2045 General Plan

Final Environmental Impact Report

State Clearinghouse Number: 2023060448

prepared by

City of Solvang
Planning Division
411 2nd Street
Solvang, California 93463
Contact: Rafael Castillo, AICP, Planning and Building Manager

prepared with the assistance of

Rincon Consultants, Inc.
319 East Carrillo Street, Suite 105
Santa Barbara, California 93101

May 2024

RINCON CONSULTANTS, INC. SINCE 1994

Table of Contents

This page intentionally left blank.

1 Introduction

1.1 Final EIR Contents

This Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) has been prepared by the City of Solvang Planning Division (City) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed General Plan Update (referred to in this EIR as "2045 General Plan" or "proposed project").

As prescribed by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) *Guidelines* Sections 15088 and 15132, the lead agency, the City, is required to evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who have reviewed the Draft EIR and to prepare written responses to those comments. This document, together with the Draft EIR (incorporated by reference) comprise the Final EIR for this project. This Final EIR includes individual responses to each letter received during the public review period for the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15088(c), the written responses describe the disposition of significant environmental issues raised.

The City has provided a good faith effort to respond to all significant environmental issues raised by the comments. The Final EIR also includes amendments to the Draft EIR consisting of changes suggested by certain comments, as well as minor clarifications, corrections, or revisions to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR includes the following contents:

- Section 1: Introduction
- Section 2: Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR, which also includes a list of all commenters and public comment letters
- Section 3: Amendments to the Draft EIR
- Section 4: Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program
- Appendices, which includes revised appendices

1.2 Draft EIR Public Review Process

The City filed a notice of completion (NOC) with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to begin the 46-day public review period (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21161), which began on February 29, 2024 and ended on April 15, 2024. The Draft EIR was made available on the City's website (https://plansolvang.com/). A notice of availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR was published on February 29, 2024. As a result of these notification efforts, written and verbal comments on the content of the Draft EIR were received from four State and local agencies, one organization, and six individuals. Section 2, "Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR," identifies these commenting parties, their respective comments, and responses to these comments. None of the comments received, or the responses provided, constitute "significant new information" by CEQA standards (State CEQA Guidelines CCR Section 15088.5).

1.3 EIR Certification Process and Project Approval

Before adopting the proposed project, the lead agency is required to certify that the EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the EIR, and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

Upon certification of an EIR, the lead agency makes a decision on the project analyzed in the EIR. A lead agency may: (a) disapprove a project because of its significant environmental effects; (b) require changes to a project to reduce or avoid significant environmental effects; or (c) approve a project despite its significant environmental effects, if the proper findings and statement of overriding considerations are adopted (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15042, 15043, 15091, 15093).

In approving a project, for each significant impact of the project identified in the EIR, the lead or responsible agency must find, based on substantial evidence, that either: (a) the project has been changed to avoid or substantially reduce the magnitude of the impact; (b) changes to the project are within another agency's jurisdiction and such changes have or should be adopted; or (c) specific economic, social, or other considerations make the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091). Per PRC Section 21061.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15364, feasible means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account, economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.

If an agency approves a project with unavoidable significant environmental effects, it must prepare a written Statement of Overriding Considerations that sets forth the specific social, economic, or other reasons supporting the agency's decision and explains why the project's benefits outweigh the significant environmental effects (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093). Because the proposed project has identified unavoidable significant environmental effects, Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be made by the City.

When an agency makes findings on significant effects identified in the EIR, it must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures that were adopted or made conditions of project approval to mitigate significant effects (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091[d]). Section 4 of this Final EIR contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

1.4 Draft EIR Recirculation Not Required

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires Draft EIR recirculation when comments on the Draft EIR or responses thereto identify "significant new information." Significant new information is defined as including:

1. A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
2. A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
3. A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
4. The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

The comments, responses, and Draft EIR amendments presented in this document do not constitute such "significant new information;" instead, they clarify, amplify, or make insignificant modifications to the Draft EIR. For example, none of the comments, responses, and Draft EIR amendments disclose new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects of the proposed project,

or new feasible mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Draft EIR that would clearly lessen the proposed project's significant effects.

2 Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

This section includes comments received during public circulation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the 2045 General Plan (Project).

The Draft EIR was circulated for a 46-day public review period that began on February 29, 2024 and ended on April 15, 2024. The City of Solvang received 11 comment letters on the Draft EIR. The commenters and the page number on which each commenter's letter appear are listed below.

The comment letters and responses follow. The comment letters are numbered sequentially and each separate issue raised by the commenter, if more than one, has been assigned a number. The responses to each comment identify first the number of the comment letter, and then the number assigned to each issue (Response 1.1, for example, indicates that the response is for the first issue raised in Comment Letter 1).

Where a comment resulted in a change to the Draft EIR text, a notation is made in the response indicating that the text is revised. Changes in text are signified by strikeout font (~~strikeout font~~) where text was removed and by underlined font (<u>underlined font</u>) where text was added. These changes in text are also included in Section 3, *Revisions to the Draft EIR*.

SUZANNE ELLEDGE
PLANNING & PERMITTING SERVICES, INC.

Letter 1

20 March 2024

City of Solvang
Planning Division
Attn: Rafael Castillo, Planning Manager
411 Second Street
Solvang, CA 93463

Via email to:
plansolvang@cityofsolvang.com
rcastillo@cityofsolvang.com

Subject: **Public Comment**
2045 Solvang General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Dear Rafael:

On behalf of the owners of Alisal Ranch, SEPPS respectfully submits the following public comment on the 2045 Solvang General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The area of the Alisal Ranch that lies within the City of Solvang is located at 1054 Alisal Road/APN 137-310-010. 1

Comments provided herein are consistent with previously submitted comments dated January 3, 2024 related to the Public Review Draft of the 2045 General Plan. We continue to be concerned that the Public Review Draft General Plan, and now the Draft EIR, fail to acknowledge existing agricultural land use on the southern portion of APN 137-310-010 where there are existing equestrian and cattle grazing areas and ag and equestrian/cattle support facilities and structures. Alisal Ranch has been operating as a working ranch on the subject parcel and adjacent parcels since 1946. Agriculture is a defining component of the Ranch's operation and long-standing history in the community, and is important to the guest ranch experience which is a cornerstone of the City's tourism sector. Enclosed is a screen shot of an aerial photo of this area for reference; note grazing, pens, stables, barns, equestrian facilities, and ag support structures. 2

Comments on the General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) are as follows:

Project Description - Table 2-3 Proposed Land Use Designations (page 2-13)

Consistent with our previous comment letter related to the Public Review Draft 2045 General Plan, it is important that the proposed definition of "Guest Ranch" (which is proposed to be applied to the property) be revised to reflect ag uses as follows: 3

> ***"Guest Ranch (GR):*** *This designation is established to recognize the approximately 30 acres of the Alisal Ranch located within the city. Allowed uses include guest lodging, employee housing, restaurants, ~~and~~ recreation and entertainment, and agriculture."*

3 (cont.)

Section 4.18.1 - Effects Found Not to be Significant – Agricultural and Forestry Resources – Assessment of Impacts (bottom page 4.18-1 and top page 4.18-2)

The paragraph at the bottom of page 4.18-1 indicates the Ranch property within the City "*is not currently used for agriculture*". This is not accurate, as discussed above and as can be seen on the aerial photo of the southern portion of APN 137-310-010. There are existing equestrian and cattle grazing areas and ag and equestrian/cattle support facilities and structures.

4

The paragraph at the top of page 4.18-2 also fails to acknowledge existing ag uses and activity, and highlights why (pursuant to our previous comment letter and discussed above) it is important that the proposed land use definition of "Guest Ranch" be revised to reflect ag uses.

We again request that the "Guest Ranch" land use definition in the Draft General Plan be revised and the text at the bottom of page 4.18-1 and the top of page 4.18-2 of the Draft EIR be revised to reflect existing and future ag use and that implementation of the 2045 General Plan will avoid conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use; the Guest Ranch land use designation for Alisal Ranch would simply continue to include ag uses.

5

For reference, the currently applicable "Agriculture/Guest Ranch" land use designation as described in the 2008 General Plan as follows:

> *"This General Plan designation is intended to recognize the Alisal Ranch as a unique use in the community. The Alisal Ranch is a working ranch that encompasses over 10,000 acres of which only approximately 29.8 acres are within the City of Solvang. The area within the City includes lodging with 66 units, employee housing, equestrian facilities, two dining rooms, a lounge / cocktail lounge, tennis club, golf course, and golf club. The current Conditional Use Permit for the facility allows a total of 75 guest units. This land use designation does not infer expansion of the facility for any kind of commercial or retail use, and limits the number of guest units allowed to 100."*

Alisal Ranch has been operating as a working ranch on the subject parcel and adjacent parcels since 1946. Agriculture is a defining component of the Ranch's operation and long-standing history in the community, and is important to the guest ranch experience which is a cornerstone of the City's tourism sector. The guest ranch experience also promotes agritourism through equestrian activities on APN 137-310-010 and equestrian activities, hiking, mountain biking, and fishing on adjacent parcels that are not currently within the City's boundary.

6

As Alisal Ranch continues to function as a guest ranch and a working agricultural operation, it is critical the 2045 General Plan and the related EIR identify agricultural uses as a key component of their existing and future land use designation.

These proposed revisions are necessary to accurately reflect existing and future land uses at the subject property, but also ensures adoption of the 2045 General Plan does not result in the creation of nonconforming uses at Alisal Ranch, which could result in limitations on expanding agricultural uses in the future. 7

■ ■ ■

We appreciate the City's consideration of these comments. We believe the revisions requested in the comments above are appropriate and necessary to accurately characterize existing land uses and operations at Alisal Ranch. Should you have any questions or require additional information regarding these requested updates, please contact me at (805) 966-2758 x101 or stevef@sepps.com.

Sincerely,
SUZANNE ELLEDGE
PLANNING & PERMITTING SERVICES, INC.

Steven M. Fort
Senior Planner

Cc: Kathleen Cochran, James Jackson, Charles Jackson - Alisal Ranch


Sharon Pl
Sharon Pl
Sharon Pl
Alisal Rd
Alisal Rd
Alisal Rd
Alisal Creek

Letter 1

COMMENTER: Steven M. Fort, Senior Planner, *Suzanne Elledge, Planning and Permitting Services, Inc.*

DATE: March 20, 2024

Response 1.1

The commenter notes that they are commenting on behalf of the owners of Alisal Ranch.

This comment is noted.

Response 1.2

The commenter notes that the Public Review Draft General Plan and Draft EIR do not acknowledge that existing agricultural land use occurs on Alisal Ranch. A screenshot is attached to show the activities that occur on the ranch as stated by the commenter.

This comment has been noted and passed on to decision makers for consideration. The City plans to address this in a revision to the 2045 General Plan and proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments that will implement the General Plan. The commenter's suggestions and the corresponding changes in the 2045 General Plan regarding existing land uses at Alisal Ranch and proposed definitions of the term Guest Ranch do not pertain to the conclusions of the environmental analysis in the DEIR.

Response 1.3

The commenter suggests a revision of the "Guest Ranch" definition to include agriculture.

This comment has been noted and passed on to decision makers for consideration. The City plans to address this in a revision to the 2045 General Plan. The commenter's suggestions regarding existing land uses at Alisal Ranch and proposed definitions of the term Guest Ranch do not alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis in the DEIR.

Response 1.4

The commenter suggests a revision to the bottom of page 4.18-1 which states that the Ranch property is not currently used for agriculture to reflect the agricultural activities mentioned by the commenter.

This comment has been noted and passed on to decision makers for consideration. The City plans to address this in a revision to the 2045 General Plan. The commenter's suggestions regarding existing land uses at Alisal Ranch and proposed definitions of the term Guest Ranch do not alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis in the DEIR.

Response 1.5

The commenter suggests a revision on page 4.18-2 to update the definition of "Guest Ranch" to reflect the existing and future agricultural land uses. The commenter cites the 2008 General Plan as a reference.

This comment has been noted and passed on to decision makers for consideration. The City plans to address this in a revision to the 2045 General Plan. The commenter's suggestions regarding existing

land uses at Alisal Ranch and proposed definitions of the term Guest Ranch do not alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis in the DEIR.

Response 1.6

The commenter notes that Alisal Ranch has been a working ranch since 1946 and adds the agritourism and recreational activities associated with the Ranch.

This comment has been noted and passed on to decision makers for consideration. The commenter's suggestions regarding existing land uses at Alisal Ranch and proposed definitions of the term Guest Ranch do not pertain to the conclusions of the environmental analysis in the DEIR.

Response 1.7

The commenter summarizes their suggestions and expresses appreciation for the opportunity to review.

This comment is noted.

Letter 2

From: Josh Richman <jjrichman@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 2:46 PM
To: General Plan <plansolvang@cityofsolvang.com>
Subject: Comments on Draft EIR - Clarifications as to Site C and Alternatives 3 & 4

Dear Rafael,

I have the following comments on the February 2024 Draft EIR for the General Plan Update.

1. Clarification as to the EIR "Project Description" Pertaining to Site C. Page ES-3 of the draft EIR includes "Site C" within the scope of the environmental review. The description of Site C on that page identifies three possible future uses for the site:

- 11-14 housing units under a 20-R-1 current zoning designation.

- 40-50 housing units on the "lower half" of the site at a zoning of DR-20 with the "other half of the site designated for 20-R-1 or Open Space".

- An "alternative plan" for 109 housing units as proposed by a plan submitted by the landowner.

An "Alternative 3" is later described on page ES-6 as "No Alamo Pintado Project." It is unclear which of the above three possible future uses for the site was considered for the main project vs the Alternative 3. If by "Alamo Pintado Project" the environmental document intends to refer to the 109-unit plan submitted by the landowner (depicted in Appendix B to the draft EIR), then I believe this could be clarified on pages ES-3, ES-6, 2-9, 2-10, 4.7-17, 6-19, 6-36, and elsewhere in the report where appropriate. This way, Alternative 3 "No Alamo Pintado Project" will be clearly understood to mean no 109-unit project as proposed by the developer.

1

2. Clarification as to the Meaning of "2045 General Plan" as to Site C. Page ES-6 states that: "*Alternative 3 (No Alamo Pintado Project) would involve implementation of the 2045 General Plan and exclusion of the Alamo Pintado site as an area of potential growth. [….] Under Alternative 3, the proposed Alamo Pintado Project would not be implemented, and the zoning and General Plan designations would not change from the existing designations."*

As stated above, how Site C is treated in the 2045 General Plan, and how it was studied, is ambiguous and should be clarified. While Site C is currently zoned 20-R-1 and has been zoned this way for more than 30 years, the City Council just voted in 2023 to designate the "lower half" of Site C DR-20 (high density residential) for its 2023-2031 Housing Element Update. It is my understanding that the City Council intends to vote to rezone the "lower half" of the site in Summer 2024. Therefore, it would seem that "implementing the 2045 General Plan as to Site C" would necessarily need to consider the environmental impacts of rezoning the "lower half" of Site C to DR-20 while keeping the upper half 20-R-1. 2

3. Clarification as to Alternative 3. Alternative 3, described on ES-6, explains that "No Alamo Pintado Project" means that "*the zoning and General Plan designations would not change from the existing designations*" but that "*housing could still be built on the Alamo Pintado Project site, for a total of 2 units and 5 new residents*." It goes on to say that "*Alternative 3 would result in…107 fewer housing units in Solvang in 2045."*

It is unclear how these numbers were derived. 3

The existing zoning designation for Site C is 20-R-1, which would permit one single family residence per 20,000 square feet of lot area. Site C is approx. 5.5 acres or approximately 239,580 square feet. Therefore, under the existing zoning designation, 11 single family housing units would be allowable.

The zoning designation being proposed by the City in its 2023-2031 Housing Element Update contemplates DR-20 for the lower half of the site while retaining 20-R-1 zoning for the upper half. This would mean 40-50 housing units on the lower half and 4-5 housing units on the top half.

The zoning designation being proposed by the developer is DR-20 for the entire site, totaling 109 residential units.

Please provide clarification on how the projected buildout figures in Alternative 3 were arrived at, or revise them to be in line with the buildout figures that align with the current zoning.

3 (cont.)

4. Clarification as to Alternative 4. Since Alternative 3 and 4 both contemplate "No Alamo Pintado Project" any change made to Alternative 3 should also be applied to Alternative 4.

4

This concludes my comments on the draft Program EIR.

Sincerely,

Josh Richman
805-350-1791

Letter 2

COMMENTER: Josh Richman

DATE: March 28, 2024

Response 2.1

The commenter notes that the DEIR Project Description identifies three possible scenarios for Site C. The commenter requests clarification about which of the three possible future uses for Site C is considered for the project and which is considered for Alternative 3.

The commenter is correct that three possible future uses are envisioned for the site. The landowner's plan for 109 housing units is incorporated into the DEIR analysis in order to evaluate the most conservative (greatest amount of development) scenario. Alternative 3 analyzes the proposed General Plan Update without increased development (compared to existing land uses) at the Alamo Pintado Site in order to provide the City, public, and decision makers the ability to assess the individual project impacts to compare to the overall General Plan impacts.

As described in Section 6, *Alternatives*, of the DEIR, the project as evaluated in the DEIR would involve a zone change on Site C to Design Residential 20 (DR-20). Under the proposed General Plan Update, the project site would have a land use designation of High Density Residential. Under Alternative 3, the proposed Alamo Pintado Project would not be implemented, and the zoning and General Plan designations would not change from the existing designations. However, housing could still be built on the Alamo Pintado Project site.

Response 2.2

The commenter requests clarification on how Site C would be zoned in the proposed 2045 General Plan. The commenter notes that the lower half of Site C is described as DR-20 in the recently certified Housing Element.

As discussed in Response 2.1, there are three possible scenarios for Site C evaluated in the DEIR. The impact analysis in the DEIR assumes a rezone of the full site to DR-20 and the development of the 109-unit Alamo Pintado project, because this scenario provides the most conservative scenario to assess the greatest possible environmental impacts.

Regarding the Housing Element, the purpose of the housing element's site inventory is to identify and analyze specific land (sites) that is available and suitable for residential development in order to determine the jurisdiction's capacity to accommodate residential development and reconcile that capacity with the jurisdiction's Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA). The site inventory enables the jurisdiction to determine whether there are sufficient adequate sites to accommodate the RHNA by income category. A site inventory and analysis determines whether program actions must be adopted to "make sites available" with appropriate zoning, development standards, and infrastructure capacity to accommodate the new development need.

While Site C is included in the site inventory as a vacant site with proposed rezoning in the certified Housing Element and described with only the lower half being rezoned to DR-20, the land use that is proposed in the 2045 General Plan was analyzed as part of the overall buildout scenario in the General Plan EIR. The land use in the final 2045 General Plan, along with the zoning ordinance, will take precedence over the site inventory description in the Housing Element.

As stated on page ES-1 of the DEIR, the project analyzed in the DEIR involves updates to all of the City's existing General Plan Elements, except for the Housing Element which was updated as part of a separate project and adopted in 2023. Therefore, the Housing Element was not included in the DEIR for the General Plan Update.

Response 2.3

The commenter requests clarification about how the number of units for the Alamo Pintado project, and Alternative 3's were determined.

The buildout numbers for proposed development at Site C are detailed on page 6-19. As described therein, the Alamo Pintado Project site is currently vacant. The Alamo Pintado Project, as analyzed in the General Plan Update EIR and proposed by the project applicant, would involve construction of three, three-story apartment buildings featuring one- and two-bedroom units. Building A would include 25 units, Building B would include 38 units, and Building C would include 46 units (for a total of 109 units). The project would include amenities, an open space/drainage basin area, trash enclosures, and 143 parking spaces including 24 private garages.

In response to this comment, Page 6-19 of the DEIR has been revised with the following (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline), for clarification:

> The project site is currently zoned Residential, 20,000 square feet (20-R-1), which allows for single-family residential development, and has a General Plan land use designation of Low/Medium Residential (2 dwelling units per acre, with up to 3 accessory dwelling units). The proposed General Plan Update would involve a zone change to Design Residential 20 (DR-20). Under the proposed General Plan Update, the project site would have a land use designation of High Density Residential.
>
> Although the Alamo Pintado Project would not be included under Alternative 3, this would not preclude development from occurring on the site in the future. There are currently two existing lots and therefore 2 units were assumed to be developed under the existing zoning of Residential, 20,000 square feet (20-R-1), which allows for single-family residential development, and a General Plan land use designation of Low/Medium Residential (2 dwelling units per acre, with up to 3 accessory dwelling units). Based on the zoning of 20-R-1 there is a potential for up to 11 units or lots to be designed for this 5.5-acre property. Additionally, there is potential for Accessory Dwelling Units. This level of development would require the process of a Development Plan and additionally a Tentative Tract Map. These discretionary applications would require process of the applications, environmental review and a public hearing at the Planning Commission.
>
> Under Alternative 3, the proposed Alamo Pintado Project would not be implemented, and the zoning and General Plan designations would not change from the existing designations. However, housing could still be built on the Alamo Pintado Project site, for a total of 2 to 11 units and 5 to 27 new residents.
>
> Therefore, in comparison to the 2045 General Plan's anticipated 2045 population of 7,253 and housing stock of 3,019 units, Alternative 3 would result in 235 to 256 fewer additional residents and 107 to 98 fewer housing units in Solvang in 2045. As a result, the anticipated growth in Solvang would be less than the 2045 General Plan. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would not fulfill the Project Objectives of supporting strategic land uses and diverse housing options.

This revision is included in the DEIR for clarification. These changes do not alter the conclusions of the findings or analysis in the DEIR and do not result in a new or substantial increase in any environmental impacts compared to the DEIR.

Response 2.4

The commenter requests clarification on Alternative 4 because both Alternatives 3 and 4 consider "no Alamo Pintado Project" so changes suggested in this letter for Alternative 3 should apply to Alternative 4 as well.

This comment has been noted.

Letter 3

From: Raether, Constantin@CalOES <Constantin.Raether@CalOES.ca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2024 1:53 PM
To: General Plan <plansolvang@cityofsolvang.com>
Cc: LaMar-Haas, Victoria@CalOES <Victoria.LaMar-Haas@CalOES.ca.gov>; Boemecke, Wendy@CalOES <Wendy.Boemecke@CalOES.ca.gov>; CalOES Mitigation Planning <mitigationplanning@caloes.ca.gov>
Subject: City of Solvang General Plan Update

Good afternoon

The California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Team has taken the time to review the proposed updates/changes to your General Plan. Government Code 65302(g)(8) states "before preparing or revising its Safety Element, each city and county shall consult…. the Office of Emergency Services for the purpose of including information known by and available to the department." 1

The Cal OES Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Team reviews and compares your current Safety Element hazards against those listed in the most recent Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) approved Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJHMP). 2

Our office has reviewed your proposed Safety Element and found no substantive changes to your hazard profiles when compared against the most recent FEMA approved Sant County MJHMP. 3

Please reach out to you our office at mitigationplanning@caloes.ca.gov if you have any further questions or need additional assistance. 4

Regards

Constantin Raether, Associate Environmental Planner
Local Mitigation Planning | Recovery Directorate
California Governor's Office of Emergency Services

Office: (916) 328-7778
Cell: (916) 715-9408
www.caloes.ca.gov/HMGP

Letter 3

COMMENTER: Constantin Raether, Associate Environmental Planner at CalOES

DATE: April 4, 2024

Response 3.1

The commenter states CalOES's obligation to review the safety element.

This comment is noted.

Response 3.2

The commenter states that the CalOES Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Team compared the current Safety Element hazards with those listed by FEMA approved by Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

This comment is noted.

