

CHAPTER I
Executive Summary

1 The following Executive Summary is presented as required by CEQA Guidelines Section
2 15123, including a definition of areas of known controversy, issues raised by agencies
3 and the public, unresolved issues, and project significant effects and proposed
4 mitigation measures.

5 **A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

6 The Lakeview Promenade project is located on the northwest corner of South Broadway
7 (State Highway 135) and Skyway Drive, in the Santa Maria. The 9.4-acre site is bounded
8 by Skyway Drive to the south, South Broadway to the east, Mercury Drive (proposed to
9 be renamed “Villa Drive”) to the north, and Auto Park Drive (proposed to be renamed
10 “Lakeview Promenade Drive”) to the west.

11 The proposed project is a mixed use commercial, residential, office, and entertainment
12 project on a site totaling 9.4 acres. The project development is delineated as follows: 266
13 condominiums; approximately 40,000 sf of retail space; approximately 14,000 sf for
14 restaurant use; approximately 14,000 sf for use as a spa/fitness/physical health care
15 facility; and a 250-seat movie theater.

16 **B. AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY**

17 Through the Notice of Preparation process and general community discussion, the City
18 of Santa Maria is aware of public concerns regarding traffic congestion and traffic safety,
19 from a project of this magnitude, and at this location. Section IV-A of this EIR analyzes
20 traffic issues, giving due concerns to these issues.

21 **C. ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

22 Air Quality: Operation of the proposed project would generate air pollutant on-road
23 vehicle trip ozone precursors including reactive organic compounds and nitrogen oxide
24 emissions exceeding 25 lbs./day. Emissions of these emissions from project operations,
25 in combination with emissions from other probable future proposed and approved
26 projects in the region, would exacerbate the existing ozone and particulate matter
27 nonattainment status within the County.

28 **D. SUMMARY IMPACT TABLES, UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

29 Four tables are provided that present a summary of potential environmental effects
30 identified in this EIR, including the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts,
31 resulting from proposed project implementation. Mitigation measures are numbered
32 sequentially by resource, such that they can have a different number from the associated
33 impact (e.g., **Impact AQ-2** is addressed by Mitigation Measure **AQ-1**, etc.)

34 Table I-1 identifies potentially significant environmental impacts that can be fully
35 mitigated to a level below significance;

36 Table I-2 identifies potential effects which can be fully mitigated, but only through the
37 actions of other public agencies;

38 Table I-3 identifies potentially significant environmental impacts which may require
39 mitigation measures, but those measures cannot reduce impacts to a level below
40 significance; and

- 1 Table I-4 summarizes potential effects that were found not to be significant as they
- 2 would not exceed local thresholds of significance defined in this EIR.

- 1 **Summary of Potential Effects Which Can be Mitigated**
- 2 Items in Table I-1 below represent potentially significant environmental effects that can be fully mitigated to a level below
- 3 significance, as described in Section 21081(a)(1) of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Table I-1. Summary of Potential Effects Which Can be Mitigated		
<i>Significant Effect (SE)</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures (MM)</i>	<i>Reasons Why Mitigation Was Found to be Effective</i>
SE TRANS-1: The proposed project would generate additional vehicle trips during the P.M. peak hour that would degrade the Skyway Drive/ Auto Park Drive intersection below LOS D.	MM TRANS-1: The Planned Development Permit(s) shall include the following requirement: The applicant shall fund and construct a traffic signal at the Skyway Drive/ Auto Park Drive (proposed Lakeview Promenade Drive) intersection. The new signal at Skyway Drive/ Auto Park Drive would need to be inter-connected with the State Route 135/Skyway-Lakeview signal so that traffic flows can be coordinated between the two intersections.	This is a standard engineering condition developed through direct consultation with Mr. Rodger Olds of the City of Santa Maria Public Works Department, based on the City’s expert assessment of the way in which the actions are capable of reducing adverse transportation effects.
SE TRANS-2: Proposed project traffic would add 46 peak hour trips to the Betteravia Road/Skyway Drive intersection that would operate at LOS D under Project + Cumulative conditions, exceeding SBCAG CMP level of service standards.	Imposition of MM TRANS-1 would address this effect as well.	
SE TRANS-4: Proposed project traffic could increase existing hazards affecting bicyclists and pedestrians travelling to and from public schools in the project site vicinity.	MM TRANS-2: The Planned Development Permit(s) shall include the following requirement: The applicant shall provide appropriate funding to ensure that the following improvements are constructed along Lakeview Road: a. Complete sidewalks extending across the frontage of one residential parcel of about 135 feet in the vicinity of the Lakeview Junior High school crossing at the Marvin Street intersection, on the north side of Lakeview Road between Marvin Street, and the sidewalk that is present adjacent to the Spencer's Market parking lot.	These are standard engineering conditions developed by the ATE, EIR transportation consultant, based on the transportation engineering profession’s expert assessment of the way in which the actions are capable of reducing adverse transportation effects.

