of Supervisors have been established based on geologic constraints, flood hazards and other physical limitations to development.*
- g) *The project results in potentially hazardous geologic conditions such as the construction of cut slopes exceeding a grade of 1.5 horizontal to one vertical.*
- h) *3. The project proposes construction of a cut slope over 15 feet in height as measured from the lowest finished grade*
- i) *The project is located on slopes exceeding 20 percent grade.*

Based on a reasonably foreseeable worst case scenario, it was anticipated in the 1982 Final EIR that road surfacing associated with the Husky Oil Project would limit or restrict natural changes in dune form if not removed. However, mitigation measures included in the 1982 Final EIR required the removal of all road materials at project abandonment and therefore this impact was determined to be less than significant after mitigation (Class II). While this impact was partially mitigated through removal of remaining surface features in 1997 under 96-CDP-010, remnant gravel remains within the Project Site. It is difficult to assess the impact of remnant gravel on dune formation and movement over the past 30 years due to other factors that could affect these processes, including sand mining operations in the vicinity. However, as described in Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*, the Project Site includes substantial dune habitat that does not appear to be adversely impacted by the remnant gravel. Therefore, this impact (1982-GEO-1) is now considered Class III. Further, in addition to directly offsetting recreational impacts, the in-lieu fee the purchase of property for public recreational or open space purposes described in MM REC-1 would also result in indirect benefits to geological resources, as the offsite land acquisition could result in the preservation of the natural dune function and movement.

The Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not be expected to increase the area of impervious surfaces such that an impact to storm water runoff would result. The Project Site contains minor amounts of industrial development and is predominantly dune sand. The Project Site is not located near any major, active faults. The Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not include any new structural development on the site that would be exposed to major flood events. No impacts to geologic resources are expected to result as a result of the Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, or Partial Gravel Removal Alternative.

3.11.5 Mineral Resources

According to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would have a significant impact on Mineral Resources if the project:

- a) *Resulted in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state*
- b) *Resulted 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.*

Sand mining operations are conducted near the Project Site by the Gordon Sand Company; however, the Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of mineral resources.

3.11.6 Population and Housing Resources

According to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would have a significant impact on Population and Housing Resources if the project:

- a) *Induced substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly*
- b) *Displaced substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere*
- c) *Displaced substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.*

The Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not induce population growth or displace existing housing or people.

3.11.7 Public Services

According to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would have a significant impact on Public Services if the project:

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

The Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual considers an impact to solid waste production significant if:

- b) *A construction, demolition or remodeling project of a commercial, industrial or residential development that is projected to create more than 350 tons of construction and demolition debris. Although amounts of waste generated vary project to project we have the following estimates of projects that will reach the threshold of significance:*
 - a. *Remodeling projects over 7,000 square feet for residential projects and 17,500 square feet for commercial/industrial projects.*
 - b. *Demolition projects over 11,600 square feet for residential buildings and 7,000 square feet for commercial/industrial buildings.*
 - c. *New construction projects over 47,000 square feet for residential buildings and 28,000 square feet for commercial/industrial buildings.*

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

- c) *A project is considered to result in a significant impact to landfill capacity if it would generate five percent or more of the expected annual increase in waste generation thereby*

using a significant portion of the remaining landfill capacity. Based on the analysis conducted (as illustrated in Table 1), the numerical value associated with the five percent increase is 196 tons per year. As indicated above, source reduction, recycling and composting can reduce a project's waste stream (generated during operations) by as much as 50 percent. If a proposed project generates 196 or more tons per year after reduction and recycling efforts, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable (Class I). Project approval Solid Waste Thresholds would then require the adoption of overriding considerations. A typical single family residential project of 68 units or less would not trigger the threshold of significance.

- d) *A project would also be considered cumulatively significant, as the project specific threshold of significance is based on a cumulative growth scenario. However, as landfill space is already extremely limited, any increase of one percent or more of the estimated increase accounted for in the SRRE [Source Reduction and Recycling Element], mitigation would be considered an adverse contribution (Class III) to regional cumulative solid waste impacts. One percent of the SRRE projected increase in solid waste equates to 40 tons per year (in operational impacts). To reduce adverse cumulative impacts, and to be consistent with the SRRE, mitigation should be recommended for projects which generate between 40 and 196 tons of solid waste per year. Projects which generate less than 40 tons per year of solid waste would not be considered to have an adverse effect due to the small amount of solid waste generated by these projects and the existing waste reduction provisions in the SRRE. A typical single family residential project of 14 units or less would not trigger this adverse impact level.*

The Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not involve or require any additional public services, or be of sufficient size to have any effect on construction-based or operational solid waste generation.

3.11.8 Quality of Life

Quality of life is identified in the Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual as a primary concern of the County. Examples of quality of life issues include: loss of privacy, neighborhood incompatibility, loss of sunlight, increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods (not exceeding traffic thresholds), and nuisance noise levels (not exceeding noise thresholds). The Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual provides that quality of life issues shall be determined on a case-by-case basis and that quality of life impacts shall be significant "where a substantial physical impact to the quality of the human environment is demonstrated".

No residential neighborhoods or areas of human inhabitation are present on the Project Site. In addition, no public views or other factors contributing to quality of life would be affected by the Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, or Partial Gravel Removal Alternative. Furthermore, the Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not create a physical impact that would reduce the quality of the human environment.

3.11.9 Schools

The Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual considers a significant impact on schools to occur when a project would generate sufficient students to require an

additional classroom. This threshold assumes a classroom size of 29 students for elementary school and junior high, and a classroom size of 28 students for high school.

The Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not impact schools; they do not propose any new structural development generating student population.

3.11.10 Utilities and Service Systems

According to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would have a significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems if the project:

- a) *Exceeded the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board*
- b) *Required or resulted in the construction of new water, storm water, or wastewater treatment or drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects*
- c) *Would not be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs*
- d) *Would not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste*

The Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would not require wastewater treatment or additional water supply. The No Project Alternative and Partial Gravel Removal Alternative would involve removal of only gravel, which would be stockpiled in an existing materials yard.