Response 3.3

The commenter states that they found no substantive changes to hazard profiles when compared with the most recent FEMA approved Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

This comment is noted.

Response 3.4

The commenter provides contact information.

This comment is noted.

Letter 4

April 10, 2024

Planning Division, City of Solvang
c/o Rafael Castillo, AICP, Planning and Building Manager
411 2nd Street
Solvang, California

Sent Via Email: plansolvang@cityofsolvang.com

Re: Air Pollution Control District Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Solvang Comprehensive General Plan Update and Rezoning Project

Dear Mr. Castillo:

The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (District) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the City of Solvang Comprehensive General Plan Update and Rezoning. The City proposes to update the City of Solvang General Plan which presents the community's vision for Solvang through 2045. The General Plan serves as the City's primary guide for land use and development decisions and will influence the rezoning of properties to be consistent with the Housing Element and other proposed zoning changes. The General Plan update will include the following elements: Land Use; Community Design; Economic Development; Mobility; Public Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure; Environmental and Sustainability; Safety; and Housing. 1

District staff reviewed the Draft EIR and offers the following comments related to Air Quality:

1. **Page 4.2-12 - 13, Section 4.2.3.b, Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Impact AQ-1:** By definition, consistency with the Ozone Plan for the projects means that direct and indirect emissions associated with the project are accounted for in the Ozone Plan's emissions growth assumptions and the project is consistent with measures that are developed and implemented in accordance with the Ozone Plan. As stated in the District's *Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents* and mentioned at the end of Section 4.2.3.a on page 4.2-11, of the Draft EIR, "any general plan amendment that would provide for increased population growth above that forecasted in the most recently adopted Ozone Plan is inconsistent with the Ozone Plan and may have a significant impact on air quality." Since the 2045 General Plan project would lead to population growth above SBCAG's 2045 population forecast (which is similar to the growth data used by the District[1]), the project is potentially inconsistent with the District's current Ozone Plan. 2

   The District is in the process of developing our next, triannual Ozone Plan. The District's 2025 Ozone Plan will incorporate revised population growth data available since the development of the 2022 Plan, including updated Department of Finance's growth projections, general plan updates, and other available sources. Therefore, the Santa Barbara County growth profiles of the 2025 Ozone Plan will account for the anticipated population growth from the

[1] The 2022 Ozone Plan's Population and Housing growth factors are based on the Department of Finance's growth projections, which are similar to SBCAG's 2050 Regional Growth Forecast values.

Aeron Arlin Genet, Air Pollution Control Officer
(805) 979-8050 | 260 N. San Antonio Rd., Ste. A Santa Barbara, CA 93110 | ourair.org | @OurAirSBC

project. The 2025 Ozone Plan would also incorporate any new control measures necessary to maintain air quality standards. Therefore, due to the required and forthcoming updates to the District's planning document that will consider and address the proposed growth, we agree that growth impacts as a result of the project would be less than significant. 2 (cont.)

2. **Page 4.2-13, Section 4.2.3.b, Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Impact AQ-1, *MM AQ-1 SBCAPCD's Construction Impact Mitigation: PM10 Mitigation Measures*:** The District recommends this measure is updated to be consistent with the District's most current Fugitive Dust Control Measures (see **Attachment A**). 3

3. **Page 4.2-14 - 17, Section 4.2.3.b, Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Impact AQ-2:** The District recommends that the District's recommended measures to reduce diesel particulate and NOx emissions (see **Attachment B**) also be included as required measures to address construction-related impacts, as the currently included measure (MM AQ-1) only addresses impacts from fugitive dust (i.e. PM10/2.5 emissions). 4

4. **Page, 4.2-19, Section 4.2.3.b, Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Impact AQ-3, MM AQ-1 *Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures***: It appears that the mitigation measure identified on page 4.2-19 as "MM AQ_1 Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures" should be numbered as "MM AQ-2" given that the document contains a measure numbered as MM AQ-1 "*SBCAPCD's Construction Impact Mitigation: PM10 Mitigation Measures"* on page 4.2-13. Please revise the mitigation measure numbering as appropriate. 5

5. **Page 4.2-19, Section 4.2.3.b, Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Impact AQ-3, *MM AQ-1 Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures*:** This measure currently requires large construction projects to use equipment meeting CARB Tier 3 or higher for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines. To be consistent with the District's *Diesel Particulate and NO_X Emissions Reduction Measures* (see **Attachment B**) and demonstrate that the impacts from toxic air contaminant exposure are reduced to the maximum extent feasible during project construction, the District recommends that the project be required to employ off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment with engines certified to meet U.S. EPA Tier 4 emission standards whenever commercially available. It should be noted that Tier 4 engines are readily available and comprise the largest group of equipment in use in the state[2]. The District also recommends that this measure include a requirement to employ electric equipment and/or equipment/vehicles powered by alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or renewable diesel, whenever feasible. 6

We hope you find our comments useful. We look forward to reviewing the Final EIR. Please contact me at (805) 979-8302 or via email at wongb@sbcapcd.org if you have questions. 7

[2] South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2023. California Air Resources Board, PowerPoint on Development of Amendments to the In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation, South Coast AQMP Mobile Source Working Group, June 15, 2021. Available at: https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2022-air-quality-management-plan/carb-construction-aqmp-mswg-final-06-15-21.pdf?sfvrsn=14.

Sincerely,

p.p. Carly Barham

Bryan Wong
Air Quality Specialist
Planning Division

Attachments: Fugitive Dust Control Measures
Diesel Particulate and NO_x Emission Measures

cc: Planning Chron File

air pollution control district
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY

ATTACHMENT A
FUGITIVE DUST CONTROL MEASURES

These measures should be required for all projects involving earthmoving activities regardless of the project size or duration. Projects are expected to manage fugitive dust emissions such that emissions do not exceed APCD's visible emissions limit (APCD Rule 302), create a public nuisance (APCD Rule 303), and are in compliance with the APCD's requirements and standards for visible dust (APCD Rule 345).

- During construction, use water trucks, sprinkler systems, or dust suppressants in all areas of vehicle movement to prevent dust from leaving the site and from exceeding the APCD's limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60 minute period. When using water, this includes wetting down areas as needed but at least once in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency should be required when sustained wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. However, reclaimed water should not be used in or around crops for human consumption.
- Onsite vehicle speeds shall be no greater than 15 miles per hour when traveling on unpaved surfaces.
- Install and operate a track-out prevention device where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can include any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out of dirt such as gravel pads, pipe-grid track-out control devices, rumble strips, or wheel-washing systems.
- If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than one day shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.
- Minimize the amount of disturbed area. After clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, treat the disturbed area by watering, OR using roll-compaction, OR revegetating, OR by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible.
- Schedule clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation activities during periods of low wind speed to the extent feasible. During periods of high winds (>25 mph) clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation operations shall be minimized to prevent fugitive dust created by onsite operations from becoming a nuisance or hazard.
- The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor and document the dust control program requirements to ensure any fugitive dust emissions do not result in a nuisance and to enhance the implementation of the mitigation measures as necessary to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or map clearance.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS: All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans and/or as a separate information sheet listing the conditions of approval to be recorded with the map. **Timing**: Requirements shall be shown on plans prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or recorded with the map during map recordation. Conditions shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

MONITORING: The Lead Agency shall ensure measures are on project plans and/or recorded with maps. The Lead Agency staff shall ensure compliance onsite. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.

ATTACHMENT B
DIESEL PARTICULATE AND NO_x EMISSION REDUCTION MEASURES

Particulate emissions from diesel exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the state of California. The following is a list of regulatory requirements and control strategies that should be implemented to the maximum extent feasible.

The following measures are required by state law:

- All portable diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 brake horsepower (bhp) shall be registered with the state's portable equipment registration program OR shall obtain an APCD permit.
- Fleet owners of diesel-powered mobile construction equipment greater than 25 hp are subject to the California Air Resource Board (CARB) In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation (Title 13, California Code of Regulations (CCR), §2449), the purpose of which is to reduce oxides of nitrogen (NOx), diesel particulate matter (DPM), and other criteria pollutant emissions from in-use off-road diesel-fueled vehicles. Off-road heavy-duty trucks shall comply with the State Off-Road Regulation. For more information, see www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/ordiesel.htm.
- Fleet owners of diesel-fueled heavy-duty trucks and buses are subject to CARB's On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles (In-Use) Regulation (Title 13, CCR, §2025), the purpose of which is to reduce DPM, NOx and other criteria pollutants from in-use (on-road) diesel-fueled vehicles. For more information, see www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/onrdiesel.htm.
- All commercial off-road and on-road diesel vehicles are subject, respectively, to Title 13, CCR, §2449(d)(3) and §2485, limiting engine idling time. Off-road vehicles subject to the State Off-Road Regulation are limited to idling no more than five minutes. Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes, unless the truck engine meets the optional low-NOx idling emission standard, the truck is labeled with a clean-idle sticker, and it is not operating within 100 feet of a restricted area.

The following measures are recommended:

- Off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment with engines certified to meet U.S. EPA Tier 4 emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible. Please contact the District if alternative strategies for meeting Tier 4 emission standards are considered.
- On-road heavy-duty equipment with model year 2010 engines or newer should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible. Electric auxiliary power units should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Equipment/vehicles using alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or renewable diesel, should be used on-site where feasible.
- Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.
- The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.
- The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
- Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.
- Construction truck trips should be scheduled during non-peak hours to reduce peak hour emissions whenever feasible.
- Proposed truck routes should minimize impacts to residential communities and sensitive receptors.
- Construction staging areas should be located away from sensitive receptors such that exhaust and other construction emissions do not enter the fresh air intakes to buildings, air conditioners, and windows.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND TIMING: Prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or map recordation, all requirements shall be shown as conditions of approval on grading/building plans, and/or on a separate sheet to be recorded with the map. Conditions shall be adhered to throughout grading and construction periods. The contractor shall retain onsite the Certificate of Compliance for CARB's In-Use Regulation for Off-Road Diesel Vehicles and have it available for inspection.

MONITORING: The Lead Agency shall ensure measures are on project plans and/or recorded with maps. The Lead Agency staff shall ensure compliance onsite. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.

Letter 4

COMMENTER: Bryan Wong, Air Quality Specialist at Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District

DATE: April 10, 2024

Response 4.1

The commenter states appreciation to review the EIR and summarizes the General Plan purpose and components.

This comment is noted.

Response 4.2

The commenter states that the General Plan would potentially be inconsistent with the District's current Ozone Plan due to the Plan increasing the City's population. However, due to the required and upcoming updates to the District's Ozone Plan that will consider and address the proposed growth, the Air Pollution Control District is in agreement that impacts would be less than significant.

This comment is noted.

Response 4.3

The commenter recommends MM AQ-1 be revised to be consistent with the District's most current Fugitive Dust Control Measures, attached to the letter.

In response to this comment, the City has revised mitigation contained in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*. Mitigation Measure AQ-1 on page ES-9 and 4.2-13 of the DEIR has been revised with the following (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline), which reflect SBCAPCD's most current Fugitive Dust Control Measures:

AQ-1 SBCAPCD's Construction Impact Mitigation~~: PM10 Mitigation Measures~~

The applicant shall require all construction contractors to implement the basic construction mitigation measures recommended by SBCAPCD to reduce fugitive dust emissions. These measures should be required for all projects involving earthmoving activities regardless of the project size or duration. Projects are expected to manage fugitive dust emissions such that emissions do not exceed APCD's visible emissions limit (APCD Rule 302), create a public nuisance (APCD Rule 303), and are in compliance with the APCD's requirements and standards for visible dust (APCD Rule 345). Emission reduction measures will include, at a minimum, the following measures:

- During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site and from exceeding SBCAPCD's limit of 20 percent opacity for greater than three minutes in any 30-minute period. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 miles per hour (mph). Reclaimed water shall be used whenever possible. However, reclaimed water shall not be used in or around crops for human consumption.
- The amount of disturbed area shall be minimized.

- On-site vehicle speeds shall be no greater than 15 mph when traveling on unpaved surfaces.
- A track-out prevention device shall be installed and operated where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can include any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out of dirt such as gravel pads, pipe-grid track-out control devices, rumble strips, or wheel washing systems.
- ~~If stockpiling of material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than one day shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.~~
- After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, or using roll-compaction, or revegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. All driveways and sidewalks to be paved/surfaced shall be completed as soon as possible.
- The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SBCAPCD prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or map clearance.
- ~~The project applicant shall comply with SBCAPCD Rule 345: Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities, including all applicable standards and measures therein.~~
- If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than one day shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.
- Schedule clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation activities during periods of low wind speed to the extent feasible. During periods of high winds (>25 mph) clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation operations shall be minimized to prevent fugitive dust created by onsite operations from becoming a nuisance or hazard.

Changes to Mitigation Measure AQ-1 do not rise to the level of "new information" as defined in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, and thus recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required. These changes do not alter the findings or analysis in the DEIR and do not result in a new or substantial increase in any environmental impacts compared to the DEIR.

Response 4.4

The commenter recommends inclusion of the District's recommended measures to reduce diesel particulate and NOx emissions in order to address construction related impacts in MM AQ-2.

In response to this comment, the City has revised mitigation contained in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*. Mitigation Measure AQ-2 on page ES-11 and 4.2-14 of the DEIR has been revised with the following (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline), which reflect SBCAPCD's recommended measures to reduce diesel particulate and No_x emissions.

AQ-~~1~~2 Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures

For individual residential projects facilitated by the 2045 General Plan that would develop three or more units, would involve demolition, mass grading, or excavation and trenching phases longer than two months and would be located within 1,000 feet of existing sensitive receptors,

the City shall enforce a project specific Condition of Approval requiring the following: ~~off-road heavy-duty diesel engines to meet CARB-certified Tier 3 or higher emission standards or employ CARB-certified Level 3 diesel particulate filters to the extent that this equipment is commercially available. "Commercially available" shall be defined as the availability of required equipment in geographic proximity to the project site and within a reasonable timeframe relative to critical path construction timing. If Tier 3 or higher emission standard equipment or Level 3 diesel particulate filters are not commercially available, documentation shall be provided by the project applicant to the City stating that Tier 3 equipment or higher emission standard or Level 3 diesel particulate filters are not commercially available with supporting evidence from the contractor. If CARB-certified Level 3 diesel particulate filters are utilized, they shall be kept in working order and maintained in operable condition according to manufacturer's specifications, as applicable.~~

- Off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment with engines certified to meet U.S. EPA Tier 4 emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- On-road heavy-duty equipment with model year 2010 engines or newer should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible. Electric auxiliary power units should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Equipment/vehicles using alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or renewable diesel, should be used on-site where feasible.
- Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.
- The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.
- The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
- Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.
- Construction truck trips should be scheduled during non-peak hours to reduce peak hour emissions whenever feasible.
- Proposed truck routes should minimize impacts to residential communities and sensitive receptors.
- Construction staging areas should be located away from sensitive receptors such that exhaust and other construction emissions do not enter the fresh air intakes to buildings, air conditioners, and windows.

Changes to Mitigation Measure AQ-2 do not rise to the level of "new information" as defined in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, and thus recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required. These changes do not alter the findings or analysis in the DEIR and do not result in a new or substantial increase in any environmental impacts compared to the DEIR.

Response 4.5

The commenter recommends revision of MM numbering MM AQ-1 Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures to MM AQ-2.

The labeling of the Mitigation Measure on page 4.2-19 of the DEIR has been revised with the following (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline), for clarification:

AQ-~~1~~2 Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures

Response 4.6

The commenter recommends revising MM AQ-1 Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures to be more consistent with the District's Diesel Particulate and Nox Emissions Reduction Measures. This includes requiring the project to employ off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment with engines certified to meet U.S. EPA Tier 4 emission standards whenever commercially available. The District also recommends that this measure include a requirement to employ electric equipment and/or equipment/vehicles powered by alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or renewable diesel, whenever feasible.

Please refer to Response 4.4. As shown therein, MM AQ-2: Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures has been revised to reflect the use of U.S. EPA Tier 4 emissions standards wherever commercially available and to include a requirement to employ electric equipment and/or equipment/vehicles powered by alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or renewable diesel, whenever feasible. Other conforming edits have also been made to replace references to Tier 3 emission standards with references to Tier 4.

Response 4.7

The commenter provides contact information.

This comment is noted.

Letter 5

From: Sandy Mills <sandymills3rd@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2024 10:38 AM
To: General Plan <plansolvang@cityofsolvang.com>
Subject: Comment on draft EIR

Please see attached.

The Transportation Section (4.14) of the DEIR appears to be based upon an incomplete Traffic analysis, as shown in Appendix G. One of the Primary Arterials was not included in the data used to model VMT, namely Alamo Pintado Road. Alamo Pintado is an important high volume corridor and is a Gateway to Solvang for tourists. It should have been a part of the selected links in the ADT Volume Collection (Figure 11 in Appendix G).

Alamo Pintado Road carries traffic from multiple sources other than tourists, including local residences, retail access to shopping centers, and emergency traffic to the Cottage Hospital. Already, there is a large amount of road congestion along this corridor that was not considered in the model. Bypassing the data from this Primary Arterial puts the estimates of VMT used in question. 1

As stated in the Alternatives (Section 6), the transportation impacts will be greater with reduced buildout, Alternative 4. The difference in the impact is very small, less than 0.2%, which is considered insignificant, in modelled data. Specifically, the VMT per capita with buildout is 22.18 per capita vs. 22.21 per capita for reduced buildout, and 21.52 per employee for buildout vs. 21.55 per employee for reduced buildout. Given that the model is missing data, this small difference may change if the additional corridor is added. It would be better to state that the transportation impact is similar for Alternative 4. 2

Lastly, future development projects in the area of Alamo Pintado will drastically increase traffic congestion, although the EIR doesn't take that into consideration. It would also affect air pollution, health, and safety. Specifically, the Alamo Pintado project proposes a development which has 109 units, and 143 parking places. It can be assumed that the additional 143 cars will be making multiple trips on Alamo Pintado daily, increasing VMT significantly. In addition, this project only has one entrance to the parking lot off of Hillside Drive, with no alternative for emergency access if this driveway or street becomes blocked. 3

The current Traffic analysis underestimates this project's detrimental affect on Solvang, and it should not be allowed to move forward. The EIR conclusion that Alternative 4 is the most environmentally superior is correct and would be strengthened by a better traffic model including Alamo Pintado in the data. 4

Letter 5

COMMENTER: Sandy Mills

DATE: April 12, 2024

Response 5.1

The commenter states that Alamo Pintado Road was excluded from VMT analysis and states that it should have been included in selected links in Figure 11 of Appendix G.

Lead agencies have the discretion to choose the most appropriate methodology to evaluate a project's VMT pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(4).

As discussed on Page 4.14-3 of the DEIR, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is a measure used in transportation planning. **VMT measures the amount of travel for all vehicles in a geographic region over a given period of time, typically a one year period**. VMT is calculated by adding up all the miles driven by all the cars and trucks on all the roadways in a region. Therefore, Alamo Pintado Road was included as part of the Countywide VMT Analysis.

As described on page 4.14-2 of the DEIR, VMT estimates were modeled using the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) travel demand model released in July 2022. As shown in Figure 6 of Appendix G, Alamo Pintado Road is included in the SBCAG model links. Therefore, Alamo Pintado Road was included as part of the Countywide VMT Analysis.

Regarding the commenter's reference to Figure 11 of Appendix G, these ADT segments were chosen not to analyze traffic, but rather to analyze noise. Noise analysis, such as the noise contour maps, evaluates citywide noise at key locations where traffic congregates. Selected segments included in the analysis were chosen to represent noise from various sources including traffic from roadways like Alamo Pintado that may utilize busier roadways such as SR 246. Therefore, a segment of SR 246 between Alamo Pintado Road and Old Mill Road was included in the noise analysis. As shown in Tables 13-18 of Appendix G, sections of SR 246 between Alamo Pintado Road and Old Mill Road were incorporated into the analysis to determine Average Daily Trips (ADT) for the various project scenarios.

Response 5.2

The commenter notes that with the missing data on Alamo Pintado Road, the impact of Alternative 4 would change from less impactful to similar.

Refer to Response 5.1 regarding the inclusion of Alamo Pintado road in the VMT model analysis.

Response 5.3

The commenter notes that the future development projects in the area of Alamo Pintado Road would drastically increase traffic congestion and VMT would increase significantly. The commenter also notes that the project only has one entrance to the parking lot leaving no alternatives for emergency access if there is congestion.

VMT is discussed in Section 4.14, *Transportation*, of the DEIR. As stated therein, Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would require project applicants of individual projects with potentially significant VMT impacts to implement VMT reduction strategies. Adoption and implementation of the City's VMT thresholds in accordance with Policy MOB-1.4 would ensure that development facilitated by the

project would generally be consistent with SB 743. However, individual projects that may occur would not be guaranteed to be below thresholds in the adopted VMT Program nor would feasible mitigation therein necessarily reduce VMT below thresholds. Therefore, the project's impacts related to VMT would be significant and unavoidable.

Impacts regarding emergency access are discussed in Section 4.14, *Transportation*, of the DEIR. As stated therein, existing State and local requirements, and the proposed 2045 General Plan policies would ensure transportation safety and maintain adequate emergency access. These policies include the following:

- **Policy MOB-1.5:** New Development Access. The City shall require new development to be served by roads of adequate capacity and design standards to provide reasonable access in accordance with City standards.
- **Policy MOB-1.6:** Rights-of-way Preservation. The City shall reserve and protect adequate rights-of-way to accommodate future roadway widening projects.
- **Policy MOB-1.9:** Safe Speeds. The City shall enforce speed limits and consider lower posted speeds as warranted.

Future development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan would be reviewed by City staff to ensure consistency with all applicable City and State design standards, including standards for project access points, location, and design, sight lines, roadway modifications, provisions for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections, and emergency access. As a result, these impacts were determined to be less than significant.

Response 5.4

The commenter agrees with the DEIR conclusion that Alternative 4 is the environmentally superior option and states the opinion that analysis would be strengthened by including Alamo Pintado in the data for the traffic modeling.

This comment has been noted and passed on to decision makers for consideration. Refer to Response 5.1 regarding the inclusion of Alamo Pintado Road in the traffic (VMT) analysis.