Table I-1. Summary of Potential Effects Which Can be Mitigated		
<i>Significant Effect (SE)</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures (MM)</i>	<i>Reasons Why Mitigation Was Found to be Effective</i>
SE TRANS-4 (cont).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Install a sidewalk extending across three residential parcels of about 255 feet on the south side of Lakeview Road, between Lindalee Street and the sidewalk that is present along the north side of the vacant parcel to the west. c. Add signage in the vicinity of the Lakeview Road/Orcutt Road intersection to direct pedestrians to use the crosswalk at Marvin Street. d. Add a flashing yellow light at the existing sidewalk at the Lakeview Road/Marvin Street intersection. 	<p>These are standard engineering conditions developed by ATE, the EIR transportation consultant, based on the transportation engineering profession’s expert assessment of the way in which the actions are capable of reducing adverse transportation effects.</p>
SE TRANS-5: Proposed project development, when combined with cumulative buildout traffic levels, would result in degrading the Skyway Drive/ Auto Park Drive (proposed Lakeview Promenade Drive) intersection to LOS F.	Imposition of MM TRANS-1 would address this effect as well.	

Table I-1. Summary of Potential Effects Which Can be Mitigated

<i>Significant Effect (SE)</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures (MM)</i>	<i>Reasons Why Mitigation Was Found to be Effective</i>
<p>SE AQ-5: Proposed project commercial uses would have the potential to generate odor, noxious fume, toxic compound, and/or toxic particulate impacting adjacent on-site and off-site receptors.</p>	<p>MM AQ-2: The Planned Development Permit(s) shall include the following on-site design requirements: The City shall approve an Odor Abatement Plan (OAP) as part of the project lease agreement terms for businesses that operate odorous emission sources (e.g., businesses with truck loading docks). The APCD would review the OAP for adequacy in mitigating potential nuisance odor impacts from the project. OAPs should include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Name and telephone number of contact person(s) at the facility responsible for logging in and responding to odor complaints. b. Policy and procedure describing the actions to be taken when an odor complaint is received, including the training provided to the staff on how to respond. c. Description of potential odor sources at the facility. d. Description of potential methods for reducing odors, including minimizing idling of delivery and service trucks and buses, process changes, facility modifications and/or feasible add-on air pollution control equipment. e. Contingency measures to curtail emissions in the event of a public nuisance complaint. 	<p>The mitigation measures are standard APCD condition developed through direct consultation with Ms. Vijaya Jammalamadaka of the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District. They are based on the District’s expert assessment of the way in which the actions are capable of reducing adverse odors.</p>
<p>SE NOISE-1: Construction activities would result in substantial, short-term increases in existing single family residential ambient over 60 dB CNEL and exterior commercial noise levels in excess of 65 dB CNEL within the project vicinity.</p>	<p>MM NOISE-1: The Planned Development Permit(s) shall include the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stationary construction equipment that generates noise that exceeds 60 dBA at the northern, eastern, and southern project boundaries shall be shielded with the most modern and effective noise control devices (i.e., mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures to City’s satisfaction). b. Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project demolition shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed-air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed-air exhaust shall be used. In general, quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, 	<p>These are standard operating procedures that are routinely implemented to address construction equipment activities and operational design considerations by the City of Santa Maria.</p>

Table I-1. Summary of Potential Effects Which Can be Mitigated

<i>Significant Effect (SE)</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures (MM)</i>	<i>Reasons Why Mitigation Was Found to be Effective</i>
<p>SE NOISE-1 (cont).</p>	<p>whenever feasible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. All equipment shall be properly maintained to ensure that no additional noise, due to worn or improperly maintained parts, is generated. d. Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, a “noise disturbance coordinator” shall be designated by the developer. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures such that the complaint is resolved. e. Notices shall be sent to sensitive receptor (residential and educational) addresses within 300 feet of the construction site at least 48 hours in advance of the commencement of any construction activity. The notice shall list the telephone number for the disturbance coordinator so that community concerns can be communicated and resolved. f. Stockpiling, dirt hauling routes and vehicle staging areas shall be placed as far as practical from sensitive noise receptors. Every effort shall be made to create the greatest distance between noise sources and sensitive receptors during construction activities. g. All construction equipment shall be turned off when not in use. 	
<p>SE NOISE-2: Proposed project sensitive receptor interior area noise levels could exceed 45 dBA CNEL.</p>	<p>MM NOISE-2: The Planned Development Permit(s) shall include the following requirements: The design for the residential units in Building 4 that face State Route 135 shall enable closure of windows to achieve the City of Santa Maria Noise Element 45 CNEL interior noise standard. These units shall include a means by which adequate ventilation can be provided with the windows closed, i.e., mechanical ventilation and/or air-conditioning. The mechanical ventilation shall be in accordance with the latest addition of the California Building Code.</p>	<p>These are standard operating procedures that are routinely implemented to address construction equipment activities and operational design considerations by the City of Santa Maria.</p>

Table I-1. Summary of Potential Effects Which Can be Mitigated

<i>Significant Effect (SE)</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures (MM)</i>	<i>Reasons Why Mitigation Was Found to be Effective</i>
<p>SE NOISE-3: The proposed project operation could increase the existing noise levels experienced by adjacent receptors by over 5 dBA CNEL.</p>	<p>MM NOISE-3: The Planned Development Permit(s) shall include the following requirements: Commercial land uses design and equipment selection shall be determined by a detailed acoustical analysis undertaken by a City-qualified acoustical engineer. Detailed equipment location, capacities, and noise levels shall be considered in defining equipment location. Equipment such as restaurants and kitchen exhaust fans shall be located as far as possible from on-site and off-site noise sensitive areas and shall take advantage of noise shielding provided by structures or sound walls, and/or be located in mechanical rooms or in acoustically designed enclosures as necessary to reduce the fan noise levels in compliance with City Noise Element standards. Additional standard design measures shall potentially include lower-speed reduced-noise fans, installing mufflers, or acoustical lining in both the air intake and discharge sides of the fans, etc.</p>	<p>The measure contains standard operating procedures that are routinely implemented by the City of Santa Maria Public Works Department to address construction equipment activities and operational design considerations.</p>

- 1 **Summary of Potential Effects For Which Mitigation is Provided by Other Public Agencies**
- 2 Items in Table I-2 represent potential effects which can be fully mitigated, but only through the actions of other public agencies, as
- 3 described in Section 21081(a)(1) of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Table I-2. Summary of Potential Effects For Which Mitigation is Provided by Other Public Agencies	
<i>Significant Effect (SE)</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure (MM)</i>
Not Applicable, as there are no such impacts.	Not Applicable.