Letter 6

Draft EIR Comments – Dennis E. Beebe				
EIR Page	EIR Section	Comment	Recommendation	
ES-1		First para refers to "seven…elements" while the on same page , "eight…elements" are stated and 7 are listed. First page of Introduction and Project Description also state, "eight…elements"	Be consistent throughout document. Section 1 of GP is Introduction. Perhaps the eighth element is the Housing Element?	1
ES-2		The section that includes the Old Lumberyard Site, Site B, Site C and Site D is unexplained. Are these projects part of the basic 2045 GP or not? If these are alternatives to the basic 2045 GP, so state	Explain these projects are included in the EIR	2
ES-3		The Site C summary merely says, ",,, the Council authorized the review of the lower half of the site…"	In fact, the Council approved this use and re-zoning of the Site C in the Housing Element and "authorized the lower half of the site with a land use designation of DR-20" (Page 2-9)	3
E#-3		You state that "the landowner has provided an alternative plan…"[for Site C}. Alternate to what? What is the basic Site C plan in 2045 GP? "	Describe clearly the basic plan for Site C in 2045 GP	4
ES-6		Don't understand Alt 3 resulting in " 2 units and 5 new residents". This is inconsistent with the statement on ES-1 that reads, "The current land use/zoning designation for this site is 20-R-1 with a potential buildout of 11-14 units".	Revise to correct potential development under Alternative 3	5
I-2		Both "programmatic" and "program" are used to describe this EIR	Be consistent throughout document	6
	1.2.2	Many public comments received do not apply to EIR but should be considered in GP revisions	How will these comments be addressed in GP?	7
2-1		"Eight…elements" are stated but only 7 are listed		
2-1		"environmental justice" is not a term discussed by the GPAC or documented in GP	Delete reference(s) to environmental justice	8
2-3			Use "Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians" rather than "Chumash"	9
2-7		You list 7 elements but claim 8	Just point out that the 8th element is Housing	
2-11-2-12		Your term, "Land Use Map" is inconsistent with General Plan term	Use "Land Use Diagram throughout	10
4-5 & 4-13	4.4.1 & 4.4.3	Page 4-5, Paragraph c. states that there are 4 known archeological resources, while page 4-13 states there are "three known archeological resources"	Revise/correct for consistency and identify these resources	11
4.11-25	4.11-5	Table 4.11-2 quantifies traffic noise levels but does not include Alamo Pintado Rd even though this a primary artery serving Solvang	Add Alamo Pintado traffic data	12
4.12-4	4.12-2c. to read, "	Update Housing Element description with State's certification action	Revise last sentence in this section to read, "The updated Housing Element, which was adopted by the City in December 2023 and	13

			certified by the Starte in February 2024, includes…"	13
4.14-3		Table 4.14-1 is confusing and unexplained. The text states Solvang's VMT has increased without providing any VMT data. Solvang does not appear in Table. The text and table stare that the VMT per capita and per employee with no explanation. Does this data relate to Solvang? The last column in table, 15 Percent Below Existing VMT is unexplained	Provide Solvang specific data or delete the table. Later you state that Solvang's goal is 15 % of region VMT numbers, state so here	14
4.14-4	4.14.1d.		Change "SMART" to read, "SMRT"	15
6-2	6.1.1		Revise last sentence of 3rd paragraph to read, "…adopted in December 2023 and certified by the State in February 2024."	16
6-19	6.3.1	The statement in 2nd paragraph, "However, housing could still be built on the Alamo Pintado Project site, for a total of 2 units and 5 new residents" is inconsistent with the statement on, pg ES-1 that reads, "The current land use/zoning designation for this site is 20-R-1 with a potential buildout of 11-14 units -	Make changes to this paragraph to be consistent and correct	17
6-19	6.3.1	I question the statement that Alternative 3 would result in Site C being vacant with current zoning. If the Site C development is an alternative to 2045 GP, then Alternative 3 would revert to the basic provisions of the 2045 GP. The certified Housing Element, a part of the 2045 GP, includes a re-zoning project that is not discussed here	Describe the result of "no project" that includes provisions of the GP housing element that would re-zone a portion of this site to high density residential (20 units per acre for approximately haff the site)	18
6-19		I disagree with the sentence that states in part, "The Alamo Pintado site is currently vacant, and the addition of multi-story residential apartments, as proposed in the 2045 General Plan,…" This project is **not proposed** in the GP, it is an alternative to the GP.	Rewrite the sentence to read, "The Alamo Pintado site is currently vacant, and the addition of multi-story residential apartments, as proposed as an alternative to that described in 2045 General Plan,…"	19
6-21	6.3.2d.	The statement that Site C "… is currently vacant and therefore does not contain historical resources" is wrong!	The mission era aqueduct stretches across the entire site. Revise analysis and text to addresst this reality	20
	App F	The noise tables do not list Alamo Pintado Rd. How can this be? The GP recognizes APR as a significant artery for entrance from the North?	Add alamo Pintado Rd to the noise analysis	21
	App G	This appendix by DKS states that they have analyzed "Alternative 4 with Fjord Extension", a Fjord extension to CA 246. Where did this alternative come from? It is not in the body of the General Plam?	Either revise this appendix to delete this analysis from DEIR or clearly explain this analysis was done for future planning purposes but is not included in the 2045 GP..	22

Letter 6

COMMENTER: Dennis Beebe

DATE: March 29, 2024

Response 6.1

The commenter requests revisions to ensure more consistency throughout the document specifically regarding how many elements are in the General Plan (some instances in the EIR say 7 elements, others say 8).

This comment has been noted. The commenter is correct that there are eight elements of the Solvang General Plan including the Housing Element. The first paragraph on page ES-1 states that the proposed project includes *updates* to seven of the City General Plan elements. The project does not include updates to the Housing Element which was updated as part of a separate project and adopted in 2023. Therefore, while the commenter is correct that there are eight City General Plan elements including the Housing Element the proposed project only includes updates to seven of the City General Plan elements, and no revision is required to the first paragraph on Page ES-1.

The following revision has been made on page 1-1 for clarification (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline):

> This document is a programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that assesses the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of an update to the Solvang General Plan (collectively referred to in this EIR as the "2045 General Plan" or "proposed project"). ~~Including eight respective~~ The proposed project includes updates to seven of the City General Plan elements.

These changes do not alter the findings or analysis in the DEIR and do not result in a new or substantial increase in any environmental impacts compared to the DEIR. No recirculation is required.

Response 6.2

The commenter requests clarification on whether Old Lumberyard site, Site B, Site C, and Site D are included in the project or alternatives.

In order to provide the most conservative impact analysis, the DEIR considers the maximum potential buildout of the proposed sites for development (Old Lumberyard site, Site B, Site C, and Site D). For clarification, the proposed development on those sites is included in the DEIR analysis for the 2045 General Plan.

CEQA requires an EIR to consider and analyze a range of reasonable project alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts of the project. (Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Assn. v. City of Santa Cruz (2021) 73 Cal.App.5th 985, 1013.) The purpose of alternatives is to reduce the identified impacts of the project. In compliance with CEQA, the Alternatives evaluated in the EIR address possible alternative scenarios for the 2045 General Plan, including no development, or no development, on the proposed sites for development.

Response 6.3

The commenter suggests a more elaborate discussion regarding the City Council's review of the lower half of Site C.

See Response 2.2 for clarification about Site C in the Housing Element site inventory.

The following revision has been made on page ES-3 for clarification (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline):

> The City Council ~~authorized the~~ adopted the Housing Element in December 2023 which includes Site C as a vacant site with proposed rezoning. ~~Review of~~ The Housing Element considers a rezone of the lower half of the site with a land use designation of DR-20 units per acre. The estimated buildout would be ~~40~~36 to 50 units with the other half of the site designated for 20-R-1 or Open Space as noted in the adopted Housing Element.

These changes do not alter the findings or analysis in the DEIR and do not result in a new or substantial increase in any environmental impacts compared to the DEIR. No recirculation is required.

Response 6.4

The commenter requests clarity on the alternative plan for Site C provided by the landowner.

As described on Page ES-3 of the DEIR, under the 2045 General Plan, the project site would have a land use designation of High Density Residential.

Response 6.5

The commenter requests clarification and revisions on alternative 3 and the buildout results.

Refer to Response 2.3 for clarification and revisions regarding Alternative 3. The following revision has been made on page ES-6 for clarification (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline):

> Alternative 3 (No Alamo Pintado Project) would involve implementation of the 2045 General Plan and exclusion of the Alamo Pintado site as an area of potential growth. Although the Alamo Pintado Project would not be included under Alternative 3, this would not preclude development from occurring on the site in the future. Under Alternative 3, the proposed Alamo Pintado Project would not be implemented, and the zoning and General Plan designations would not change from the existing designations. However, housing could still be built on the Alamo Pintado Project site, for a total of 2 to 11 units and 5 to 27 new residents. Therefore, in comparison to the 2045 General Plan's anticipated 2045 population of 7,253 and housing stock of 3,019 units, Alternative 3 would result in 235 to 256 fewer additional residents and 107 to 98 fewer housing units in Solvang in 2045. As a result, the anticipated growth in Solvang would be less than the 2045 General Plan.

These changes do not alter the findings or analysis in the DEIR and do not result in a new or substantial increase in any environmental impacts compared to the DEIR. No recirculation is required.

Response 6.6

The commenter states that the terms "program" and "programmatic" are both used to describe the DEIR. The commenter requests consistency with the use of these terms.

This comment has been noted. The terms "program" and "programmatic" are both used interchangeably to describe the DEIR. This comment does not address the environmental analysis or conclusions of the DEIR and no revisions are required.

Response 6.7

The commenter asks how comments pertaining to the Draft General Plan will be incorporated into the General Plan.

Please see the City's website for more information on the 2045 General Plan public review process. https://plansolvang.com/

Response 6.8

The commenter suggests removing references to the term "environmental justice" since it is not a term discussed by the GPAC or documented in the General Plan.

This comment has been noted and passed to decision makers for consideration. The term environmental justice is used in the DEIR in the context of existing regulations and relevant regional plans including the SBCAG Connected 2050 RTP/SCS.

Response 6.9

The commenter requests revision of Chumash to Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians on page 2-3.

Page 2-3 of the DEIR has been revised (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline), for clarification:

> The 2045 General Plan covers approximately 3.1 square miles (1,968 acres) of land within Solvang's Planning Area. Solvang is characterized as a compact city which has evolved into a widely recognized tourist destination in the village core due to its unique architecture. The Mission District contains the Mission Santa Inés and the surrounding open space around the mission. Other influences in the surrounding region include surrounding wineries and agricultural uses, and the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians ~~Chumash~~ reservation and casino.

Response 6.10

The commenter suggests revising Land Use Map to Land Use Diagram due to inconsistency with the General Plan term.

This comment has been noted and passed on to decision makers for consideration. The term Land Use Map and Land Use Diagram are used interchangeably.

Page 2-11 of the DEIR has been revised (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline), for clarification:

> The Land Use Element contains the Land Use Map (also referred to as the Land Use Diagram) as well as the policies and standards that directly shape land use decisions and the resulting physical development of Solvang.

Response 6.11

The commenter notes that there are discrepancies in how many archaeological resources were discovered in the study.

Page 4.4-13 of the DEIR has been revised (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline), for clarification:

> As discussed in Section 4.4.1, *Setting*, there are ~~three~~ four known archaeological resources located in the Planning Area. In addition to these known archaeological resources, there may be other yet unidentified archaeological resources which may be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR.

This revision is made for clarification. It does not result in any changes to the conclusions in the Draft EIR.

Response 6.12

The commenter requests inclusion of Alamo Pintado Road to the traffic data as it is a primary arterial.

See Response 5.1 regarding Alamo Pintado Road being included as part of the Countywide VMT Analysis. The noise analysis, such as the noise contour maps, evaluates citywide noise at key locations where traffic congregates. Selected segments included in the analysis were chosen to represent noise from various sources including traffic from roadways like Alamo Pintado that may utilize busier roadways such as SR 246. Therefore, a segment of SR 246 between Alamo Pintado Road and Old Mill Road was included in the noise analysis.

Response 6.13

The commenter suggests revision of the last sentence on 4.12-4 to include the state's certification.

Please note that the baseline for analysis is typically set at the time the NOP is published, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125. Therefore, no revisions to the EIR are necessary. However, the following revision is made on 4.12-4 for clarification (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline):

> The updated Housing Element, which was adopted by the City in December 2023 and certified by the state in February 2024, includes a detailed analysis of housing needs, resources, and constraints; an analysis and identification of any areas that may perpetuate housing inequities in the community; and policies and programs with the goal of achieving more equitable housing practices.

This revision is made for clarification. It does not result in any changes to the conclusions in the Draft EIR.

Response 6.14

The commenter requests clarity on Table 4.14-1 and how the data shows Solvang's VMT has increased and requests revisions accordingly.

The following revision is made on 4.12-4 for clarification (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline):

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is a measure used in transportation planning. VMT measures the amount of travel for all vehicles in a geographic region over a given period of time, typically a one year period. VMT is calculated by adding up all the miles driven by all the cars and trucks on all the

roadways in a region. Since 2005, daily miles traveled within Solvang has increased by 13 percent. VMT on local roads within Solvang has seen a net increase of nearly 28 percent since 2005. Approximately 55 percent of the city's total VMT is on SR 246, with the remaining 45 percent on local roads. The City currently uses the existing regional SBCAG thresholds for VMT. The Technical Advisory recommends that general plans, area plans, or community plans may have a significant impact on transportation if the VMT increases would exceed a threshold of 15 percent lower per capita or per employee VMT than existing regional development. As shown in Table 4.14-1, the SBCAG region's existing VMT per capita is 21.74 and VMT per employee is 25.07.

Table 4.14-1 Existing Vehicle Miles Traveled Summary

Area	Scenario	VMT	15 Percent Below Existing VMT
SBCAG Region	Existing Per Capita (2015)	21.74	18.48
	Existing Per Employee (2015)	25.07	21.31

Source: Appendix G

This revision is made for clarification. It does not result in any changes to the conclusions in the Draft EIR.

Response 6.15

The commenter suggests a revision of the term SMART to SMRT.

Page and 4.2-13 of the DEIR has been revised with the following (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline):

~~SMART~~SMRT Breeze 200 Bus: Route runs from Santa Maria to Buellton and Solvang.

Response 6.16

The commenter requests revision of the sentence in the last sentence of the third paragraph on 6-2 to include the state certification.

Please note that the baseline for analysis is typically set at the time the NOP is published, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125. Therefore, no revisions to the EIR are necessary. However, the following revision is made on Page 6-2 for clarification (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline):

> This alternative would not remove the Agriculture Land Use designation, focus on affordable housing, or result in other updates to comply with current State law, or updates to address preservation of natural resources. Under the No Project Alternative, the existing zoning would not provide adequate residential zones and capacity necessary to meet the housing needs identified under the current Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) 6th Cycle. This could result in inconsistency between the 2045 General Plan and the adopted Housing Element, which was adopted by the City in December 2023 and certified by the state in February 2024. Considering the 2045 General Plan would guide development through 2045, land use decisions made now would impact the City's ability not only to meet the State's current 6th Cycle RHNA, but also future RHNA cycles through 2045.

This revision is made for clarification. It does not result in any changes to the conclusions in the Draft EIR.

Response 6.17

The commenter requests clarity on the housing allowed to be built on the Alamo Pintado project site and the inconsistency with the statement "The current land use/zoning designation for this site is 20-R-1 with a potential buildout of 11-14 units . . ."

Refer to Response 2.3 for clarification and revisions to Page 6-19 of the DEIR.

Response 6.18

The commenter requests inclusion on the following: "the result of "no project" that includes provisions of the GP housing element that would re-zone a portion of this site to high density residential (20 units per acre for approximately half the site).

Please see Response 2.2 for clarification regarding Site C's inclusion in the Housing Element as a vacant site with proposed rezoning.

Response 6.19

The commenter requests the revision of the sentence on page 6-19 to exclude language saying that the Alamo Pintado site multi-story residential apartments are proposed in the 2045 General Plan.

The Alamo Pintado site's proposed multi-story residential apartments are considered and evaluated as part of the General Plan Update in the DEIR to provide the most conservative analysis. As described in Section 6, *Alternatives*, of the DEIR, the project as evaluated in the DEIR would involve a zone change on Site C to Design Residential 20 (DR-20). Under the proposed General Plan Update, the project site would have a land use designation of High Density Residential. Under Alternative 3, the proposed Alamo Pintado Project would not be implemented, and the zoning and General Plan designations would not change from the existing designations.

Response 6.20

The commenter states the opinion that the DEIR assertion that Site C is currently vacant and does not contain historical resources is incorrect.

Impacts regarding historic resources are discussed on Pages 4.4-10 through 4.4-12 of the Draft EIR. As stated therein, potential future development occurring under the 2045 General Plan may include site preparation, demolition, and construction activities. Policies included in the Environment and Sustainability Element of the 2045 General Plan, listed below, would reduce impacts to a historical resource.

- **ENV-5.1: Protect Significant Sites and Buildings**. The City shall protect and enhance Solvang's historically and architecturally significant sites and buildings.
- **ENV-5.2: Support Property Owners.** The City shall encourage the efforts of property owners to preserve and renovate historic and architecturally significant structures. Where such buildings cannot be preserved intact, the City shall seek to preserve the building facades and ensure renovations are consistent with the applicable standards set forth in the Community Design Element and design guidelines.

The goals and policies included in the Environment and Sustainability Element would reduce the potential for historical resources to be adversely impacted from the development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan. Future development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan would also be subject to the provisions of applicable federal and State cultural resource regulations, as well as Chapter 4

and Section 11-4-6 of the City's Municipal Code. However, there would still be potential for development to impact historical resources.

As such, development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan could result in substantial alterations to or demolition of historical resources.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce potential adverse impacts on historical resources to the extent feasible by requiring an identification of historic-age built environment features, an evaluation of historical resources in compliance with the State Office of Historic Preservation, and, if necessary, compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties. However, it cannot be guaranteed that historical resources would not be demolished as a result of development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan, therefore impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

The following revision is made on Page 6-21 for clarification (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline):

> Alternative 3 would result in reduced buildout potential compared to the 2045 General Plan; however, the Alamo Pintado site is known to contain remnants of a mission-era aqueduct ~~which~~ which may qualify as a historical resource under CEQA ~~is currently vacant and therefore does not contain historical resources~~. Therefore, both the 2045 General Plan and Alternative 3 would have a similar potential impact on historical resources, as development ~~that~~ could impact pre-existing historical resources ~~would be identical in location~~. Similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 3 would implement policies to protect historical and culturally significant resources, and would implement Mitigation Measure CUL-1 to identify historic-age features that an individual development would alter or demolish. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have a similar level of impact when compared to the 2045 General Plan~~, and this alternative's impact on historical resources would be less than significant with mitigation, similar to the proposed project~~.

This revision is made for clarification. It does not result in any changes to the conclusions in the Draft EIR. The conclusion that Alternative 3 would have a similar level of impact when compared to the 2045 General Plan remains the same, since either scenario could result in development that could impact pre-existing historical resources and the policies and mitigation would remain applicable under either scenario.

Response 6.21

The commenter questions why Alamo Pintado Road is not included in the noise analysis in the tables in Appendix F.

The commenter does not specify which tables they are referring to in Appendix F. Noise analysis, such as the noise contour maps, evaluates citywide noise at key locations where traffic congregates. Selected segments included in the analysis were chosen to represent noise from various sources including traffic from roadways like Alamo Pintado that may utilize busier roadways such as SR 246. Therefore, a segment of SR 246 between Alamo Pintado Road and Old Mill Road was included in the noise analysis.

Response 6.22

The commenter requests clarity on the Alternative 4 with Fjord Extension shown in Appendix G and requests clarification as to why it is not included in the General Plan but discussed in the appendix.

The Alternative 4 with Fjord Extension shown in Appendix G was considered earlier in the planning when the Traffic Analysis Data Memo was created. However, it was not included in the draft 2045 General Plan or DEIR. This response is provided for clarification and does not result in any changes to the conclusions in the Draft EIR.

Letter 7

April 15, 2024

Rafael Castillo, AICP, Planning & Building Manager
Planning and Building Department
City of Solvang
411 2nd Street
Solvang, CA 93463

Comments may also be submitted via email to plansolvang@cityofsolvang.com

RE: 2045 SOLVANG GENERAL PLAN DRAFT EIR

Dear Mr. Castillo,

With regards to the Transportation section 4.14:

The Traffic Analysis Data Memorandum prepared by DKS Associates in December 2023 (Appendix G) which utilizes the updated SBCAG model released in July 2022 has no data for traffic on Alamo Pintado Road North of the Hwy 246 intersection. Specifically, it provides no traffic data to facilitate assessment of traffic impacts which would be created by the several high density projects proposed/planned that are located along Alamo Pintado Rd between Hwy 246 and the northern city limit of Solvang. Given the size of these projects and their probable impacts on the Alamo Pintado Rd./Old Mission Dr/Nielsen's Shopping Center intersection, the Alamo Pintado Rd./Village Ln. intersection and the Alamo Pintado Rd./Viborg Rd. intersection. The omission of data on these intesections appears to be a serious deficiency in the assessment of Transportation impacts, particularly with regard to Safety.

The Alamo Pintado Rd./Old Mission Dr/Nielsen's Shopping Center intersection already experiences gridlock at certain times of the day, principally weekdays around 11:30 AM to 1 PM. 1

The short distance between the Alamo Pintado Rd./Old Mission Dr/Nielsen's Shopping Center intersection, which has a 4-way stop and allows u-turns, and the signalized Hwy 246 intersection results in Southbound vehicles on Alamo Pintado backing up from the light at Hwy 246 and impeding vehicles southbound from the north side of the intersection.

Vehicles attempting to turn right or left to travel southbound on Alamo Pintado Rd become trapped in the intersection by the stopped southbound traffic. This in turn impedes vehicles traveling north from Hwy 246 on Alamo Pintado resulting in a short term gridlock preventing any movement until the light and traffic at Hwy 246 facilitates the southbound traffic proceeding thus allowing the Alamo Pintado Rd./Old Mission Dr/Nielsen's Shopping Center intersection to clear.

The primary concern is during incident response which can create difficulties for emergency vehicles attempting to enter and exit the shopping cneters and communities Along Alamo 2

Pintado Road north of Hwy 246.

It is obvious and well understood that congested streets and limited connections and access points can significantly increase response times. Traffic congestion may impede the ability of emergency vehicles to reach the site of a traffic incident or other disaster in a fast and reliable manner. The congestion may also impede the timely ability of emergency vehicles to reach Cottage hospital and emergency room on Viborg Road.

"Rapidly responding to emergency calls requires both an efficient network of first responders and dispatchers as well as an effective road infrastructure system. The literature shows that response times are critical for a number of health outcomes including hospitalization, rehabilitation and survival following an accident, stroke or heart attack (Wilde, 2013; Emberson et al., 2014; Jena et al., 2017). Police response times have also been shown to affect crime clearance rates (Blanes i Vidal and Kirchmaier (2015)). Although first responders are typically expeditious, one factor beyond their control that affects response times is traffic. This is a particularly pressing concern giving increasing trends of urbanization that have led to commensurate increases in traffic congestion." 2 (cont.)

Source: - Traffic Congestion and the Performance of First Responders: Evidence from California Fire Departments Louis-Philippe Beland Louisiana State University Daniel Brent Louisiana State University May 2018

The response time for an emergency vehicle begins at the time of the call and includes manning the vehicle, driving to the site of the incident and then transporting any victim(s) to the appropriate care providing facility (emergency room).

"the odds of having a negative outcome (death) if the response time is more than 8 minutes is double the odds of dying if the response time is less than 8 minutes"

Ref: The Effects of Ambulance Response Time on Survival Following Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest. Open Access Emerg Med. 2020 Dec 1.

A secondary, but none the less important, concern is the pedestrian and bicyle traffic that crosses the Alamo Pintado Rd./Old Mission Dr/Nielsen's Shopping Center intersection. In heavy traffic situations, particularly at a 4-way stop intersection that is congested, drivers can and do become impatient, get distracted by other vehicles going out of turn and other vehicle movements. This increases the risk that a pedestrian or bicyclist may be subjected to a near miss or even hit by a vehicle and injured. 3

An apparent negative consequence of the shift from level of service assessments of intersections to vehicle miles travelled assessments is helpful in assessing environmental impacts but leads to deficiencies in assessing safty impacts from congested intersections unless LOS data continues to be collected and analyzed. 4

There is a concept referred to as low side compliance relative to specifications and requirments that is sometimes used to manage the scope of work to that which is specifically required. This is useful for managing projects but not infrequently it results in

higher risk to estimates that may have a larger uncertainty factor or are difficult to accurately assess. Sometimes it is done intentionally and in some cases unintentionally. In the case of the State requirement shifting from LOS to VMT it appears to increase the risk of not adequately assessing saftey impacts at road intersections. Fortunately, the City has the authority to go beyond the minimum required VMT assessment and it is recommended that the City of Solvang continue to require projects to utilize LOS data and associated analysis to aaid in assessing road intersection safet impacts. 4 (cont.)