Summary of Potential Effects Which Cannot be Mitigated to a Level Below Significance

1
2 Items in Table I-3 represent potentially significant environmental impacts which may require mitigation measures, but those
3 measures cannot reduce impacts to a level below significance, as described in Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Environmental
4 Quality Act.

Table I-3. Summary of Potential Effects Which Cannot be Mitigated to a Level Below Significance

<i>Significant Effect (SE)</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure (MM)</i>	<i>Reasons Why Mitigation Was Found to be Effective</i>	<i>Reasons Why Mitigation Was Found Not Capable of Reducing Effect to a Level Below Significant</i>
<p>SE AQ-2: Operation of the proposed project would generate air pollutant on-road vehicle trip ROC and NOX emissions exceeding 25 lbs./day..</p>	<p>MM AQ-1: The Planned Development Permit(s) shall include the following on-site design requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. For bicyclists, theft proof and well-lighted bicycle storage facilities with convenient access to building entrances, on-site bikeways between buildings or uses, showers and locker facilities. b. For carpool and vanpools, provide preferential parking. c. For neighborhood commercial uses, include childcare, food services, postal machines, and banking services. d. Encourage ridesharing and vanpooling for residents and commercial employees to address the benefits of alternative transportation methods. e. Encourage residential structure orientation to maximize exposure and potential for solar energy use. f. Install low volatile organic compounds (VOC)-emitting landscaping (i.e., trees) that generate less VOC emissions g. Green building technologies such as structural orientation and use of construction materials that maximize passive solar exposures. 	<p>These measures are standard APCD conditions and measures. These measures, developed through direct consultation with Ms. Vijaya Jammalamadaka of the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, are based on the District’s expert assessment of the way in which the actions are capable of reducing adverse air quality emissions.</p>	<p>The air quality ROC and NOX emissions after implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would continue to exceed 25 lbs./day.</p>

Table I-3. Summary of Potential Effects Which Cannot be Mitigated to a Level Below Significance

<i>Significant Effect (SE)</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure (MM)</i>	<i>Reasons Why Mitigation Was Found to be Effective</i>	<i>Reasons Why Mitigation Was Found Not Capable of Reducing Effect to a Level Below Significant</i>
<p>Emissions of ROC, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions from project operations, in combination with emissions from other probable future proposed and approved projects in the region, would exacerbate the existing O₃ and PM₁₀ nonattainment status within the County.</p>	<p>The project would be conditioned to comply with APCD standard measures to reduce vehicular emissions and many would have incrementally less than significant impacts.</p> <p>Imposition of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would address this effect as well.</p>	<p>These measures are standard APCD conditions and measures. These measures, developed through direct consultation with Ms. Vijaya Jammalamadaka of the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, are based on the District’s expert assessment of the way in which the actions are capable of reducing adverse air quality emissions.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1, maximizing the use of alternative transportation modes and increasing design standards to reduce VOC emissions, would reduce the project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts.</p> <p>However, the combined, cumulative effect of these projects on ROC, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions would be significant and not mitigable. As the project’s mitigated contribution to the cumulative ROC, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions would exceed thresholds set by the APCD, the project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would be cumulatively considerable.</p>

1 **Summary of Potential Effects Which Have Been Found Not to be Significant**

2 Items in Table I-4 represent potential effects that were found not to be significant. Therefore, in accordance with Section 15128 of the
 3 CEQA Guidelines, no mitigation measures are required.

Table I-4. Summary of Potential Effects Which Have Been Found Not to be Significant	
<i>Effect</i>	<i>Reasons Why Effect Was Not Found Significant</i>
Potentially increase hazards resulting from proposed project access points in the vicinity of the State Route 135/Skyway Drive intersection.	The proposed project’s driveways, turn pockets, and median modifications would be consistent with City of Santa Maria and Caltrans standards for site access within the vicinity of the State Route 135/Skyview Drive intersection
Short-term grading producing fugitive dust PM10 emissions and equipment, generating criteria air pollutant emissions would contribute to the existing non-attainment PM10- status.	Standard conditions of approval from the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District would ensure impacts would be less than significant
Short-term grading producing fugitive dust PM10 emissions and equipment, generating criteria air pollutant emissions would contribute to the existing non-attainment PM10- status.	Standard conditions of approval from the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District would ensure impacts would be less than significant
Operations from potential commercial land uses would not result in significant public health risks.	Any proposed commercial business capable of generating toxic air contaminants would be required to comply with standard APCD and/or CARB health risk measures and procedures.
Proposed project operation would be consistent with the adopted federal and state air quality plans for the County, including the 2007 Clean Air Action Plan (CAP).	The project would generate fewer vehicle trips and associated emissions than what are assumed in these plans. Since the project also would mitigate project traffic with CAP Transportation Control Measures and would comply with APCD rules and regulations, the project would be consistent with the CAP.
The proposed project operation would not increase the existing noise levels resulting from vehicular traffic of adjacent areas by over 5 dBA CNEL.	Associated noise levels experienced by off-site noise sensitive receptors resulting from on-site residential and commercial buildout, and off-site increases in vehicular traffic would increase the noise levels by less than one dB.
Project + cumulative traffic noise would not increase proposed sensitive receptor exterior area noise levels above 65 dB CNEL.	All exterior commercial noise areas would not exceed 65 dB CNEL under cumulative conditions. In addition, exterior multi-family residential noise areas would not exceed 75 dB CNEL.

Table I-4. Summary of Potential Effects Which Have Been Found Not to be Significant	
<i>Effect</i>	<i>Reasons Why Effect Was Not Found Significant</i>
The proposed project operation along with cumulative development would not increase the existing noise levels of adjacent areas by over 5 dBA CNEL.	Associated noise levels experienced by off-site noise sensitive receptors resulting from cumulative on-site residential and commercial buildout and off-site increases in vehicular traffic would increase the noise levels by less than one dB.
The proposed project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 such that proposed excavations would not create a known significant hazard to the public or the environment.	As the proposed project site is not identified on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the potential for construction grading to encroach within known hazardous materials is less than significant.
No evidence of subsurface hazardous material contamination is known onsite, but could potentially be encountered during excavations.	Conformance with standard Santa Barbara County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Unit clean-up procedures and best management practices would ensure potential effects are less than significant.
Demolition and removal of structures could result in the dispersion of asbestos fibers.	Conformance with standard California Air Resources Board and Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District asbestos removal measures would ensure potential effects resulting from encountering asbestos-containing materials are less than significant.
Project buildout could result in the release of hazardous materials due to storage and use of such substances.	Storage of hazardous materials within residential units would be minimal or be managed by professionals with knowledge of standard hazardous materials handling requirements. The City Fire Department would regulate commercial use hazardous materials pursuant to the Uniform Fire Code.
Proposed project land uses would be potentially consistent with ALUP guidelines for development within the Santa Maria Public Airport Influence Area (AIA) Safety Area 3, Airport Traffic Pattern Zone.	Proposed residential land uses would be in Safety Area 3 and outside of Santa Maria Public Airport approach zones such that potential effects related to airport flight hazards would be less than significant.
The City of Santa Maria would have sufficient water supplies to serve the proposed project, and no new or expanded entitlements would be needed.	The proposed project’s increased demand on water supplies of 3.69 AFY would be not substantial relative to that projected in the City Urban Water Management Plan for current commercial land use designations, and the City would have available supplies of 49,710 AFY, well in excess of the city demand.
Proposed project stormwater runoff and drainage would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	Operational standard SWQMP BMPs directed at minimizing sources of operational, long-term stormwater pollution, including providing onsite treatment of stormwater runoff and minimizing storm-water runoff, would ensure that long-term impacts on storm water quality would be less than significant.