With regard to Tribal Cultural Resources section 4.15

The CENTRAL COAST INFORMATION CENTER operated by the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History (which took over operating this center from UCSB). Is the State authorized repository for archaeological and cultural reporting and information.

In discussions with the curator there appears to have been no requests from the City of Solvang for reports relative to any projects in Solvang for at least 5 years. This seems to me to be an oversight and given the known history and number of identified sites as well as the probability for as yet unidentified sites, the City of Solvanfg should be requesting a report for every project that disturbes the ground. 5

This requirement and the reference to the information center appear to be absent in the Draft EIR.

Respectfully,

Craig Kent

1901 Old Mission Dr.
Solvang, CA 93463

Letter 7

COMMENTER: Craig Kent

DATE: April 15, 2024

Response 7.1

The commenter requests the inclusion of Alamo Pintado Road in the traffic analysis and expresses concerns about traffic congestion and safety.

Refer to Response 5.1 regarding the inclusion of Alamo Pintado Road (including portions of Alamo Pintado north of SR 246) in the traffic analysis.

Regarding congestion, SB 743, which was signed into law in 2013, directed OPR to develop revisions to the CEQA Guidelines by July 1, 2014 to establish new criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts and define alternative metrics instead of traffic level of service. SB 743 requires the new criteria to "promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses." It also states that alternative measures of transportation impacts may include "vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated." SB 743 changes the way that public agencies evaluate the transportation impacts of projects under CEQA by recognizing that roadway congestion, while an inconvenience to drivers, is not itself an environmental impact (PRC Section 21099, subdivision [b][2]).

Safety impacts related to transportation and traffic are discussed on Pages 4.14-19 through 4.14-20 of the DEIR. As stated therein, all improvement plans for projects within the city, including, but not limited to, grading, water, sewer, streets and other surface and subsurface structures, shall be prepared based upon and incorporate the standard construction details as prepared by the city. As individual developments are proposed, project applicants would be required to follow appropriate design guidelines in implementing roadway improvements that are necessary to alleviate transportation hazards. Therefore, implementation of the 2045 General Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

In addition to existing State and local requirements, the 2045 General Plan proposes policies that would ensure transportation safety. These policies include the following:

- **Policy MOB-1.5:** New Development Access. The City shall require new development to be served by roads of adequate capacity and design standards to provide reasonable access in accordance with City standards.
- **Policy MOB-1.6:** Rights-of-way Preservation. The City shall reserve and protect adequate rights-of-way to accommodate future roadway widening projects.
- **Policy MOB-1.9:** Safe Speeds. The City shall enforce speed limits and consider lower posted speeds as warranted.

In addition, future development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan would be reviewed by City staff to ensure consistency with all applicable City and State design standards, including standards for project access points, location, and design, sight lines, roadway modifications, provisions for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections, and emergency access. As a result, these impacts were determined to be less than significant.

Response 7.2

The commenter notes another point of the impact of congestion on emergency services on Alamo Pintado Road, which is another reason to include the major arterial.

Emergency access impacts as they pertain to hazards and hazardous materials are discussed on Page 4.8-14. As stated therein, the City's EMP and the County's HMP provide guidance during situations requiring an unusual or extraordinary response, including traffic control and management. Implementation of these plans involve coordination with all facilities and personnel of City and County government, along with the jurisdictional resources in the County, to effectively respond to an emergency (City of Solvang 2013a; County of Santa Barbara 2023). Furthermore, development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with road standards and would be reviewed by the Solvang Emergency Services Coordinator and Fire Marshal to ensure new development would not interfere with evacuation routes or impede the effectiveness of evacuation plans. The 2045 General Plan would not introduce new features or policies that would preclude implementation of or alter these plans or procedures. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The adequacy of emergency access as it pertains to transportation and traffic is discussed on Pages 4.14-19 through 4.14-20 of the DEIR. As stated therein, in addition to existing State and local requirements, the 2045 General Plan proposes policies that would ensure transportation safety and maintain adequate emergency access. These policies include the following:

- **Policy MOB-1.5:** New Development Access. The City shall require new development to be served by roads of adequate capacity and design standards to provide reasonable access in accordance with City standards.
- **Policy MOB-1.6:** Rights-of-way Preservation. The City shall reserve and protect adequate rights-of-way to accommodate future roadway widening projects.
- **Policy MOB-1.9:** Safe Speeds. The City shall enforce speed limits and consider lower posted speeds as warranted.

In addition, future development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan would be reviewed by City staff to ensure consistency with all applicable City and State design standards, including standards for project access points, location, and design, sight lines, roadway modifications, provisions for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections, and emergency access. As a result, these impacts were determined to be less than significant.

Response 7.3

The commenter notes potential concerns regarding existing conditions on the Alamo Pintado Road, Old Mission Drive, and Nielson's Shopping Center intersection and the impact on pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

This comment has been noted and passed onto decision makers for further consideration. The DEIR includes a discussion of existing conditions related to individual impact areas specific to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G questions. Individual impact areas include a discussion of the existing conditions which are then compared to the anticipated change induced by the project. While the concerns of the commenter regarding the issues listed in the comment are noted, no specific comments regarding the analysis and conclusions of the EIR were made. No revisions to the Draft EIR are necessary in response to this comment.

Response 7.4

The commenter recommends continued usage of LOS data for safety.

This comment has been passed on to decision makers for consideration.

Senate Bill (SB) 743 changed transportation impact analysis under the Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines). As a result, "vehicle miles traveled" (VMT) is now used rather than "level of service" (LOS) or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion to evaluate a project's transportation impacts under CEQA. SB 743, which was signed into law in 2013, directed OPR to develop revisions to the CEQA Guidelines by July 1, 2014 to establish new criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts and define alternative metrics instead of traffic level of service. SB 743 requires the new criteria to "promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses." It also states that alternative measures of transportation impacts may include "vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated." SB 743 changes the way that public agencies evaluate the transportation impacts of projects under CEQA by recognizing that roadway congestion, while an inconvenience to drivers, is not itself an environmental impact (PRC Section 21099, subdivision [b][2]). The Draft EIR follows SB 743 and the CEQA Guidelines recommendations for impact analysis for traffic.

Response 7.5

The commenter suggests that the City of Solvang request a tribal cultural report from the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.

Records searches are not required by CEQA for cultural resources or tribal cultural resources and are only included in the environmental review regarding cultural resources once a specific project has been identified. As identified in Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 requires that prior to approval of a project carried out under the 2045 General Plan that will involve ground disturbance activities in native or previously undisturbed soils that may include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, potholing, grubbing, tree removal, excavation or grading, an archaeological resources assessment shall be prepared under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) in either prehistoric or historic archaeology. Assessments shall include a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search at the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) and of the Sacred Lands File Search maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).

California Department of Transportation

CALTRANS DISTRICT 5
50 HIGUERA STREET | SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA 93401-5415
(805) 549-3101 | FAX (805) 549-3329 TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

Letter 8

April 15, 2024

SB SR 246
SCH: 2023060448

Rafael Castillo, Planning and Building Manager
City of Solvang
411 2nd Street
Solvang, CA 93463
Via Email: plansolvang@cityofsolvang.com

RE: Caltrans Comments on City of Solvang's Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Dear Rafael Castillo:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) appreciates the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the City of Solvang's General Plan Update and Rezoning. Caltrans offers the following comments: 1

General Comments:

Caltrans supports local development that is consistent with State planning priorities that promote equity, strengthen the economy, protect the environment, and promote public health and safety. We accomplish this by working with local jurisdictions to achieve a shared vision of how the transportation system should and can accommodate interregional and local travel and development. Projects that support smart growth principles which include improvements to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure (or other key Transportation Demand Strategies) are supported by Caltrans and are consistent with our mission, vision, and goals.

As a result of Senate Bill (SB) 743, effective July 2020 Caltrans replaced vehicle level of service (LOS) with vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the primary metric for identifying transportation impacts from local development. Additionally, the Caltrans Transportation Impact Study Guide (TISG) replaces the Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (Caltrans, 2002) and is for use with local land use projects. The focus now will be on how projects are expected to influence the overall amount of automobile use instead of traffic congestion as a significant impact. 2

Employing VMT as the metric of transportation impact Statewide will help to promote Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission reductions consistent with SB 375 and can be achieved through influencing on-the-ground development. Implementation of this change will rely, in part, on local land use decisions to reduce GHG emissions associated with the

transportation sector, both at the project level, and in long-term plans (including general plans, climate action plans, specific plans, and transportation plans) and supporting Sustainable Community Strategies developed under SB 375. In addition to any site-specific access or safety concerns attributed to future development projects occurring as part of the City's general plan vision, it is likely that the Caltrans correspondence will focus attention on meeting overall VMT reducing goals. 2 (cont.)

Caltrans encourages integration of Transportation Demand Strategies (TDM) strategies into long range planning to increase the efficiency of the transportation system by providing options for users other than driving alone, or by shifting travel away from peak periods to help lower VMT. Examples include: locating higher density projects near transit, incorporating Complete Streets and transit, mixed-use developments, mobility hubs, and traffic calming measures to enhance walkability.

Caltrans would like to acknowledge the City of Solvang for the thorough VMT analysis provided in the DEIR and for including policies to help reduce future VMT, including but not limited to, a bicycle master plan, pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements, complete streets guidelines, and transportation demand (TDM) strategies.

Furthermore, SB 1000 (2016) required local jurisdictions to identify communities that are disproportionately burdened by environmental justice issues within their boundaries and address environmental justice in their general plans. This includes developing goals and policies to reduce pollution exposure, reduce unique or compounded health risks, promote safe and sanitary homes, and prioritize the needs of disadvantaged communities, among other focus areas. Caltrans appreciates the discussion around environmental justice and supports the policies aimed at addressing equity, especially as they relate to transit mobility and accessibility, as put forth in the DEIR. 3

To further support complete streets and active transportation enhancements, the Caltrans District 5 Active Transportation Plan is now available. The plan identifies bicycle and pedestrian needs on, across, and parallel to the State Highway System (SHS) throughout California's Central Coast. Partnership with transportation stakeholders and the public are critical to supporting a safe transportation network and encouraging healthy communities. The main deliverable of the plan is the prioritized list of Location Based Needs (LBN's) (available **here**). This prioritized list could be utilized to identify needs for the General Plan Update. 4

Specific Comments:

For analyzing freight infrastructure, Caltrans suggests referring to the California Central Coast Sustainable Freight Study, rather than the Commercial Flows Study. This new Study is expected to be completed in July 2024. The California Freight Mobility Plan can also be referenced in identifying the City's freight needs. 5

Caltrans requests to continue to be included in any future public noticing regarding this project to allow us to prepare for and participate in the public process.

We look forward to continued coordination with the City of Solvang on this effort. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, or need further clarification on items discussed above, please contact me at (805) 903-3395 or Shelby.Fredrick@dot.ca.gov. 6

Sincerely,

Shelby Fredrick

Shelby Fredrick
Local Development Review Coordinator
Caltrans, District 5

Cc:
State Clearinghouse
Veronica Lezama, Caltrans D5 Branch Chief for Regional Planning and Local Development Review

Letter 8

COMMENTER: Shelby Frederick, Local Development Review Coordinator at Caltrans District 5

DATE: April 15, 2024

Response 8.1

The commenter expresses appreciation to review the DEIR.

This comment is noted.

Response 8.2

The commenter notes in a general comment the District's obligation to review the project and explains the shift from LOS to VMT. The commenter acknowledges the City of Solvang's VMT analysis.

This comment is noted.

Response 8.3

The commenter notes the requirement to discuss environmental justice and acknowledges the City of Solvang's inclusion of this.

This comment is noted.

Response 8.4

The commenter notes the District's Active Transportation Plan as a resource.

This comment is noted. The City's Transportation Plan is in compliance with Caltrans District 5 requirements, and Transportation Demand Management programs in the Draft 2045 General Plan include the promotion of active transportation.

Response 8.5

The commenter suggests referring to the California Central Coast Sustainable Freight Study rather Commercial Flows Study expected to be completed in July 2024.

This comment has been noted. Please note that the baseline for analysis is typically set at the time the NOP is published, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125. The NOP for this DEIR was published on June 15, 2023. Therefore, no revisions to the EIR are necessary.

Response 8.6

The commenter concludes their comment letter and expressed gratitude for continued coordination with the District.

This comment is noted.

Letter 9

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Update of the Solvang General Plan

By Lansing Duncan 4/14/24

Executive Summary

The very first sentence and following paragraph of the Project Description points out a problem that undermines the accuracy of the DEIR in numerous areas. That first sentence claims that the "EIR has been prepared to examine the potential environmental effects of the 2045 General Plan." But the "Project" analyzed does not include the Housing Element which was separated and adopted in 2023. 1

Because the Housing Element is not part of the "Project" it appears that the direction for Sites B, C, and D found within the General Plan is not included in the analysis. As a result, numerous statements that claim to compare the impacts of Alternative scenarios to those of the General Plan found on pages ES-5, ES-6, ES-7 and throughout the Alternatives chapter are inaccurate and deceptive.

On page ES-3 the text which attempts to describe what is included within the General Plan for Site C is confusing. What does "The City Council authorized the review of the lower half of the site" mean? This text needs to be clarified and the paragraphs describing Sites B, C, and D should all make clear whether the direction found in the General Plan is part of the "project" analyzed and compared to other "Alternatives". 2

The third paragraph under Site C on page ES-3 introduces the different plan that the developer has requested be analyzed within the EIR. In order to avoid confusion with the "Alternatives" analyzed by the DEIR this plan should be clearly and consistently named differently. I suggest "Developer's Alternate Plan (DAP)" and will use that nomenclature in these comments.

The DAP is not consistent with the General Plan and should not be the basic scenario analyzed by the DEIR. The DAP is inherently at odds with the internal consistency of the General Plan in numerous different areas. The Environmental Review for the update attempts a holistic comprehensive analysis of the community's vision for the future and it should not be based on this poison pill. But if the DAP is the basic scenario analyzed that should be clearly stated. 3

Adding to that confusion is the inclusion of "Alternative" scenarios for the Old Lumberyard site and Site C by two different developers. Judging by the discussion of Alternatives found on pages ES-5, ES-6, E-7 and in the Alternatives section it appears that both scenarios are substituted for the direction found in the 2045 General Plan where the DEIR analyzes the impacts of the "Project".

For example, on page ES-5, where "Alternative 2 (No Old Lumberyard Project)" is discussed, it is claimed that Alternative 2 "would involve implementation of the 2045 General Plan ", suggesting that the default "Project" itself analyzed in the DEIR, does not involve the direction found in the 2045 General Plan. The analysis goes on to say that the current zoning (DR-20) would allow "a total of 50 units and 120 new residents" but later on it is stated that "Alternative 2 would not involve high-density development" on page ES-6. But development at a density of 20 units per acre is considered "high-density". The sentence also claims that lack of "high-density development on the Old Lumberyard site" would fulfill the objectives of "improving mobility, and supporting diverse housing options, to a lesser extent than the 2045 General Plan."

4

This is nonsense on top of nonsense. The comparison is not with the direction found in the 2045 General Plan, the comparison is with the developer's proposed TRC project with miniscule housing units and a hotel. How does confining the housing to a small proportion of the site support diverse housing options. It constrains housing options to miniscule units. Claiming that building the housing and hotel project and determining it improves mobility, may be making lemonade out of lemons, but it does not speak to the additional traffic added to Mission Drive by patrons of the hotel.

There is also no reason why Alternative 2 "would result in a decreased emphasis on the provision of housing units" when the majority of the site would be used for housing. How does Alternative 2 result in "an increase in VMT per capita" and "less strategic land-use planning"? Does the provision of 1 less residential unit somehow warp VMT analysis in a meaningful manner? It is not clear how not adding a hotel to the site, which is located on a roadway subject to chronic congestion, could worsen transportation in Solvang.

5

The discussion of Alternative 3 on page ES-6 also contains misinformation. Once again it is claimed that not building the Developer's Alternate Project (DAP) will result in "implementation of the 2045 General Plan". In the real world this is true, but in the DEIR it is not, because the "project" does not include the Housing

6

Element's direction for Site C. The direction for Site C included in the actual 2045 General Plan would not exclude "the Alamo Pintado site as an area of potential growth." The Site C discussion on page ES-3 says that "the lower half of the site" would have a land use designation of DR-20 with "an estimated buildout of 40-50 units" with "the other half of the site designated 20-R-1 or Open Space as noted in the adopted housing Element". Since the lower half was previously designated 20-R-1 also, the 2045 General Plan clearly identifies "the Alamo Pintado site as an area of potential growth". The lower half is proposed to be developed at a density almost ten times what was previously allowed. 6 (cont.)

Later the discussion claims that without the DAP "housing could still be built on the Alamo Pintado Project site, for a total of 2 units and 5 new residents." The misdirected computations that follow are like "the blind leading the blind." Nevertheless, the DEIR can't fail to correctly assert that not building the DAP "would result in fewer impacts to all environmental issue areas" before pointing out certain exceptions, land use and planning, and transportation. If the DAP were not built and that is compared to the previous General Plan direction for the site, land use and planning impacts probably would be "comparable." But if not building the DAP were actually compared to the direction in the Housing Element found in the 2045 General Plan, it is clear that the direction in the Housing Element results in better land use and planning and thus a reduced impact. 7

It is claimed that "..Alternative 3 would not involve high-density development on the Alamo Pintado site.." but the Housing Element's direction would allow high-density development on the lower half of the site, and would support "strategic land uses" and "diverse housing options." But the DEIR claims otherwise because it is not actually looking at the 2045 General Plan. 8

Perhaps most confounding however, is the claim that not building the 109 unit DAP will actually result in greater transportation impacts. This is presumably based on a flawed VMT analysis that flies in the face of real-world facts. It is "gaslighting," an attempt to persuade Solvang and Valley residents that what they see with their own eyes and experience in their own lives is misinformation, when in fact, it is the VMT analysis that is flawed. Despite it's importance to Solvang's circulation system, Alamo Pintado Road is not included in the VMT modeling. 9

It is clear that the traffic from the DAP will add to the gridlock that regularly develops at the intersection of Old Mission Drive and Alamo Pintado Road. This intersection with a four-way stop, serves Solvang's two major shopping centers, 10

two major supermarkets, two banks, two drug stores and the headquarters of the Forest Service for Los Padres National Forest.

The intersection is routinely affected by the congestion at Mission Drive and Alamo Pintado as traffic attempts to go through Solvang at rush hour, lunch time, when a shift at the Casino changes, when the high-school gets out, Farmer's Market days and busy holidays. Currently, vehicles fill the turn lanes between Mission Drive and Old Mission Drive, backing into the intersection that serves the two shopping centers, causing gridlock. Residents are rightly concerned that adding a thousand vehicle trips per day will make the situation even worse.

This is a very important health and safety concern for numerous reasons. Most residents on Old Mission Drive have only a single entry and exit, through that intersection. And the same will be true for the hundreds of residents in the proposed Alamo Pintado Project. Emergency traffic (County Sheriff, Fire Department, and Ambulance Service) heading towards Ballard and Los Olivos typically use this intersection, as do ambulances going to nearby Cottage Hospital. More congestion at this intersection will adversely affect the response time for these first responders. 10 (cont.)

Theoretical communitywide VMT analysis that ignores the functionality of specific roadways and intersections that are critical to Solvang's circulation system puts our entire community at risk.

The DEIR's discussion of Alternative 4 contains various erroneous buildout numbers because the updated Housing Element's direction is not incorporated into the analysis. However, the overriding analysis that "Alternative 4 would fulfill Project Objectives of fostering a distinct community character, promoting economic diversity and sustainability, providing adequate facilities, conserving open space, and ensuring public safety" is definitely correct. 11

But the following sentence that claims other objectives would be fulfilled to a lesser extent is based on flawed logic because it is claimed "...Alternative 4 would not involve high-density development on the Old Lumberyard and Alamo Pintado sites..." In both cases, high-density development could occur on the sites if the developer's alternative projects were not developed. The existing DR-20 zoning on the Old Lumberyard site would allow for high-density, and the direction of the updated Housing Element on Site C would allow for high-density. 12

The DEIR is correct when it states that Alternative 4 (Neither Project Implemented) is the "Environmentally Superior Alternative" for the numerous reasons listed. But the suggestion that transportation impacts would be greater without the development of a hotel or 109 units is hogwash, for the reasons cited above. 13

These comments are focused on the discussion found within the Executive Summary but apply equally to the specific areas of the DEIR where these issues are discussed in more detail, such as the Project Description, Transportation, and Alternatives, etc.. 14

Environmental Review is supposed to inform decision-making so that impacts can be avoided or mitigated. The repeated references to the 2045 General Plan that do not reflect the direction of the updated Housing Element result in a document that is full of errors and misinformation. The document should be revised to include the direction of the Housing Element. The text should be rewritten to reflect that direction accurately and be internally consistent. It should then be recirculated so the public and decision-makers can be 100% confident in the content and analysis. 15

Thank you for your consideration,

Lansing Duncan

Letter 9

COMMENTER: Lansing Duncan

DATE: April 14, 2024

Response 9.1

The commenter notes that the DEIR does not include the Housing Element in its analysis of the General Plan which may lead to inaccurate comparisons between alternative scenarios and General Plan impacts.

Please see Response 2.2 for clarification regarding Site C's inclusion in the Housing Element as a vacant site with proposed rezoning.

Response 9.2

The commenter requests clarification on what is included within the General Plan for Site C and whether Site C, B, and D are part of the project.

Please see Response 6.3.

Response 9.3

The commenter suggests renaming the plan proposed by the developer to "Developer's Alternate Plan (DAP)" to distinguish it from the alternatives analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). The commenter notes that the DAP is not consistent with the General Plan and should not be the primary scenario analyzed in the DEIR, as it contradicts the community's vision for the future.

The Developer's Alternate Plan is analyzed in the DEIR because it provides the most conservative analysis for decision makers and the public to understand the greatest possible environmental impact of all scenarios for the 2045 General Plan. In Section 6, *Alternatives*, Alternative 3 and Alternative 4 omit the Developer's Alternate Plan to provide environmental analysis for a 2045 General Plan scenario in which the Developer's Alternate Plan is not included.

Response 9.4

The commenter notes the confusion caused by analyzing alternative scenarios for the Old Lumberyard site and Site C by different developers in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). The commenter also notes that the comparison with the 2045 General Plan is inaccurate and misleading, particularly regarding housing density and mobility improvements. The comment suggests that the analysis does not adequately address the impact of proposed developments on traffic and housing options.

The proposed project (2045 General Plan) analyzed in the DEIR includes the applicant-proposed projects on the Old Lumberyard and Alamo Pintado sites because this scenario provides the most conservative scenario to assess the greatest possible environmental impacts. Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 provide alternative analysis for City decision makers to consider alternatives without implementing the applicant-proposed project, or revisions to land use proposed in the update to the General Plan.

However, the following revision is made on Page ES-6 for clarification (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/<u>underline</u>):

> Alternative 2 would fulfill Project Objectives of fostering a distinct community character, promoting economic diversity and sustainability, providing adequate facilities, conserving open space, and ensuring public safety. As Alternative 2 would not involve ~~high-density~~ the development of new hotel buildings on the Old Lumberyard site, it would fulfill Project Objectives of supporting strategic land uses, and improving mobility, ~~and supporting diverse housing options,~~ to a lesser extent than the 2045 General Plan. Alternative 2 would fulfill these Project Objectives to a lesser extent as the exclusion of the Old Lumberyard site would result in a decreased emphasis on the provision of housing units, an increase in VMT per capita, and less strategic land use decision-making, when compared to the 2045 General Plan

This revision is made for clarification. It does not result in any changes to the conclusions of the environmental impact analysis in the Draft EIR.

Response 9.5

The commenter questions the logic behind claims that Alternative 2 would decrease housing provision and increase vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita, particularly when the majority of the site would still be used for housing. The commenter also challenges the assertion that not adding a hotel would worsen transportation in Solvang, especially considering the chronic congestion on the roadway.

Transportation-related impacts of Alternative 2 are discussed on Page 6-18 of the DEIR. As stated therein, reduced density, which would occur if the Old Lumberyard project is not approved (Alternative 2), would result in visitors and residents of Solvang traveling greater lengths to reach destinations, as the Old Lumberyard site is located in close proximity to several commercial areas to which visitors and residents would be expected to travel. Based on the Traffic Analysis Data Memorandum prepared by DKS Associates in December 2023 (Appendix G), Alternative 2 would result in a VMT per capita of 22.19 and a VMT per employee of 21.54. These VMT values are greater than the VMT per capita and VMT per employee of Solvang with implementation of the 2045 General Plan, which would be 22.18 and 21.52, respectively. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have greater impacts to transportation, including VMT, and these impacts would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project

Response 9.6

The commenter notes there is a discrepancy in the discussion of Alternative 3. The comment points out that not building the developer-proposed project at Site C would indeed align with the implementation of the 2045 General Plan in the real world, but not in the DEIR due to its exclusion of the Housing Element's direction for Site C. It emphasizes that the lower half of the site, designated for higher density development in the DEIR, was previously identified as an area of potential growth in the 2045 General Plan, contradicting the DEIR's claims.

Please see Response 2.2 for clarification regarding Site C's inclusion in the Housing Element as a vacant site with proposed rezoning.

Response 9.7

The commenter highlights the DEIR's acknowledgment that not building the DAP would result in fewer impacts to environmental issues. It suggests that comparing not building the DAP to the direction in the Housing Element of the 2045 General Plan would likely lead to better land use and planning outcomes and reduced impacts.

Please see Response 2.2 for clarification regarding Site C's inclusion in the Housing Element as a vacant site with proposed rezoning.

Response 9.8

The commenter highlights a discrepancy between the DEIR's claim about Alternative 3 not involving high-density development on the Alamo Pintado site and the Housing Element's allowance for such development, suggesting the DEIR's analysis does not accurately reflect the 2045 General Plan.

Please see Response 2.2 for clarification regarding Site C's inclusion in the Housing Element as a vacant site with proposed rezoning. As stated on Page 6-19 of the DEIR, the project site is currently zoned Residential, 20,000 square feet (20-R-1), which allows for single-family residential development, and has a General Plan land use designation of Low/Medium Residential (2 dwelling units per acre).

Response 9.9

The commenter questions the assertion that not constructing the 109-unit DAP would lead to increased transportation impacts, suggesting it contradicts real-world observations and implies flawed VMT analysis, and suggests Alamo Pintado Road was excluded from the modeling.

Refer to Response 5.1 regarding the inclusion of Alamo Pintado Road in the traffic analysis. Transportation impacts related to not constructing the 109-unit project on Site C are discussed on Page 6-26 of the DEIR. As discussed therein, Alternative 3 would result in reduced density, as the proposed high-density residential land use on the Alamo Pintado site would not be implemented. This reduced density would result in residents of Solvang traveling greater lengths to reach destinations, as the Alamo Pintado site is located in close proximity to several commercial areas to which residents would be expected to travel.

Response 9.10

The commenter highlights concerns about traffic congestion at the intersection of Old Mission Drive and Alamo Pintado Road, noting its role in serving major shopping centers and emergency services. It emphasizes the potential safety hazards and adverse impacts on response times for first responders due to increased congestion from the proposed Alamo Pintado Project.

Please refer to Response 5.3 regarding emergency access and safety.

Response 9.11

The commenter points out potential errors in the buildout numbers for Alternative 4 due to the lack of incorporation of the updated Housing Element's direction in the analysis. The commenter acknowledges the correctness of the analysis stating that Alternative 4 would fulfill project objectives related to community character, economic diversity, sustainability, facilities, open space conservation, and public safety.

Please see Response 2.2 for clarification regarding Site C's inclusion in the Housing Element as a vacant site with proposed rezoning.

Response 9.12

The commenter states the opinion that the lesser fulfillment of objectives in Alternative 4 is flawed because it states that high-density development wouldn't occur on certain sites, despite the possibility under existing zoning and the updated Housing Element's direction.

Please see Response 6.3 for clarification regarding Site C's inclusion in the Housing Element as a vacant site with proposed rezoning.

As stated on Page 6-11, assuming the Old Lumberyard site would be developed under existing conditions, Alternative 2 would result in 2 fewer residents and 1 fewer housing unit in Solvang in 2045.

However, the following revision is made on Page 6-37 for clarification (changes shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline):

> Alternative 4 would fulfill Project Objectives of fostering a distinct community character, promoting economic diversity and sustainability, providing adequate facilities, conserving open space, and ensuring public safety. As Alternative 4 would not involve high-density development on the ~~Old Lumberyard and~~ Alamo Pintado site~~s~~, it would fulfill Project Objectives of supporting strategic land uses, improving mobility, and supporting diverse housing options, to a lesser extent than the 2045 General Plan. Alternative 4 would fulfill these Project Objectives to a lesser extent as the exclusion of the ~~Old Lumberyard and~~ Alamo Pintado site~~s~~ would result in a decreased emphasis on the provision of housing units, an increase in VMT per capita, and less strategic land use decision-making, when compared to the 2045 General Plan. However, Alternative 4 would fulfill the Project Objective of conserving open space to a greater extent than the 2045 General Plan, as the Alamo Pintado site is currently vacant and consists of a grassy field with mature trees that would be preserved.

This revision is made for clarification. It does not result in any changes to the conclusions in the Draft EIR.

Response 9.13

The commenter agrees that alternative 4 is environmentally superior but disagrees with the transportation analysis.

Transportation impacts regarding Alternative 4 are discussed on page 6-9 and 6-10 of the DEIR. As described therein, the No Project Alternative would have a reduced buildout potential compared to the 2045 General Plan and therefore would generate less vehicle trips; however, the No Project Alternative would not implement the 2045 General Plan policies and implementation actions to reduce VMT. Unlike the 2045 General Plan, the No Project Alternative would not place an emphasis on mixed-use and infill development in Solvang. Without policies to guide mixed-use and infill development, it is anticipated that regional VMT would increase as residents and employees commute at longer distances. Based on the Traffic Analysis Data Memorandum prepared by DKS Associates in December 2023 (Appendix G), the No Project Alternative would result in a VMT per capita of 22.49 and a VMT per employee of 22.14. These VMT values are greater than the VMT per capita and VMT per employee of Solvang with implementation of the 2045 General Plan, which would be 22.18 and 21.52, respectively. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have greater impacts on transportation, including VMT, and these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project.

Response 9.14

The commenter notes that these comments have mainly been regarding the executive summary but should be reflected across the entire DEIR.

This comment has been noted.

Response 9.15

The commenter emphasizes the importance of accurate information in Environmental Review to guide decision-making, highlighting errors stemming from outdated references to the 2045 General Plan instead of the updated Housing Element, suggesting a revision and recirculation for confidence in the analysis.

Please see Response 6.3 for clarification regarding Site C's inclusion in the Housing Element as a vacant site with proposed rezoning.

Letter 10

From: Mcroberts, Ingrid@DOT <Ingrid.Mcroberts@dot.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2024 2:19 PM
To: General Plan <plansolvang@cityofsolvang.com>
Subject: Solvang Comprehensive General Plan Update and Rezoning Project-SCH 2023060448

Hello Mr. Castillo:

The California Department of Transportation, Caltrans Aeronautics has reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Solvang Comprehensive General Plan Update and Rezoning Project, State Clearinghouse No. 2023060448. One of the goals of the California Department of Transportation, Aeronautics Program, is to assist cities, counties, and Airport Land Use Commissions (ALUC) or their equivalent, to understand and comply with the State Aeronautics Act pursuant to the California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 21001 et seq. Caltrans encourages collaboration with our partners in the planning process and thanks you for including the Aeronautics Program in the review of the draft EIR. 1

The Aeronautics Program commends the City of Solvang on the preparation of the EIR and the continued collaboration with aviation stakeholders on regional aviation planning issues.

Thank you,
Ingrid McRoberts
Office of Aviation Planning
Caltrans Aeronautics Program
Phone: (805) 835-6555

Letter 10

COMMENTER: Ingrid McRoberts, Caltrans Aeronautics Program

DATE: April 15, 2024

Response 10.1

The commenter notes that they have reviewed the DEIR and expresses appreciation for the current and future continued collaboration with the District.

This comment is noted.

Letter 11

From: Stephen Martin <stormyscm@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 13, 2024 6:49 PM
To: Rafael Castillo <rcastillo@cityofsolvang.com>; planning@cityofsolvang.com; Planning Dept Public List <planningdept@cityofsolvang.com>; General Plan <plansolvang@cityofsolvang.com>
Subject: Comments on General Plan Draft EIR

Please accept the following comments on the draft Solvang General Plan Environmental Impact Review.

1. I strongly agree with the draft EIR conclusion that Alternative # 4 (as it relates to no development of DEVELOPER'S ALTERNATE plan at Alamo Pintado and Old Mission Drive on Site C) is the environmentally preferred alternative. 1
2. Thr EIR drew conclusions that there was adequate City water and sewer capacity at the proposed rezoned high density building sites but said they did not analyze traffic issues because there were no specific building project applications and proposals. This is faulty logic. The conclusions as to water and sewer must have properly been based on assumptions of maximum allowed occupancy at 20 units per acre and average consumption data. Likewise, traffic could and should have been analyzed on the basis of that same maximum occupancy and area traffic data. 2
3. In addition, added traffic analyses should be based on cumulative figures from ALL existing development, including new residences recently constructed on Old Mission Drive; approved development such as Sansum Clinic on Rte 246, the approved 32 unit development at Alamo Pintado and Village Lane, and the new hotel at Allisal Rd and Mission Drive; as well as the proposed100 unit development for Alamo Pintado and Old Mission Drive; and the potential high density development now allowed by rezoning on Allisal road and the corner of Alamo Pintado and Viborg. It appears the EIR did not make a complete evaluation based on ALL this cumulative added existing and likely traffic. 3
4. The EIR did not adequately evaluate the overflow, flooding and pollution potential from developing the steep Site C ALTERNATE proposal, with water and silt likely overflowing into Alamo Pintado Creek and ultimately the Santa Ynez River. 4
5. The draft EIR needs more specific analysis ofl the destruction of a designated view shed, open space and habitat in one of the only places where diverse wildlife exist within the city limits of Solvang. The EIR simply dismisses the wildlife subject by saying that they did not observe certain species on Site C and then omitting them from listings. This ommission, included amazingly, the herds of deer that routinely roam Site C, together with species that are primarily nocturnal. Nor did the EIR address the effect of loss of open habitat and new high density buildings and traffic on the adjacent Mission Oaks land where over 30 acres has been set aside as open space, currently serving as a safe habitat for many wildlife species, a habitat that is unique to Solvang. 5

Thank you.

Stephen C. Martin
698 Hillside Drive

Solvang, CA 93463
stormtscm@gmail.com

Stephen C. Martin

Letter 11

COMMENTER: Stephen Martin

DATE: April 13, 2024

Response 11.1

The commenter expresses agreement with the DEIR conclusion that Alternative 4 would be the environmentally superior option.

This comment has been noted.

Response 11.2

The commenter states the opinion that traffic, water and sewer analysis should have assumed maximum allowed occupancy of 20 units per acre.

Water and sewer impacts are addressed in Section 4.16, *Utilities and Service Systems*, of the DEIR. As described on Page 4.16-13 water demand is calculated in the DEIR using the assumed maximum growth facilitated by the 2045 General Plan of up to 1,398 people. Wastewater generation is calculated based on the anticipated water demand; therefore, wastewater generation is also calculated in the DEIR using the assumed maximum growth facilitated by the 2045 General Plan.

Regarding traffic, the commenter does not make a specific reference within the DEIR, however, the Traffic Analysis Memo included as Appendix G includes analysis of all project scenarios and alternatives including the full buildout of the high-density rezone sites.

Response 11.3

The commenter states the opinion that cumulative projects were not adequately considered in the traffic analyses.

Cumulative transportation and traffic impacts are discussed on Page 4.14-20 of the DEIR. As stated therein, regional cumulative impacts consider the City-wide impacts together with similar impacts of reasonably anticipated regional projects/programs. Compliance with applicable regulations and oversight, including Caltrans design guidelines, City design guidelines, and Santa Barbara County Fire Department standards would effectively reduce the potential for individual projects to create a cumulative transportation hazard or emergency access impacts within Solvang, as well as Santa Barbara County. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to transportation hazards and emergency access were determined to be less than significant and no additional analysis or changes to the Draft EIR are required.

Response 11.4

The commenter states the opinion that the DEIR did not adequately evaluate the potential for the alternative development at Site C to overflow, flood, and or discharge pollution into the Alamo Pintado Creek/Santa Ynez River.

Impacts related to flooding and pollutant discharge into local waters are discussed in Section 4.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*. As stated therein, operation of future development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan would be required to comply with the provisions of California's Phase II MS4 Permit. Section 14-3 of the City's Municipal Code requires any owner or person developing real

property to integrate post-construction requirements that would control the volume, rate, and potential pollutant load of runoff. In addition, projects that create or replace greater than or equal to 2,500 square feet of impervious surface must implement post-construction BMPs and submit a Stormwater Control Plan listing applicable BMPs to the City for review and approval. Pursuant to the Municipal Code, post construction requirements must comply with the RWQCB Central Coast Region Resolution No. R3-2013-0032. In addition, the Municipal Code requires industrial and commercial facilities and other new development, as applicable, to minimize the discharge of pollutants through the implementation of BMPs that are consistent with the CASQA BMP Handbooks or equivalent, such as the County's Stormwater Technical Guide for Low Impact Development.

The City enforces project-specific operational BMP requirements by incorporating these as conditions of approval into land use entitlements and building permits specific to a project, and requires applicants to ensure the proper long-term operation and maintenance of selected BMPs. Any future development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan that would be categorized under Standard Industrial Classification codes would be subject to the Industrial General Permit, which requires development of a site-specific operational SWPPP. Implementation of the operational SWPPP would reduce the risk of water degradation on-site and off-site from soil erosion and other pollutants related to project operation, because an operational SWPPP requires the design, installation, and maintenance of post-construction stormwater controls. The operational SWPPP identifies the site-specific sources of pollutants and describes the BMPs implemented at the facility to prevent dry weather runoff and to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges. Adherence to permit and Municipal Code requirements would minimize impacts related to water quality and ensure development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Impacts related to water quality were determined be less than significant and no additional analysis or changes to the Draft EIR are required.

Construction facilitated by the 2045 General Plan would alter the existing drainage patterns of individual project sites which has the potential to cause erosion and flooding, exceed stormwater drainage capacity, provide additional sources of polluted runoff, or alter flood flows. Projects subject to the NPDES Construction General Permit would be required to prepare a SWPPP which includes project-specific BMPs to control erosion, sediment release, and otherwise reduce the potential for discharge of pollutants from construction into stormwater. Projects not subject to the NPDES Construction General Permit would be required to implement a project-specific Erosion and Sediment Control Plan which must include BMPs to minimize adverse impacts associated with the alteration of drainage patterns. As described in Impact HYD-4 of the DEIR, Chapter 13 of the City's Municipal Code requires flood control measures to be implemented during construction for projects in flood hazard areas, including development to be elevated above the base flood elevation.

Runoff during operation of development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan would be regulated under the Phase II MS4 Permit. Projects that create or replace greater than or equal to 2,500 square feet of impervious surface must implement post-construction BMPs and submit a Stormwater Control Plan listing applicable BMPs to the City for review and approval. Pursuant to the Municipal Code, post construction requirements must comply with the RWQCB Central Coast Region Resolution No. R3-2013-0032. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of a site or area such that substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, flooding on- or off-site, exceedance of the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provision of additional sources of polluted runoff, or impediment or redirection of flood flows would occur.

Therefore, impacts were determined to be less than significant and no additional analysis or changes to the Draft EIR are required.

Response 11.5

The commenter states the opinion that additional analysis of the destruction of designated viewsheds, open space, and wildlife habitat is needed. The commenter states that the analysis omits species that are not specifically named by the DEIR. The commenter also expresses concerns regarding the Mission Oaks open space adjacent to Site C.

Regarding viewsheds, impacts related to scenic vistas are discussed on pages 4.1-5 through 4.1-7 of the DEIR. As stated therein, one of the primary objectives of the 2045 General Plan is to conserve and protect open space to preserve the scenic beauty of Solvang's natural surroundings. Policies in the proposed Environment and Sustainability Element would encourage the protection of scenic vistas. Goal ENV-2 aims to protect important scenic resources within the Planning Area; this goal would be implemented through Policy ENV-2.1, which requires protection of scenic views of rolling hillsides and agricultural lands; Policy ENV-2.3, which requires protection of scenic qualities of transportation corridors; and Policy ENV-2.4, which requires preservation of the scenic character of the greenbelts and buffers surrounding Solvang. These policies would ensure development would not adversely affect scenic vistas throughout Solvang.

Several policies in the 2045 General Plan's Community Design Element are intended to preserve specific vistas of the hillsides that surround Solvang including Policy CD-1.34 which ensures that new development on sites with high visibility, such as on hillsides or in the highway corridors, is designed to minimize adverse visual impact; Policy CD-1.38 which requires new development on major ridge lines, canyon edges, and hilltops to be designed and constructed to blend into the natural environment without creating adverse visual impacts; Policy CD-1.41 which hillside residential development projects to use plant materials which screen structures and present an appearance that integrates residences with the natural appearance of the area; and Policy CD-2.40 which requires that hillside properties be designed to minimize formal landscape planting and hardscapes and locate them close to the residence, follow the natural topography, and preserve native trees, native plant and wildlife habitats, and migration corridors.

As stated on Page 4.1-6 of the DEIR, the abovementioned 2045 General Plan goals and policies pertaining to protection of scenic vistas and hillside vistas would apply to development at the Alamo Pintado site and would minimize the potential for this development to adversely affect scenic vistas in Solvang. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on scenic vistas was determined to be less than significant, and no additional analysis or changes to the Draft EIR are required.

Regarding wildlife species and wildlife habitat, pursuant to Section 15380 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the DEIR evaluates the potential for the project to 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Analysis of other wildlife that does not meet this criteria is not required by CEQA. The DEIR also evaluates the project's potential impacts on established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Impacts to these biological resources are discussed in Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of the DEIR. As stated therein, 2045 General Plan policies would minimize impacts to protected biological resources and provide open space that preserves habitat that may support special-status species and sensitive habitats. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3 are included in the DEIR to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels, and no additional analysis or changes to the Draft EIR are required.

Regarding the commenter's concern about open space adjacent to Site C, areas adjacent to Site C currently have designated land uses for high-density residential, professional office, and retail commercial. None of the lots adjacent to Site C have an existing land use designation of open space under the currently adopted General Plan. No additional analysis or changes to the Draft EIR are required.

This page intentionally left blank.

3 Errata to the Draft EIR

Chapter 3 presents specific changes to the text of the Draft EIR that are being made in response to comments received or to make corrections. In no case do these revisions result in a greater number of impacts or impacts of a substantially greater severity than those set forth in the Draft EIR. Where revisions to the main text are called for, the page number is set forth, followed by the appropriate revision. Added text is indicated with underlined and deleted text is indicated with ~~strikeout~~. Page numbers correspond to the page numbers of the Draft EIR.

3.1 Revisions to the Draft EIR

Page ES-3:

The City Council ~~authorized the~~ adopted the Housing Element in December 2023 which includes Site C as a vacant site with proposed rezoning. ~~Review of~~ The Housing Element considers a rezone of the lower half of the site with a land use designation of DR-20 units per acre. The estimated buildout would be ~~40~~36 to 50 units with the other half of the site designated for 20-R-1 or Open Space as noted in the adopted Housing Element.

Page ES-6:

Alternative 3 (No Alamo Pintado Project) would involve implementation of the 2045 General Plan and exclusion of the Alamo Pintado site as an area of potential growth. Although the Alamo Pintado Project would not be included under Alternative 3, this would not preclude development from occurring on the site in the future. Under Alternative 3, the proposed Alamo Pintado Project would not be implemented, and the zoning and General Plan designations would not change from the existing designations. However, housing could still be built on the Alamo Pintado Project site, for a total of 2 to 11 units and 5 to 27 new residents. Therefore, in comparison to the 2045 General Plan's anticipated 2045 population of 7,253 and housing stock of 3,019 units, Alternative 3 would result in 235 to 256 fewer additional residents and 107 to 98 fewer housing units in Solvang in 2045. As a result, the anticipated growth in Solvang would be less than the 2045 General Plan.

Page ES-6:

Alternative 2 would fulfill Project Objectives of fostering a distinct community character, promoting economic diversity and sustainability, providing adequate facilities, conserving open space, and ensuring public safety. As Alternative 2 would not involve ~~high-density~~ the development of new hotel buildings on the Old Lumberyard site, it would fulfill Project Objectives of supporting strategic land uses, and improving mobility, ~~and supporting diverse housing options,~~ to a lesser extent than the 2045 General Plan. Alternative 2 would fulfill these Project Objectives to a lesser extent as the exclusion of the Old Lumberyard site would result in a decreased emphasis on the provision of housing units, an increase in VMT per capita, and less strategic land use decision-making, when compared to the 2045 General Plan

Page ES-9:

AQ-1 SBCAPCD's Construction Impact Mitigation~~: PM10 Mitigation Measures~~

The applicant shall require all construction contractors to implement the basic construction mitigation measures recommended by SBCAPCD to reduce fugitive dust emissions. These measures should be required for all projects involving earthmoving activities regardless of the project size or duration. Projects are expected to manage fugitive dust emissions such that emissions do not exceed APCD's visible emissions limit (APCD Rule 302), create a public nuisance (APCD Rule 303), and are in compliance with the APCD's requirements and standards for visible dust (APCD Rule 345). Emission reduction measures will include, at a minimum, the following measures:

- During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site and from exceeding SBCAPCD's limit of 20 percent opacity for greater than three minutes in any 30-minute period. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 miles per hour (mph). Reclaimed water shall be used whenever possible. However, reclaimed water shall not be used in or around crops for human consumption.
- The amount of disturbed area shall be minimized.
- On-site vehicle speeds shall be no greater than 15 mph when traveling on unpaved surfaces.
- A track-out prevention device shall be installed and operated where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can include any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out of dirt such as gravel pads, pipe-grid track-out control devices, rumble strips, or wheel washing systems.
- ~~If stockpiling of material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than one day shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.~~
- After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, or using roll-compaction, or revegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. All driveways and sidewalks to be paved/surfaced shall be completed as soon as possible.
- The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SBCAPCD prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or map clearance.
- ~~The project applicant shall comply with SBCAPCD Rule 345: Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities, including all applicable standards and measures therein.~~
- If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than one day shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.
- Schedule clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation activities during periods of low wind speed to the extent feasible. During periods of high winds (>25 mph) clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation operations shall be minimized to prevent fugitive dust created by onsite operations from becoming a nuisance or hazard.

The commenter recommends inclusion of the District's recommended measures to reduce diesel particulate and NOx emissions in order to address construction related impacts in MM AQ-2.

Page ES-11:

AQ-~~1~~2 Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures

For individual residential projects facilitated by the 2045 General Plan that would develop three or more units, would involve demolition, mass grading, or excavation and trenching phases longer than two months and would be located within 1,000 feet of existing sensitive receptors, the City shall enforce a project specific Condition of Approval requiring the following: ~~off-road heavy-duty diesel engines to meet CARB-certified Tier 3 or higher emission standards or employ CARB-certified Level 3 diesel particulate filters to the extent that this equipment is commercially available. "Commercially available" shall be defined as the availability of required equipment in geographic proximity to the project site and within a reasonable timeframe relative to critical path construction timing. If Tier 3 or higher emission standard equipment or Level 3 diesel particulate filters are not commercially available, documentation shall be provided by the project applicant to the City stating that Tier 3 equipment or higher emission standard or Level 3 diesel particulate filters are not commercially available with supporting evidence from the contractor. If CARB-certified Level 3 diesel particulate filters are utilized, they shall be kept in working order and maintained in operable condition according to manufacturer's specifications, as applicable.~~

- Off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment with engines certified to meet U.S. EPA Tier 4 emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- On-road heavy-duty equipment with model year 2010 engines or newer should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible. Electric auxiliary power units should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Equipment/vehicles using alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or renewable diesel, should be used on-site where feasible.
- Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.
- The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.
- The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
- Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.
- Construction truck trips should be scheduled during non-peak hours to reduce peak hour emissions whenever feasible.
- Proposed truck routes should minimize impacts to residential communities and sensitive receptors.
- Construction staging areas should be located away from sensitive receptors such that exhaust and other construction emissions do not enter the fresh air intakes to buildings, air conditioners, and windows.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce potential residual health risk impacts associated with exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations of diesel particulate matter and toxic air contaminants to the extent feasible. However, as U.S. EPA Tier 4~~3~~ or higher emission standard equipment ~~or Level 3 diesel particulate filters~~ cannot be guaranteed to be commercially available, impacts are conservatively assessed as significant and unavoidable.

Page ES-16:

Mitigation Measure CUL-1 Historical Resources

Prior to project approval of a development project carried out under the 2045 General Plan, City staff shall determine the age of the structure(s) present. If a structure is determined to be ~~greater than~~ 45 years of age or older, the project applicant shall submit preliminary information (i.e., photographs) identifying any historical age features (i.e., structures ~~over~~ 45 years of age or older) proposed to be substantially altered, relocated, or demolished. If a building, structure, object, or other built environment feature that is 45 years of age or older is proposed to be substantially altered, relocated, or demolished, and after reviewing this documentation, the Planning Manager or their designee, supported by an architectural historian as needed, shall make a preliminary determination as to whether the building qualifies as a historical resource. "Historical resource" shall mean a property listed or found eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or identified as historically and/or architecturally significant by the City pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. A property that is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources must retain its historic integrity and meet one of the following eligibility criteria:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

If the Planning Manager or their designee determines the built environment resource may have the potential to qualify as a historical resource, then a historical resources evaluation shall be required. The evaluation shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) in architectural history or history. The qualified architectural historian or historian shall conduct an intensive-level evaluation in accordance with the guidelines and best practices promulgated by the State Office of Historic Preservation to identify potential historical resources within the proposed development site. All properties 45 years of age or older shall be evaluated within their historic context and documented in a report meeting the State Office of Historic Preservation guidelines. All evaluated properties shall be documented on Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 Forms. The report will be submitted to the City for review and concurrence. If the property is already listed in the NRHP or CRHR, the historical resources evaluation described above shall not be required.

If historical resources are identified through the survey and evaluation within the development site of a proposed development, efforts shall be made to the extent feasible to ensure that impacts are mitigated. Application of mitigation shall generally be overseen by a qualified architectural historian

or historic architect meeting the PQS, unless unnecessary in the circumstances (e.g., preservation in place). In conjunction with a development application that may affect the historical resource, the historical resources evaluation report shall also identify and specify the treatment of character-defining features and construction activities.

Efforts shall be made to the greatest extent feasible to ensure that the relocation, rehabilitation, or alteration of the resource is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties (Standards). In accordance with CEQA, a project that has been determined to conform with the Standards generally would not cause a significant adverse direct or indirect impact to historical resources (14 CCR § 15126.4(b)(1)). Application of the Standards shall be overseen by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect meeting the PQS. In conjunction with any development application that may affect the historical resource, a report identifying and specifying the treatment of character-defining features and construction activities shall be provided to the City for review and concurrence. As applicable, the report shall demonstrate how the project complies with the Standards and be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of permits.

If significant historical resources are identified on a development site and compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties and or avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be established and undertaken. Mitigation measures may include documentation of the historical resource in the form of a Historic American Building Survey report. The report shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation and shall generally follow the Historic American Building Survey Level III requirements, including digital photographic recordation, detailed historic narrative report, and compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Professional Qualifications Standards as defined by 36 CFR Part 61 and submitted to the City prior to issuance of any permits for demolition or alteration of the historical resource.

Page ES-37:

Impact UTIL-2 2045 General Plan implementation would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Impacts would be less than significant. ~~the overall growth anticipated by the 2045 general plan would generate additional water demand in solvang that could exceed projected water supplies. With the implementation of 2045 general plan policies, which require the city to restrict development until adequate water supplies are available to serve additional development, this impact would be less than significant.~~

Page 1-1:

This document is a programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that assesses the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of an update to the Solvang General Plan (collectively referred to in this EIR as the "2045 General Plan" or "proposed project"). ~~including eight respective~~ The proposed project includes updates to seven of the City General Plan elements.

Page 2-3:

The 2045 General Plan covers approximately 3.1 square miles (1,968 acres) of land within Solvang's Planning Area. Solvang is characterized as a compact city which has evolved into a widely recognized tourist destination in the village core due to its unique architecture. The Mission District contains the Mission Santa Inés and the surrounding open space around the mission. Other influences in the surrounding region include surrounding wineries and agricultural uses, and the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians ~~Chumash~~ reservation and casino.

Page 2-11:

The Land Use Element contains the Land Use Map (also referred to as the Land Use Diagram) as well as the policies and standards that directly shape land use decisions and the resulting physical development of Solvang.

Page 4.2-13:

AQ-1 SBCAPCD's Construction Impact Mitigation~~: PM10 Mitigation Measures~~

The applicant shall require all construction contractors to implement the basic construction mitigation measures recommended by SBCAPCD to reduce fugitive dust emissions. These measures should be required for all projects involving earthmoving activities regardless of the project size or duration. Projects are expected to manage fugitive dust emissions such that emissions do not exceed APCD's visible emissions limit (APCD Rule 302), create a public nuisance (APCD Rule 303), and are in compliance with the APCD's requirements and standards for visible dust (APCD Rule 345). Emission reduction measures will include, at a minimum, the following measures:

- During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site and from exceeding SBCAPCD's limit of 20 percent opacity for greater than three minutes in any 30-minute period. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 miles per hour (mph). Reclaimed water shall be used

whenever possible. However, reclaimed water shall not be used in or around crops for human consumption.

- The amount of disturbed area shall be minimized.
- On-site vehicle speeds shall be no greater than 15 mph when traveling on unpaved surfaces.
- A track-out prevention device shall be installed and operated where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can include any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out of dirt such as gravel pads, pipe-grid track-out control devices, rumble strips, or wheel washing systems.
- ~~If stockpiling of material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than one day shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.~~
- After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, or using roll-compaction, or revegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. All driveways and sidewalks to be paved/surfaced shall be completed as soon as possible.
- The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SBCAPCD prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or map clearance.
- ~~The project applicant shall comply with SBCAPCD Rule 345: Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities, including all applicable standards and measures therein.~~
- If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than one day shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.
- Schedule clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation activities during periods of low wind speed to the extent feasible. During periods of high winds (>25 mph) clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation operations shall be minimized to prevent fugitive dust created by onsite operations from becoming a nuisance or hazard.

Page 4.2-13:

~~SMART~~SMRT Breeze 200 Bus: Route runs from Santa Maria to Buellton and Solvang.

Page 4.2-17:

Impact AQ-3 development facilitated by the 2045 General Plan could result in construction activity that could produce toxic air contaminant emissions in proximity to residential receptors. Mitigation Measure AQ~~1~~-2 would require large construction projects to use equipment meeting ~~CARB tier 3~~ U.S. EPA Tier 4 or higher for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines, which would reduce toxic air contaminant emissions. However, Tier ~~3~~4 or higher emission standard equipment ~~or level 3 diesel particulate filters~~ cannot be guaranteed to be commercially available. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Page 4.2-18:

Individual residential development projects within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors, that have construction durations longer than two months, and are larger than single-family residences, ADUs, or duplexes can result in potentially significant health risk impacts when Tier ~~3~~4 or higher construction equipment, which results in substantially lower TAC emissions than older construction equipment, is not utilized. SBCAPCD recommends diesel equipment meeting the ~~CARB Tier 3~~ U.S. EPA Tier 4 or higher emission standards be used in place of older construction equipment to the maximum extent feasible ~~(SBCAPCD 2022a)~~. As a result, the construction of certain individual housing development projects – those with three or more units and a construction duration longer than two months that take place within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors – could result in potentially significant health risk impacts if construction equipment does not meet this criteria~~CARB Tier 3 or higher for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines~~. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant, requiring mitigation.

Page 4.2-19:

AQ-~~1~~2 Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures

For individual residential projects facilitated by the 2045 General Plan that would develop three or more units, would involve demolition, mass grading, or excavation and trenching phases longer than two months and would be located within 1,000 feet of existing sensitive receptors, the City shall enforce a project specific Condition of Approval requiring the following: ~~off-road heavy-duty diesel engines to meet CARB-certified Tier 3 or higher emission standards or employ CARB-certified Level 3 diesel particulate filters to the extent that this equipment is commercially available. "Commercially available" shall be defined as the availability of required equipment in geographic proximity to the project site and within a reasonable timeframe relative to critical path construction timing. If Tier 3 or higher emission standard equipment or Level 3 diesel particulate filters are not commercially available, documentation shall be provided by the project applicant to the City stating that Tier 3 equipment or higher emission standard or Level 3 diesel particulate filters are not commercially available with supporting evidence from the contractor. If CARB-certified Level 3 diesel particulate filters are utilized, they shall be kept in working order and maintained in operable condition according to manufacturer's specifications, as applicable.~~

- Off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment with engines certified to meet U.S. EPA Tier 4 emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- On-road heavy-duty equipment with model year 2010 engines or newer should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible. Electric auxiliary power units should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Equipment/vehicles using alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or renewable diesel, should be used on-site where feasible.
- Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.
- The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.

- The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
- Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.
- Construction truck trips should be scheduled during non-peak hours to reduce peak hour emissions whenever feasible.
- Proposed truck routes should minimize impacts to residential communities and sensitive receptors.
- Construction staging areas should be located away from sensitive receptors such that exhaust and other construction emissions do not enter the fresh air intakes to buildings, air conditioners, and windows.

Page 4.4-11 through 4.4-12:

Mitigation Measure CUL-1 Historical Resources

Prior to project approval of a development project carried out under the 2045 General Plan, City staff shall determine the age of the structure(s) present. If a structure is determined to be greater than 45 years of age, the project applicant shall submit preliminary information (i.e., photographs) identifying any historical age features (i.e., structures ~~over~~ 45 years of age or older) proposed to be substantially altered, relocated, or demolished. If a building, structure, object, or other built environment feature that is 45 years of age or older is proposed to be substantially altered, relocated, or demolished, and after reviewing this documentation, the Planning Manager or their designee, supported by an architectural historian as needed, shall make a preliminary determination as to whether the building qualifies as a historical resource. "Historical resource" shall mean a property listed or found eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or identified as historically and/or architecturally significant by the City pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. A property that is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources must retain its historic integrity and meet one of the following eligibility criteria:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

If the Planning Manager or their designee determines the built environment resource may have the potential to qualify as a historical resource, then a historical resources evaluation shall be required. The evaluation shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) in architectural history or history. The qualified architectural historian or historian shall conduct an intensive-level evaluation in accordance with the guidelines and best practices promulgated by the State Office of Historic Preservation to identify potential historical resources within the proposed development site. All properties 45 years of age or older shall be evaluated within their historic context and

documented in a report meeting the State Office of Historic Preservation guidelines. All evaluated properties shall be documented on Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 Forms. The report will be submitted to the City for review and concurrence. If the property is already listed in the NRHP or CRHR, the historical resources evaluation described above shall not be required.

If historical resources are identified through the survey and evaluation within the development site of a proposed development, efforts shall be made to the extent feasible to ensure that impacts are mitigated. Application of mitigation shall generally be overseen by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect meeting the PQS, unless unnecessary in the circumstances (e.g., preservation in place). In conjunction with a development application that may affect the historical resource, the historical resources evaluation report shall also identify and specify the treatment of character-defining features and construction activities.

Efforts shall be made to the greatest extent feasible to ensure that the relocation, rehabilitation, or alteration of the resource is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties (Standards). In accordance with CEQA, a project that has been determined to conform with the Standards generally would not cause a significant adverse direct or indirect impact to historical resources (14 CCR § 15126.4(b)(1)). Application of the Standards shall be overseen by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect meeting the PQS. In conjunction with any development application that may affect the historical resource, a report identifying and specifying the treatment of character-defining features and construction activities shall be provided to the City for review and concurrence. As applicable, the report shall demonstrate how the project complies with the Standards and be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of permits.

If significant historical resources are identified on a development site and compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties and or avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be established and undertaken. Mitigation measures may include documentation of the historical resource in the form of a Historic American Building Survey report. The report shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation and shall generally follow the Historic American Building Survey Level III requirements, including digital photographic recordation, detailed historic narrative report, and compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Professional Qualifications Standards as defined by 36 CFR Part 61 and submitted to the City prior to issuance of any permits for demolition or alteration of the historical resource.

Page 4.4-13:

As discussed in Section 4.4.1, *Setting*, there are ~~three~~four known archaeological resources located in the Planning Area. In addition to these known archaeological resources, there may be other yet unidentified archaeological resources which may be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR.

Page 4.12-4:

The updated Housing Element, which was adopted by the City in December 2023 and certified by the state in February 2024, includes a detailed analysis of housing needs, resources, and constraints; an analysis and identification of any areas that may perpetuate housing inequities in the community; and policies and programs with the goal of achieving more equitable housing practices

Page 4.12-4:

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is a measure used in transportation planning. VMT measures the amount of travel for all vehicles in a geographic region over a given period of time, typically a one year period. VMT is calculated by adding up all the miles driven by all the cars and trucks on all the roadways in a region. Since 2005, daily miles traveled within Solvang has increased by 13 percent. VMT on local roads within Solvang has seen a net increase of nearly 28 percent since 2005. Approximately 55 percent of the city's total VMT is on SR 246, with the remaining 45 percent on local roads. The City currently uses the existing regional SBCAG thresholds for VMT. The Technical Advisory recommends that general plans, area plans, or community plans may have a significant impact on transportation if the VMT increases would exceed a threshold of 15 percent lower per capita or per employee VMT than existing regional development. As shown in Table 4.14-1, the SBCAG region's existing VMT per capita is 21.74 and VMT per employee is 25.07.

Table 4.14-1 Existing Vehicle Miles Traveled Summary

Area	Scenario	VMT	15 Percent Below Existing VMT
SBCAG Region	Existing Per Capita (2015)	21.74	18.48
	Existing Per Employee (2015)	25.07	21.31

Source: Appendix G

Page 4.2-19:

AQ-~~1~~2 Construction Equipment Exhaust Control Measures

Page 4.16-13:

Impact UTIL-2 2045 General Plan implementation would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Impacts would be less than significant. ~~the overall growth anticipated by the 2045 general plan would generate additional water demand in solvang that could exceed projected water supplies. With the implementation of 2045 general plan policies, which require the city to restrict development until adequate water supplies are available to serve additional development, this impact would be less than significant.~~

Page 6-2:

This alternative would not remove the Agriculture Land Use designation, focus on affordable housing, or result in other updates to comply with current State law, or updates to address preservation of natural resources. Under the No Project Alternative, the existing zoning would not provide adequate residential zones and capacity necessary to meet the housing needs identified under the current Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) 6th Cycle. This could result in inconsistency between the 2045 General Plan and the adopted Housing Element, which was adopted by the City in December 2023 and certified by the state in February 2024. Considering the 2045 General Plan would guide development through 2045, land use decisions made now would impact the City's ability not only to meet the State's current 6th Cycle RHNA, but also future RHNA cycles through 2045.

Page 6-3:

The No Project Alternative would result in fewer construction emissions, compared to the 2045 General Plan, as there would be less overall development under the No Project Alternative. SBCAPCD does not have quantitative thresholds of significance for plan-level activity that would apply to the 2045 General Plan. Therefore, construction impacts for the 2045 General Plan are discussed qualitatively. As described in Section 4.2, Air Quality, there is not sufficient data to allow project-level construction analysis. Therefore, the No Project Alternative, with adherence to SBCAPCD's fugitive dust control measures, may still exceed SBCAPCD's threshold and construction air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project.

Using methodology described in Section 4.2, Air Quality, California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was used to estimate approximate emissions during No Project Alternative operations. As shown in Appendix C, the No Project Alternative would result in an approximate six to eighteen percent decrease in ROC, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed project as a result of the reduced buildout. Therefore, similar to the 2045 General Plan, the No Project Alternative operations would not result in a cumulatively conservable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment, and operational impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Page 6-4 to 6-5:

The No Project Alternative would result in reduced buildout potential compared to the 2045 General Plan. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would involve less overall new development as compared to the 2045 General Plan. The goals, policies, and actions in the 2045 General Plan that would protect archaeological and historic resources would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative. Although 2045 General Plan updated goals and policies would not be implemented, existing regulations would still be in effect. Development under both the No Project Alternative and the 2045 General Plan would be required to comply with federal and State regulations as well as the City's Municipal Code, which would require identification, evaluation, and protection of historic resources throughout the City. Overall, the No Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts to archaeological and historic resources compared to the 2045 General Plan because development under this alternative is anticipated to be reduced compared to the 2045 General Plan. Additionally, each individual project under the No Project Alternative would be required to implement mitigation to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level~~, similar to the 2045 General Plan~~. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources under the No Project Alternative would be ~~less than significant with mitigation incorporated,~~ similar to the proposed project.

Page 6-8:

Operation of future development under the No Project Alternative would not involve substantial vibration or groundborne noise. Therefore, impacts would be similar to the 2045 General Plan. Overall, impacts involving groundborne vibration and noise would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated, similar to the proposed project.

Page 6-12:

SBCAPCD does not have quantitative thresholds of significance for plan-level activity that would apply to the 2045 General Plan. Therefore, construction impacts for the 2045 General Plan are discussed qualitatively. As described in 4.2, Air Quality, there is not sufficient data to allow project-level construction analysis. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2, with adherence to SBCAPCD fugitive dust control measures, may still exceed SBCAPCD's threshold and construction impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Although, due to the reduced buildout potential, Alternative 2 would result in a minor emissions reduction compared to the 2045 General Plan. Using methodology described in Section 4.2, Air Quality, CalEEMod was used to estimate approximate emissions during Alternative 2 operations. As shown in Appendix C, Alternative 2 would result in an approximate two percent decrease in ROC, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed project operations because of a reduction of area and energy consumption, due to a reduced residential buildout. Therefore, similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 2 would not result in a cumulatively ~~conservable~~considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment, and operational impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 2 would potentially expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations in the form of TACs during construction. Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would still be required under Alternative 2 and DPM and TAC emissions would be substantially reduced at sensitive receptors. However, U.S. EPA Tier ~~3~~4 or higher engines ~~tiers or Level 3 diesel particulate filters~~ cannot be guaranteed to be commercially available. Therefore, construction related impacts are conservatively assessed as significant and unavoidable, similar to the 2045 General Plan. Although, due to the reduced buildout potential, Alternative 2 would result in a minor TAC emission reduction, specifically near single-family residences that are north and east of the Old Lumberyard site, compared to the 2045 General Plan. The buildout of Alternative 2 would not include land uses that would emit substantial amount of operational TAC emissions, and stationary sources would be required to be permitted by SBCPACD. Therefore, similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 2 would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial operational TAC emissions and operational impacts would be less than significant. As with the 2045 General Plan, construction-related odors would be short-term and temporary, and odor-related impacts would be less than significant~~the Alternative 2 would not result in other emissions that would adversely affect a substantial number of people~~.

Page 6-13:

Alternative 2 would result in reduced buildout potential compared to the 2045 General Plan. Nonetheless, Alternative 2 would have similar potential as the proposed project to affect historical resources substantially and adversely since this alternative could still facilitate development on parcels containing historic structures. Similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 2 would implement policies to protect historical and culturally significant resources and would implement Mitigation Measure CUL-1 to identify historic-age features that an individual development would alter or demolish. However, there would still be potential for development to impact historical resources. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have similar impacts to historical resources as the 2045 General Plan~~, and this alternative's impact on historical resources would be less than significant with mitigation, similar to the proposed project~~. As Alternative 2 would result in reduced buildout potential, this alternative would therefore have

less potential to disturb subsurface archaeological resources, as development and ground-disturbing activities would not occur on the Old Lumberyard site. Similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 2 would implement Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 and would require archaeological resources assessments, archaeological resources monitoring, or implementation of unanticipated discovery procedures for development involving ground-disturbing activities. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have fewer impacts than the 2045 General Plan, and this alternative's impact on archaeological resources would be less than significant with mitigation, similar to the proposed project. Similar to the 2045 General Plan, excavations during construction activities facilitated by Alternative 2 could have the potential to disturb human remains in the Planning Area which could include Native American burial sites, however, adherence to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

Page 6-19:

The project site is currently zoned Residential, 20,000 square feet (20-R-1), which allows for single-family residential development, and has a General Plan land use designation of Low/Medium Residential (2 dwelling units per acre, with up to 3 accessory dwelling units). The proposed General Plan Update would involve a zone change to Design Residential 20 (DR-20). Under the proposed General Plan Update, the project site would have a land use designation of High Density Residential.

Although the Alamo Pintado Project would not be included under Alternative 3, this would not preclude development from occurring on the site in the future. There are currently two existing lots and therefore 2 units were assumed to be developed under the existing zoning of Residential, 20,000 square feet (20-R-1), which allows for single-family residential development, and a General Plan land use designation of Low/Medium Residential (2 dwelling units per acre, with up to 3 accessory dwelling units). Based on the zoning of 20-R-1 there is a potential for up to 11 units or lots to be designed for this 5.5-acre property. Additionally, there is potential for Accessory Dwelling Units. This level of development would require the process of a Development Plan and additionally a Tentative Tract Map. These discretionary applications would require process of the applications, environmental review and a public hearing at the Planning Commission.

Under Alternative 3, the proposed Alamo Pintado Project would not be implemented, and the zoning and General Plan designations would not change from the existing designations. However, housing could still be built on the Alamo Pintado Project site, for a total of 2 to 11 units and 5 to 27 new residents.

Therefore, in comparison to the 2045 General Plan's anticipated 2045 population of 7,253 and housing stock of 3,019 units, Alternative 3 would result in 235 to 256 fewer additional residents and 107 to 98 fewer housing units in Solvang in 2045. As a result, the anticipated growth in Solvang would be less than the 2045 General Plan. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would not fulfill the Project Objectives of supporting strategic land uses and diverse housing options.

This revision is included in the DEIR for clarification. These changes do not alter the conclusions of the findings or analysis in the DEIR and do not result in a new or substantial increase in any environmental impacts compared to the DEIR.

Page 6-20:

SBCAPCD does not have quantitative thresholds of significance for plan-level activity that would apply to the 2045 General Plan. Therefore, construction impacts for the 2045 General Plan are discussed qualitatively. As described in 4.2, Air Quality, there is not sufficient data to allow project-level construction analysis. Therefore, Alternative 3, with adherence to SBCAPCD fugitive dust control measures, may still exceed SBCAPCD's threshold and construction impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Although, due to the reduced buildout potential, Alternative 3 would result in a minor emissions reduction compared to the 2045 General Plan. Using methodology described in Section 4.2, Air Quality, CalEEMod was used to estimate approximate emissions during Alternative 3 operations. As shown in Appendix C, Alternative 3 would result in an approximate one to six percent decrease in ROC, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed project operations because of a reduction of area and energy consumption, due to a reduced residential buildout. Therefore, similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 3 would not result in a cumulatively considerable~~conservable~~ net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment, and operational impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 3 would potentially expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations in the form of TACs during construction. Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would still be required under Alternative 3 and DPM and TAC emissions would be substantially reduced at sensitive receptors. However, Tier U.S. EPA ~~4~~3 or higher engines ~~tiers or Level 3 diesel particulate filters~~ cannot be guaranteed to be commercially available. Therefore, construction related impacts are conservatively assessed as significant and unavoidable, similar to the 2045 General Plan. Although, due to the reduced buildout potential, Alternative 3 would result in a minor TAC emission reduction, specifically near single-family residences that are north, west, and southwest of the Alamo Pintado site, compared to the 2045 General Plan. The buildout of Alternative 3 would not include land uses that would emit substantial amount of operational TAC emissions, and stationary sources would be required to be permitted by SBCPACD. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial operational TAC emissions and operational impacts would be less than significant. As with the proposed project, construction-related odors would be short-term and temporary, odor-related impacts would be less than significant~~the Alternative 3 would not result in other emissions that would adversely affect a substantial number of people~~.

Page 6-21:

Alternative 3 would result in reduced buildout potential compared to the 2045 General Plan; however, the Alamo Pintado site is known to contain remnants of a mission-era aqueduct which may qualify as a historical resource under CEQA ~~is currently vacant and therefore does not contain historical resources~~. Therefore, both the 2045 General Plan and Alternative 3 would have a similar potential impact on historical resources, as development ~~that~~ could impact pre-existing historical resources ~~would be identical in location~~. Similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 3 would implement policies to protect historical and culturally significant resources, and would implement Mitigation Measure CUL-1 to identify historic-age features that an individual development would alter or demolish. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have a similar level of impact when compared to the 2045 General Plan~~, and this alternative's impact on historical resources would be less than significant with mitigation, similar to the proposed project~~. As Alternative 3 would result in reduced buildout potential, this alternative would

therefore have less potential to disturb subsurface archaeological resources, as development and ground-disturbing activities would not occur on the Alamo Pintado site. Similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 3 would implement Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 and would require archaeological resources assessments, archaeological resources monitoring, or implementation of unanticipated discovery procedures for development involving ground-disturbing activities. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have fewer impacts than the 2045 General Plan, and this alternative's impact on archaeological resources would be less than significant with mitigation, similar to the proposed project. Similar to the 2045 General Plan, excavations during construction activities facilitated by Alternative 3 could have the potential to disturb human remains in the Planning Area which could include Native American burial sites, however, adherence to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

Page 6-28:

SBCAPCD does not have quantitative thresholds of significance for plan-level activity that would apply to the 2045 General Plan. Therefore, construction impacts for the 2045 General Plan are discussed qualitatively. As described in 4.2, Air Quality, there is not sufficient data to allow projectlevel construction analysis. Therefore, Alternative 4, with adherence to SBCAPCD fugitive dust control measures, may still exceed SBCAPCD's threshold and construction impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Although, due to the reduced buildout potential, Alternative 4 would result in a minor operational emissions reduction compared to the 2045 General Plan. Using methodology described in Section 4.2, Air Quality, CalEEMod was used to estimate approximate emissions during Alternative 4 operations. As shown in Appendix C, Alternative 4 would result in an approximate one to seven percent decrease in ROC, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed project operations because of a reduction of area and energy consumption, due to a reduced residential buildout. Therefore, similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 4 would not result in a cumulatively conservable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment, and operational impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 4 would potentially expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations in the form of TACs during construction. Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would still be required under Alternative 4 and DPM and TAC emissions would be substantially reduced at sensitive receptors. However, U.S. EPA Tier ~~3~~4 or higher engines ~~tiers or Level 3 diesel particulate filters~~ cannot be guaranteed to be commercially available. Therefore, construction related impacts are conservatively assessed as significant and unavoidable, similar to the 2045 General Plan. Although, due to the reduced buildout potential, Alternative 4 would result in a minor TAC emission reduction, specifically near single-family residences that are adjacent to the Old Lumberyard and Alamo Pintado sites, compared to the 2045 General Plan. The buildout of Alternative 4 would not include land uses that would emit substantial amount of TAC emissions, and stationary sources would be required to be permitted by SBCPACD. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC emissions during operations and operational impacts would be less than significant As with the 2045 General Plan, construction-related odors would be short-term and temporary, odor-related impacts would be less than significant~~the Alternative 2 would not result in other emissions that would adversely affect a substantial number of people~~.

Page 6-29:

Alternative 4 would result in reduced buildout potential compared to the 2045 General Plan. Additionally, the existing Solvang Mill, Lumberyard building, and single-family residence located on the Old Lumberyard site would not be demolished or relocated. These buildings are not listed on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources (See Section 4.4, Cultural Resources); however, these structures could meet the age threshold (45 years or older) for potential historical resources, pursuant to CEQA. Additionally, the Alamo Pintado site is vacant and does not contain historical resources. Nonetheless, Alternative 4 would have similar potential as the proposed project to affect historical resources substantially and adversely since this alternative could still facilitate development on parcels containing historic structures. Similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 4 would implement policies to protect historical and culturally significant resources, and would implement Mitigation Measure CUL-1 to identify historic-age features that an individual development would alter or demolish. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have a similar level of impact to historical resources when compared to the 2045 General Plan.~~, and this alternative's impact on historical resources would be less than significant with mitigation, similar to the proposed project~~

As Alternative 4 would result in reduced buildout potential, this alternative would therefore have less potential to disturb subsurface archaeological resources, as development and ground-disturbing activities would not occur on the Old Lumberyard and Alamo Pintado sites. Similar to the 2045 General Plan, Alternative 4 would implement Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 and would require archaeological resources assessments, archaeological resources monitoring, or implementation of unanticipated discovery procedures for development involving ground-disturbing activities. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have fewer impacts than the 2045 General Plan, and this alternative's impact on archaeological resources would be less than significant with mitigation, similar to the proposed project. Similar to the 2045 General Plan, excavations during construction activities facilitated by Alternative 4 could have the potential to disturb human remains in the Planning Area which could include Native American burial sites, however, adherence to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

Page 6-37:

Alternative 4 would fulfill Project Objectives of fostering a distinct community character, promoting economic diversity and sustainability, providing adequate facilities, conserving open space, and ensuring public safety. As Alternative 4 would not involve high-density development on the ~~Old Lumberyard and~~ Alamo Pintado site~~s~~, it would fulfill Project Objectives of supporting strategic land uses, improving mobility, and supporting diverse housing options, to a lesser extent than the 2045 General Plan. Alternative 4 would fulfill these Project Objectives to a lesser extent as the exclusion of the ~~Old Lumberyard and~~ Alamo Pintado site~~s~~ would result in a decreased emphasis on the provision of housing units, an increase in VMT per capita, and less strategic land use decision-making, when compared to the 2045 General Plan. However, Alternative 4 would fulfill the Project Objective of conserving open space to a greater extent than the 2045 General Plan, as the Alamo Pintado site is currently vacant and consists of a grassy field with mature trees that would be preserved.

Page ES-21 through ES-22, Page 4.6-24 through 4.5-25:

GEO-1 Protection of Paleontological Resources

For projects that would involve excavation below 12 inches in depth in undisturbed soils underlain by sedimentary geologic units with high paleontological sensitivity, ~~The~~ City of Solvang shall ~~add the following policies providing for the protection of paleontological resources to the 2045 General Plan prior to its adoption. These policies shall include~~ require projects to adhere to the following stipulations:

- A Qualified Professional Paleontologist, as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP), must be retained to conduct a paleontological resources analysis prior to the initiation of projects that may impact sediments with high paleontological sensitivity to determine whether there is a potential for the project to significantly impact paleontological resources.
- If potential impacts to paleontological resources are found to be significant, then a Qualified Professional Paleontologist shall be retained to develop and implement a Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program (PRMP) to ensure that impacts to paleontological resources are mitigated. This PRMP may include:
  - Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training;
  - Pre-construction surveys;
  - Paleontological construction monitoring;
  - Retention of an on-call Qualified Professional Paleontologist;
  - Salvage, laboratory preparation, and curation of paleontological resources; and/or
  - Reporting to regulatory agencies.
- Should paleontological resources be encountered during any construction activity, all activity that could damage or destroy the resources shall be suspended until a Qualified Professional Paleontologist has examined the site. Construction shall not resume until the resource is properly evaluated and, if necessary, mitigation actions are carried out to address the impacts of the project on these resources.

Page ES-25 through ES-26, Page 4.11-27:

NOI-1 Adopt and Implement Construction Noise Reduction Measures

To minimize noise during construction, ~~the City shall adopt a policy to include the following:~~ construction contractors shall implement the following measures for construction activities conducted within the City. Construction plans submitted to the City shall identify the following minimum measures on demolition, grading, and construction plans submitted to the City. The City Building Department shall verify that grading, demolition, and/or construction plans submitted to the City include these notations prior to issuance of demolition, grading and/or building permits.

- Mufflers. During excavation and grading construction phases, all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards.
- Stationary Equipment. All stationary construction equipment shall be placed so that emitted noise is directed away from the nearest sensitive receivers.

- Equipment Staging Areas. Equipment staging shall be located in areas that will create the greatest distance feasible between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receivers.
- Smart Back-up Alarms. Mobile construction equipment shall have smart back-up alarms that automatically adjust the sound level of the alarm in response to ambient noise levels. Alternatively, back-up alarms shall be disabled and replaced with human spotters to ensure safety when mobile construction equipment is moving in the reverse direction in compliance with applicable safety laws and regulations.
- Electrically-Powered Tools and Facilities. Electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools and to power any temporary structures, such as construction trailers or caretaker facilities, where feasible.
- Noise Disturbance Coordinator. The project applicant shall designate a "noise disturbance coordinator" responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of any noise complaint and shall require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. A telephone number for the disturbance coordinator and the City shall be posted at the construction site.
- Temporary Noise Barriers. Erect temporary noise barriers, where feasible, when construction noise is predicted to exceed the acceptable standards (e.g., 80 dBA Leq at residential receivers, schools or other sensitive receptors during the daytime) or when the anticipated construction duration is greater than is typical (e.g., two years or greater) and there are sensitive receptors within 500 feet of the construction site. Temporary noise barriers shall be constructed with solid materials (e.g., wood) with a density of at least 1.5 pounds per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier. If a sound blanket is used, barriers shall be constructed with solid material with a density of at least 1 pound per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier and be lined on the construction side with acoustical blanket, curtain or equivalent absorptive material rated sound transmission class (STC) 32 or higher.

Page ES-26 through ES-27, Page 4.11-29:

NOI-2 Adopt and Implement Vibration Control Measures and Screening Distances

To reduce potential construction vibration impacts, the City shall ~~adopt the following 2045 General Plan Policy~~ require the following measures for applicable projects:

- Prior to issuance of a building permit for a project requiring pile driving during construction a) within 135 feet of fragile structures (historical resources, 100 feet of non-engineered timber and masonry buildings [e.g., most residential buildings], b) within 75 feet of engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster); c) a vibratory roller within 40 feet of fragile historical resources or 25 feet of any other structure; and/or d) a dozer or other large earthmoving equipment within 20 feet for a fragile historical structure or 15 feet of any other structure, the project applicant shall prepare a ground borne vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential vibration impacts related to these construction activities. This vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer. The vibration levels shall not exceed FTA architectural damage thresholds (e.g., 0.12 in/sec PPV for fragile or historical resources, 0.2 in/sec PPV for non-engineered timber

and masonry buildings, and 0.3 in/sec PPV for engineered concrete and masonry). If vibration levels would exceed these thresholds, alternative uses such as drilling piles as opposed to pile driving, static rollers as opposed to vibratory rollers, and lower horsepower earthmoving equipment shall be used. If necessary, construction vibration monitoring shall be conducted to ensure FTA vibration thresholds are not exceeded.

4 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(1) requires that a Lead Agency adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) before approving a project in order to mitigate or avoid significant impacts that have been identified in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The purpose of the MMRP is to ensure that the required mitigation measures identified in the EIR are implemented as part of the overall project development process. In addition to ensuring implementation of mitigation measures, the MMRP provides guidance to agency staff and decision-makers during project implementation and identifies the need for enforcement action before irreversible environmental damage occurs. The MMRP must be adopted when the City Council makes a final decision on the project.

The following table summarizes the mitigation measures identified in the Solvang General Plan Final EIR for the proposed project. Specifically, the table identifies each mitigation measure; the action required for the measure to be implemented; the time at which the monitoring is to occur; the monitoring conditions; and the agency or party responsible for ensuring that the monitoring is performed. Once completed, all monitoring actions will be reported in writing to or by the City, which will maintain mitigation monitoring records for the proposed project.

This page intentionally left blank.

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
Air Quality							
MM AQ-1 SBCAPCD's Construction Impact Mitigation The applicant shall require all construction contractors to implement the basic construction mitigation measures recommended by SBCAPCD to reduce fugitive dust emissions. These measures should be required for all projects involving earthmoving activities regardless of the project size or duration. Projects are expected to manage fugitive dust emissions such that emissions do not exceed APCD's visible emissions limit (APCD Rule 302), create a public nuisance (APCD Rule 303), and are in compliance with the APCD's requirements and standards for visible dust (APCD Rule 345). Emission reduction measures will include, at a minimum, the following measures: ▪ During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site and from exceeding SBCAPCD's limit of 20 percent opacity for greater than three minutes in any 30-minute period. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 miles per hour (mph). Reclaimed water shall be used whenever possible. However, reclaimed water shall not be used in or around crops for human consumption. ▪ The amount of disturbed area shall be minimized. ▪ On-site vehicle speeds shall be no greater than 15 mph when traveling on unpaved surfaces. ▪ A track-out prevention device shall be installed and operated where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can include any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out of dirt such as gravel pads, pipe-grid track-out control devices, rumble strips, or wheel washing systems. ▪ After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, or using roll-compaction, or revegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. All driveways and sidewalks to be paved/surfaced shall be completed as soon as possible. ▪ The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SBCAPCD prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or map clearance. ▪ If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than one day shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin. ▪ Schedule clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation activities during periods of low wind speed to the extent feasible. During periods of high winds (>25 mph) clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation operations shall be minimized to prevent fugitive dust created by onsite operations from becoming a nuisance or hazard.	Require all construction contractors to implement the basic construction mitigation measures recommended by SBCAPCD to reduce fugitive dust emissions.	Requirements shall be shown on plans prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or recorded with the map during map recordation	Once	City of Solvang			
		Conditions shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods	As needed				
MM AQ-2 Construction Exhaust Control Measures For individual residential projects facilitated by the 2045 General Plan that would develop three or more units, would involve demolition, mass grading, or excavation and trenching phases longer than two months and would be located within 1,000 feet of existing sensitive receptors, the City shall enforce a project specific Condition of Approval requiring the following: ▪ Off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment with engines certified to meet U.S. EPA Tier 4 emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible. ▪ On-road heavy-duty equipment with model year 2010 engines or newer should be used to the maximum extent feasible. ▪ Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible. Electric auxiliary power units should be used to the maximum extent feasible. ▪ Equipment/vehicles using alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or renewable diesel, should be used on-site where feasible. ▪ Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible. ▪ All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications. ▪ The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size. ▪ The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time. ▪ Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite. ▪ Construction truck trips should be scheduled during non-peak hours to reduce peak hour emissions whenever feasible. ▪ Proposed truck routes should minimize impacts to residential communities and sensitive receptors. ▪ Construction staging areas should be located away from sensitive receptors such that exhaust and other construction emissions do not enter the fresh air intakes to buildings, air conditioners, and windows.	Enforce a project specific Condition of Approval requiring construction exhaust control measures.	Prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or map recordation, all requirements shall be shown as conditions of approval on grading/building plans, and/or on a separate sheet to be recorded with the map	Once	City of Solvang			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
Biological Resources							
MM BIO-1 Conduct Pre-construction Bird Surveys and Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures For construction activities initiated during the bird nesting season (February 1 through September 15, and as early as January 1 for raptors), involving removal of vegetation, abandoned structures, man-made features, or other nesting bird habitat, a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted no more than 5 days prior to initiation of ground disturbance and vegetation removal. The nesting bird pre-construction survey shall be conducted on foot and shall include an area on and around the construction site at a distance determined by a qualified biologist, including staging and storage areas. The minimum survey radii surrounding the work area shall be 500 feet. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist familiar with the identification of avian species known to occur in the Solvang region. If construction lapses for 5 days or longer, the qualified biologist shall conduct another focused survey before project activities are reinitiated. If nests are found, an avoidance buffer shall be determined by the biologist dependent upon the species, the proposed work activity, and existing disturbances associated with land uses outside the site. The qualified biologist shall observe the active nest to establish a behavioral baseline of the adults and nestlings, if present. The qualified biologist shall monitor the active nests, while construction activities are happening to detect signs of disturbance and behavioral change as a result of construction impacts, such as noise, vibration, odors, or worker/equipment motion. If signs of disturbance and behavioral changes are observed, the qualified biologist shall stop all construction work causing those changes and until a larger avoidance buffer is established or until it is determined that the nesting period is completed. The buffer shall be demarcated by the biologist with bright orange construction fencing, flagging, construction lathe, or other means to demarcate the boundary. All construction personnel shall be notified of the buffer zone as an "Nesting Bird Area" and to avoid entering the buffer zone until a biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. No ground-disturbing activities shall occur within the buffer until the biologist has confirmed that breeding/nesting is completed and the young have fledged the nest. A report summarizing the pre-construction survey(s) shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and shall be included on project site plans and submitted to the City prior to the commencement of construction activities.	Schedule construction activities to commence outside the general avian nesting season (September 16 to January 31) if feasible.	Prior to construction	Once	City of Solvang			
	If project construction commences within the general avian nesting season (February 1 to September 15), retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey and establish buffer areas, if necessary.	No more than 5 days prior to initiation of ground disturbance and vegetation removal	Once				
	Verify compliance with avoidance requirements, if any.	During construction	As needed				
MM BIO-2 Special Status Bat Species Habitat Assessment Survey and Emergence Surveys For future projects where trees, abandoned structures, or other habitat for roosting bats is present and construction activities may occur during seasonal periods of bat activity, construction activities shall occur outside the maternity season, as feasible. Should construction timing not allow for it, a special-status bat habitat assessment survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to any construction activities during the bat maternity season from April 1 through August 31. The survey will document any evidence of special-status bat species that may occur in proposed work areas through direct observation (e.g., roosting bats) and/or sign (e.g., bat guano). If no observance and/or sign of special-status bats are detected during these surveys, then construction-related activities may proceed. If observance or sign of special status bat species are detected during the survey, special-status bat species emergence survey(s) will need to be conducted. If observance and/or sign of special-status bat species use is documented within the project site during implementation of BIO-2, and construction activities occur during the bat maternity season (April 1 through August 31), special-status bat species emergence survey(s) will be conducted. As part of BIO-3, a habitat assessment survey generally outlined in BIO-2 will be conducted on the first night of the emergence survey(s) to document the areas of suitable bat habitat within the Project site. Emergence surveys will be conducted in areas of suitable bat habitat (e.g., near buildings or trees) during the bat maternity season to document any special-status bat species emerging from features identified during the habitat assessment survey. Multiple emergence surveys may be required depending on the size and number of suitable habitat locations. The emergence survey(s) will be conducted one hour prior to sunset and last up to a minimum of two hours after sunset. Depending on potential species that may occur, surveys may need to be conducted until midnight. Passive acoustic monitoring equipment will be utilized during the emergence surveys to identify bats to the species level. Any special-status bat species observed maternity roosting within or adjacent to the Project site should be avoided and provided a minimum buffer as determined by the qualified biologist (a 100-foot to 300-foot buffer is recommended) or in consultation with USFWS and/or CDFW prior to the commencement of construction. Should special-status bat species only be day roosting and not maternity roosting, a bat mitigation and/or management plan should be developed for roost relocation. Mitigation and management plans would also require consultation with USFWS and/or CDFW prior to the commencement of construction.	Schedule construction activities to commence outside the general bat maternity season (September 1 to March 31) if feasible.	Prior to construction	Once	City of Solvang			
	If project construction commences within the general avian nesting season (April 1 to August 31), retain a qualified biologist to conduct a special-status bat habitat assessment survey and special-status bat species emergence survey, if necessary.	Prior to any construction activities	Once				
	Verify compliance with avoidance requirements, if any.	During construction	As needed				

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
MM BIO-3 Conduct Pre-construction Crotch's Bumblebee Surveys and Implement Avoidance Measures For construction activities located in vacant or undeveloped areas containing open grasslands, shrublands, or chaparral, a habitat assessment for Crotch's bumblebee shall be performed. If it is determined that suitable habitat for Crotch's bumblebee is present, a focused survey shall be performed during the species active flight period for Crotch's bumblebee and peak blooming period of nectar and pollen sources (May 1 through July 31). The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine presence of Crotch's bumblebee no more than 5 days prior to initiation of construction activities. The Crotch's bumblebee survey shall be conducted on foot and shall encompass the entirety of a project site and focus on areas that allow for the highest probability of detection, such as high abundance nectar or pollen sources and rodent burrows that may be used for breeding and nesting, subject to the discretion of the qualified biologist. Prior to the start of construction, the qualified biologist shall map areas with abundant nectar or pollen sources that have potential use by Crotch's bumblebee and active nesting sites. A report summarizing the habitat assessment and pre-construction survey (if required) shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and shall be submitted to the City prior to the commencement of construction activities. If Crotch's bumblebee is determined to be present, the project proponent shall consult with CDFW and obtain an Incidental Take Permit in accordance with the CESA prior to initiating any ground disturbance on the site.	If project construction occurs in Crotch's Bumblebee habitat, a qualified biologist should be retained to conduct a pre-construction survey during the species active flight period for Crotch's Bumblebee and peak blooming period of nectar and pollen sources (May 1 through July 31).	Prior to construction	Once	City of Solvang			
		No more than 5 days prior to initiation of construction activities	Once				
	Verify that the summarized habitat assessment and pre-construction survey report is submitted to the City.	Prior to construction	Once				
	Verify compliance with proper avoidance measures.	During construction	As needed				
Cultural Resources							
MM CUL-1 Historical Resources Prior to project approval of a development project carried out under the 2045 General Plan, City staff shall determine the age of the structure(s) present. If a structure is determined to be 45 years of age or older, the project applicant shall submit preliminary information (i.e., photographs) identifying any historical age features (i.e., structures 45 years of age or older) proposed to be substantially altered, relocated, or demolished. If a building, structure, object, or other built environment feature that is 45 years of age or older is proposed to be substantially altered, relocated, or demolished, and after reviewing this documentation, the Planning Manager or their designee, supported by an architectural historian as needed, shall make a preliminary determination as to whether the building qualifies as a historical resource. "Historical resource" shall mean a property listed or found eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or identified as historically and/or architecturally significant by the City pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. A property that is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources must retain its historic integrity and meet one of the following eligibility criteria: ▪ Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. ▪ Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. ▪ Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction. ▪ Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory. If the Planning Manager or their designee determines the built environment resource may have the potential to qualify as a historical resource, then a historical resources evaluation shall be required. The evaluation shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) in architectural history or history. The qualified architectural historian or historian shall conduct an intensive-level evaluation in accordance with the guidelines and best practices promulgated by the State Office of Historic Preservation to identify potential historical resources within the proposed development site. All properties 45 years of age or older shall be evaluated within their historic context and documented in a report meeting the State Office of Historic Preservation guidelines. All evaluated properties shall be documented on Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 Forms. The report will be submitted to the City for review and concurrence. If the property is already listed in the NRHP or CRHR, the historical resources evaluation described above shall not be required. If historical resources are identified through the survey and evaluation within the development site of a proposed development, efforts shall be made to the extent feasible to ensure that impacts are mitigated. Application of mitigation shall generally be overseen by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect meeting the PQS, unless unnecessary in the circumstances (e.g., preservation in	Verify a historical resources evaluation has been conducted for projects with potential to impact historical resources. If necessary, verify implementation of avoidance and/or reduction measures.	During project/permitting review	Once	City of Solvang			
		Prior to and during project construction	Continuously during grading, excavation, and demolition				

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
place). In conjunction with a development application that may affect the historical resource, the historical resources evaluation report shall also identify and specify the treatment of character-defining features and construction activities. Efforts shall be made to the greatest extent feasible to ensure that the relocation, rehabilitation, or alteration of the resource is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties (Standards). In accordance with CEQA, a project that has been determined to conform with the Standards generally would not cause a significant adverse direct or indirect impact to historical resources (14 CCR § 15126.4(b)(1)). Application of the Standards shall be overseen by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect meeting the PQS. In conjunction with any development application that may affect the historical resource, a report identifying and specifying the treatment of character-defining features and construction activities shall be provided to the City for review and concurrence. As applicable, the report shall demonstrate how the project complies with the Standards and be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of permits. If significant historical resources are identified on a development site and compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties and or avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be established and undertaken. Mitigation measures may include documentation of the historical resource in the form of a Historic American Building Survey report. The report shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation and shall generally follow the Historic American Building Survey Level III requirements, including digital photographic recordation, detailed historic narrative report, and compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Professional Qualifications Standards as defined by 36 CFR Part 61 and submitted to the City prior to issuance of any permits for demolition or alteration of the historical resource.							
MM CUL-2 Archaeological Resources Assessment Prior to approval of a project carried out under the 2045 General Plan that will involve ground disturbance activities in native or previously undisturbed soils that may include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, potholing, grubbing, tree removal, excavation or grading, an archaeological resources assessment shall be prepared under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) in either prehistoric or historic archaeology. Assessments shall include a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search at the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) and of the Sacred Lands File Search maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The records searches shall characterize the results of previous cultural resource surveys and disclose any cultural resources that have been recorded and/or evaluated in and around the project site. A Phase I pedestrian survey shall be undertaken in proposed project areas that are on previously undeveloped land to locate any surface cultural materials. By performing a records search, consultation with the NAHC, and a Phase I survey, a qualified archaeologist shall be able to classify the project area as having high, medium, or low sensitivity for archaeological resources. If the Phase I archaeological survey identifies resources that may be affected by the project, the archaeological resources assessment shall also include Phase II testing and evaluation. If resources are determined significant or unique through Phase II testing and site avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be identified in the Phase II evaluation. These measures shall include, but would not be limited to, a Phase III data recovery program, avoidance, or other appropriate actions to be determined by a qualified archaeologist. If significant archaeological resources cannot be avoided, impacts may be reduced to less-than-significant levels by filling on top of the sites rather than cutting into the cultural deposits. Alternatively, and/or in addition, a data collection program may be warranted, including mapping the location of artifacts, surface collection of artifacts, or excavation of the cultural deposit to characterize the nature of the buried portions of sites. Curation of the excavated artifacts or samples would occur as specified by the archaeologist.	Verify an archaeological resources evaluation has been completed for applicable projects.	During permitting review	Once	City of Solvang			
	If necessary, verify implementation of avoidance and/or reduction measures.	Prior to and during project construction	Continuously during grading, excavation, and demolition				
MM CUL-3 Archaeological Monitoring For projects whose Phase I archaeological survey identifies archaeological resources that may be affected, the applicant shall retain a qualified cultural resource specialist to monitor construction activities that involve ground-disturbing activities greater than 12 inches in depth and occur within 60 feet of a potentially significant cultural resource.	Retain a qualified cultural resource specialist to monitor construction activities that involve ground disturbing activities greater than 12 inches in depth and occurring within 60 feet of a potentially significant cultural resource.	Prior to commencement of construction activities	As needed	City of Solvang			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
MM CUL-4 Unanticipated Discoveries In the event that archaeological resources are unexpectedly encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work within 50 feet of the find shall halt and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (National Park Service 1983) shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the resource. If the resource is determined by the qualified archaeologist to be prehistoric, then a Chumash representative shall also be contacted to participate in the evaluation of the resource. If the qualified archaeologist and/or Chumash representative determines it to be appropriate, archaeological testing for CRHR eligibility shall be completed. If the resource proves to be eligible for the CRHR and significant impacts to the resource cannot be avoided via project redesign, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare a data recovery plan tailored to the physical nature and characteristics of the resource, per the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C). The data recovery plan shall identify data recovery excavation methods, measurable objectives, and data thresholds to reduce any significant impacts to cultural resources related to the resource. Pursuant to the data recovery plan, the qualified archaeologist and Chumash representative, as appropriate, shall recover and document the scientifically consequential information that justifies the resource's significance. The City shall review and approve the treatment plan and archaeological testing as appropriate, and the resulting documentation shall be submitted to the regional repository of the CHRIS at the CCIC, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C).	Require in the construction contract that work be halted upon discovery of an archaeological resource.	Prior to construction	Once	City of Solvang			
	Retain a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find and prepare a data recovery plan, if warranted.	During construction	As needed				
	Contact a Chumash representative if the find is prehistoric.	During construction	As needed				
	Review and approve the archaeological testing and treatment plan.	During construction	As needed				
Geology and Soils							
MM GEO-1 Protection of Paleontological Resources For projects that would involve excavation below 12 inches in depth in undisturbed soils underlain by sedimentary geologic units with high paleontological sensitivity, City of Solvang shall require projects to adhere to the following stipulations: ▪ A Qualified Professional Paleontologist, as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP), must be retained to conduct a paleontological resources analysis prior to the initiation of projects that may impact sediments with high paleontological sensitivity to determine whether there is a potential for the project to significantly impact paleontological resources. ▪ If potential impacts to paleontological resources are found to be significant, then a Qualified Professional Paleontologist shall be retained to develop and implement a Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program (PRMP) to ensure that impacts to paleontological resources are mitigated. This PRMP may include: ▫ Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training; ▫ Pre-construction surveys; ▫ Paleontological construction monitoring; ▫ Retention of an on-call Qualified Professional Paleontologist; ▫ Salvage, laboratory preparation, and curation of paleontological resources; and/or ▫ Reporting to regulatory agencies. ▪ Should paleontological resources be encountered during any construction activity, all activity that could damage or destroy the resources shall be suspended until a Qualified Professional Paleontologist has examined the site. Construction shall not resume until the resource is properly evaluated and, if necessary, mitigation actions are carried out to address the impacts of the project on these resources.	Conduct a paleontological resources analysis	Prior to the initiation of projects that may impact sediments with high paleontological sensitivity	Once	City of Solvang			
	Require that work be halted upon discovery of a paleontological resource.	During Construction	As needed				
	Retain a qualified paleontologist to evaluate the find and identify appropriate mitigation measures, if warranted.	If paleontological resources are encountered	As needed				
Noise							
MM NOI-1 Adopt and Implement Construction Noise Reduction Measures To minimize noise during construction, construction contractors shall implement the following measures for construction activities conducted within the City. Construction plans submitted to the City shall identify the following minimum measures on demolition, grading, and construction plans submitted to the City. The City Building Department shall verify that grading, demolition, and/or construction plans submitted to the City include these notations prior to issuance of demolition, grading and/or building permits. ▪ Mufflers. During excavation and grading construction phases, all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards. ▪ Stationary Equipment. All stationary construction equipment shall be placed so that emitted noise is directed away from the nearest sensitive receivers. ▪ Equipment Staging Areas. Equipment staging shall be located in areas that will create the greatest distance feasible between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receivers. ▪ Smart Back-up Alarms. Mobile construction equipment shall have smart back-up alarms that automatically adjust the sound level of the alarm in response to ambient noise levels. Alternatively, back-up alarms shall be disabled and replaced with human spotters to	Implement noise reduction measures	Prior to issuance of demolition, grading and/or building permits	Continuously during project construction	City of Solvang			
	Verify noise reduction measures are included on grading, demolition, and/or construction plans	Prior to issuance of demolition, grading and/or building permits	Continuously during project construction				

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
ensure safety when mobile construction equipment is moving in the reverse direction in compliance with applicable safety laws and regulations. ▪ Electrically-Powered Tools and Facilities. Electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools and to power any temporary structures, such as construction trailers or caretaker facilities, where feasible. ▪ Noise Disturbance Coordinator. The project applicant shall designate a "noise disturbance coordinator" responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of any noise complaint and shall require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. A telephone number for the disturbance coordinator and the City shall be posted at the construction site. ▪ Temporary Noise Barriers. Erect temporary noise barriers, where feasible, when construction noise is predicted to exceed the acceptable standards (e.g., 80 dBA Leq at residential receivers, schools or other sensitive receptors during the daytime) or when the anticipated construction duration is greater than is typical (e.g., two years or greater) and there are sensitive receptors within 500 feet of the construction site. Temporary noise barriers shall be constructed with solid materials (e.g., wood) with a density of at least 1.5 pounds per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier. If a sound blanket is used, barriers shall be constructed with solid material with a density of at least 1 pound per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier and be lined on the construction side with acoustical blanket, curtain or equivalent absorptive material rated sound transmission class (STC) 32 or higher.							
MM NOI-2 Adopt and Implement Vibration Control Measures and Screening Distances To reduce potential construction vibration impacts, the City shall require the following measures for applicable projects: ▪ Prior to issuance of a building permit for a project requiring pile driving during construction a) within 135 feet of fragile structures (historical resources, 100 feet of non-engineered timber and masonry buildings [e.g., most residential buildings], b) within 75 feet of engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster); c) a vibratory roller within 40 feet of fragile historical resources or 25 feet of any other structure; and/or d) a dozer or other large earthmoving equipment within 20 feet for a fragile historical structure or 15 feet of any other structure, the project applicant shall prepare a groundborne vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential vibration impacts related to these construction activities. This vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer. The vibration levels shall not exceed FTA architectural damage thresholds (e.g., 0.12 in/sec PPV for fragile or historical resources, 0.2 in/sec PPV for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings, and 0.3 in/sec PPV for engineered concrete and masonry). If vibration levels would exceed these thresholds, alternative uses such as drilling piles as opposed to pile driving, static rollers as opposed to vibratory rollers, and lower horsepower earthmoving equipment shall be used. If necessary, construction vibration monitoring shall be conducted to ensure FTA vibration thresholds are not exceeded.	Include vibration control measures in construction contractor specifications.	Apply condition at time of permitting	Once	City of Solvang			
	Verify vibration reduction measures are being implemented as a standard condition of approval.	During project construction	Continuously during project construction				
Transportation							
MM TRA-1 Achieve VMT Reductions for Development Projects In the interim, prior to the City establishing VMT thresholds for determining transportation impacts for CEQA, per Policy MOB-1.4 of the 2045 General Plan, for individual projects that exceed the City's recommended threshold below the VMT average based on project-specific VMT analysis, the City shall require the project applicant to implement project-level VMT reduction strategies. The City shall design strategies for the proposed project to reduce VMT from existing land uses, where feasible, and from new discretionary residential or employment land use projects. The design of programs and project-specific mitigation shall focus on VMT reduction strategies that increase travel choices and improve the comfort and convenience of sharing rides in private vehicles, using public transit, biking, or walking. VMT reduction strategies may include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) Provision of bus stop improvements 2) Pedestrian improvements, on-site or off-site, to connect to nearby transit stops, services, schools, shops, etc. by paying in lieu fees. 3) Bicycle programs, including bike rentals, storage, maintenance programs, and on-site education programs 4) Enhancements to the citywide bicycle network by paying in lieu fees 5) Parking reductions and/or fees set at levels sufficient to incentivize transit, active transportation, or shared modes 6) Cash allowances, passes, or other public transit subsidies 7) Employee-based housing options Following the City's establishment of VMT thresholds, individual projects shall be evaluated and mitigated in accordance with the procedures outlined in the City's VMT Program.	Require project applicants to implement project-level VMT reduction strategies.	Prior to the City establishing VMT thresholds	Continuously, as needed	City of Solvang			
	Evaluate and mitigate in accordance with the procedures outlined in the City's VMT Program	Following the City's adoption of VMT thresholds	Continuously, as needed				

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
Tribal Cultural Resources							
MM TCR-1 Workers Environmental Awareness Program The Applicant will invite a City-approved archaeologist to provide a cultural resources awareness training program (Worker Environmental Awareness Program [WEAP]) for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers. The City will invite consulting Chumash Tribe(s) to provide a tribal cultural resources awareness training program WEAP for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers. The WEAP training shall be conducted prior to any project-related ground disturbing activities in the project area. The WEAP will include relevant information regarding sensitive cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, including applicable regulations, protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations. The WEAP will also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for cultural resources and tribal cultural resources that could be located at the project site and will outline what to do and who to contact if any potential cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are encountered. The WEAP will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any discovery of significance to Native Americans and will discuss appropriate behaviors and responsive actions, consistent with Chumash tribal values.	Retain a City-approved archaeologist and Chumash tribe consultants to provide a cultural resources awareness training program. Require attendance of all personnel involved in project construction.	Prior to any project-related ground-disturbing activities in the project area	Once, as needed	City of Solvang			
MM TCR-2 Retain Chumash Tribal Monitors For any project with the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources as determined through consultation, prior to issuance of any City Grading or Construction Permit, the Applicant or its designee shall work with consulting Chumash Tribe(s) to retain Tribal Monitor(s) to assist in the monitoring, mitigation, and curation activities for the specific project. Where multiple areas of work are concurrently permitted for grading or disturbance, or where multiple pieces of equipment are operating within the same work area, there shall be multiple monitors, at least one for each area, and a sufficient number of Tribal Monitors shall be onsite to ensure all concurrent activities are monitored. The tribal monitors may be rotated to ensure that consulting Chumash Tribe(s) can observe the work areas. The City shall be responsible for creating monitoring schedules for the Chumash Tribal Monitors, and specifying the locations where they will monitor in consultation with the consulting Chumash Tribe(s). Any interference with monitoring activities, removal of a monitor from duties , or direction to a monitor to relocate or cease monitoring activities by anyone other than the City shall be considered a non-compliance event. In the event a Chumash Tribal Monitor is dismissed from monitoring and the City determines this to be in error, the Chumash Tribal Monitor will be compensated for time lost by the Applicant. Any disagreements between the Project Archaeologist and Chumash Tribal Monitors shall be brought to the City's attention for resolution. The Project Archaeologist or consulting Chumash Tribe(s) shall notify the Applicant and the City by telephone or email, of any incidents of non-compliance with any cultural resource mitigation measure or condition within 24 hours of becoming aware of the situation. The Project Archaeologist and consulting Chumash Tribe(s) shall also recommend corrective action(s) to resolve the problem or achieve compliance with the mitigation measure or project condition. In the event of a non-compliance issue, the Project Archaeologist shall write a report within two weeks after resolution of the issue that describes the issue, resolution of the issue, and the effectiveness of resolution measures. The report shall be provided in the next Monthly Compliance Report, which is submitted to the City. The Applicant or its designee shall also provide a copy of the non-compliance report to the consulting Chumash Tribe(s) when issued to the City.	Consult with Chumash Tribes and retain Tribal Monitors on a project level basis, when necessary. Retain a Project Archaeologist to monitor and report noncompliance and recommend corrective actions.	Prior to commencement of construction activities Within 24 hours of becoming aware of the non-compliant situation	Once As needed	City of Solvang			
MM TCR-3 Retain a Project Osteologist For any project with the potential to encounter human remains as determined through consultation and/or during the preparation of archaeological assessments carried out under CUL-2, prior to issuance of any City Grading or Construction Permit, a Project Osteologist shall be retained by the Applicant or its designee to assist in the identification of any human remains. The Project Osteologist shall have the following minimum qualifications: ▪ A graduate degree in archaeology, forensic anthropology, or related discipline, with four years' experience working with archaeological and Tribal Cultural resources in California. If an Osteologist with four years' experience is not available, a candidate with no less than two years' experience may be considered. ▪ A copy of the Project Osteologist's qualifications shall be provided to the City for review and approval. The Project Osteologist's qualifications shall be provided by the City to consulting Chumash Tribe(s) for review and comment prior to approval by the City.	Retain a Project Osteologist to assist in identification of human remains	Prior to issuance of any City Grading or Construction Permit	Once	City of Solvang			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
MM TCR-4 Develop a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Discovery Plan For any project with the potential to encounter cultural and/or tribal cultural resources as determined through consultation and/or the preparation of archaeological assessments carried out under CUL-2, prior to issuance of any City Grading or Construction Permit, the Project Archaeologist shall develop and submit a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Discovery Plan (CRMDP) to the City for review and approval. No ground disturbing activities can occur until the CRMDP is approved by the City. A draft of the CRMDP shall be provided by the City to consulting Chumash Tribe(s) and an independent third-party City-qualified archaeologist for a 45-day review and comment period. No ground disturbance can occur before approval of any construction-related permits by the City. At a minimum, the CRMDP shall include the following: ▪ An introduction outlining the project description, purpose for monitoring, summary of resources studies or description of known resources, anticipated construction schedule, anticipated impacts to cultural resources, curation and treatment options. Permanent curation of Tribal Cultural Resources will not take place unless approved in writing by consulting Chumash Tribe(s) in compliance with CalNAGPRA (if applicable) along with any other applicable state and federal laws. ▪ A description of the monitoring personnel involved with the Project (Project Archaeologist, Archaeological Monitors, and Chumash Tribal Monitors as appointed by consulting Chumash Tribe(s)) and their responsibilities, which shall include but are not limited to: ▫ A list of personnel involved in the monitoring activities and their availability; ▫ A description of how the monitoring shall occur; ▫ A description of how the monitoring schedule will be developed and implemented given that different areas of ground disturbance may occur simultaneously; ▫ A description of what resources are expected to be encountered and where they are expected to be encountered; and ▫ A description of monitoring reporting procedures. ▪ A description of the Cultural Resources Worker Environmental Awareness Program training and Tribal Cultural Resources Worked Environmental Awareness Program Training as provided by consulting Chumash Tribe(s) (see MM CUL-5) and when and how that will take place. ▪ Identification of the areas on the site, plus a buffer, where earthwork and site disturbance will be avoided. This should include the following: ▫ A description of the exclusion zone which shall be placed around each avoidance area and labeled as “Environmentally Sensitive Area” in all relevant project documents and engineering drawings, as needed. Environmentally Sensitive Areas shall exclude all construction equipment and personnel. Exclusion zone fencing shall be installed prior to any site disturbance (and later removed) under the direction of the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the City and consulting Chumash Tribe(s). The construction contractor will be responsible for maintaining the exclusion zone fencing throughout the duration of decommissioning. ▪ Definition and description of authorities, protocols, and procedures for halting and/or pausing work in order to record, evaluate, and identify any necessary treatment for any cultural resources encountered. This shall include protocols for ensuring all treatment or recovery of cultural resources is completed prior to work resuming in the area of the find. ▪ Information that the Project Archaeologist, Archaeological Monitor(s), and the Chumash Tribal Monitor(s) shall have the authority to halt ground disturbing activities in the event previously unknown cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are encountered or if known resources may be impacted in a previously unanticipated manner as a result of that ground disturbing activity. ▪ Details regarding the immediate cessation of ground disturbing activities within a minimum of 100 feet of the discovery of any cultural resources/tribal cultural resources or human remains and measures to delineate the area with clearly visible lath, flagging tape, or other marking. The City and the consulting Chumash Tribe(s) shall be consulted on a determination of significance. If potential human remains are identified, the project archaeologist, the project osteologist, City designee(s), and the consulting Chumash Tribe(s) shall be invited to be present during determination and development of protective measures of find until the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) is notified as appropriate. ▪ Notification procedures of unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources/tribal cultural resources including human remains. The City and consulting Chumash Tribe(s) shall be notified of a discovery as soon as possible but no later than 24 hours of the find. If the discovery occurs on a Friday, the City can be notified the following Monday morning. ▪ Specific in-field procedures for collecting, handling, and categorizing cultural resources, including human remains, encountered and a detailed process for evaluating unanticipated discoveries. ▪ Development of a preliminary treatment plan which shall, at a minimum, include: ▫ A description of the treatment options for each type of resource which include, in order of priority: 1) preservation in place, where feasible; 2) the development of a treatment plan, archaeological testing, or data recovery; 3) reburial as close as possible to the location where all artifacts, remains, and/or funerary objects were found; and 4) reburial in a predetermined area. Any	Retain a Project Archaeologist to develop and submit a CRMDP. Ensure the consulting Chumash Tribe and an independent third-party City-qualified archaeologist receives a copy of the CRMDP.	Prior to issuance of any City Grading or Construction Permit Prior to issuance of any City Grading or Construction Permit	Once Once	City of Solvang			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
Chumash cultural materials disinterred as a result of specific projects shall be curated or reinterred upon determination by the City and consulting Chumash Tribe(s). ▫ The location of a secured, on-site storage area for recovered cultural/tribal resources shall be identified before any ground disturbing activities occur by the City and consulting Chumash Tribe(s). ▫ In the event of a human remains discovery, the City and consulting Chumash Tribe(s), and Coroner's office shall be notified no later than 24 hours of the find by the Applicant or their designee. The Coroner will contact the NAHC to identify the MLD of the human remains. The Applicant or their designee must follow HSC § 7050.5 and proceed under PRC § 5097.98 within 48 hours. Once a MLD has been assigned, they and the applicant shall be given 48 hours from the time of notification to provide a proposed treatment option to the City. No photographs, removal of remains (unless already disinterred), nor further disturbance may take place without written approval of the MLD. ▫ For the predetermined area for reburial of human remains and cultural resources, the location must be surveyed in advance of its inclusion in the CRMDP, to determine if the location may be used (i.e., there are no biological and/or cultural/tribal resources sensitivities). The location must be under a deed restriction, protecting any reburials of human remains and artifacts in perpetuity. ▫ A commitment from the Applicant to pay all treatment costs for artifacts, funerary objects, and remains discovered, from discovery to reinternment, and for related documentation produced, if any, during cultural resources investigations conducted for the Project. ▪ Procedures for the Project Archaeologist, the Applicant, or its contractors to provide immediate notification to the City and consulting Chumash Tribe(s) and immediately cease any earthwork conducted outside the limits of the approved grading plan or land use permit as these activities require prior approval by the City. ▪ Outline of reporting procedures, including monthly summary reports and an annual archaeological monitoring report to be submitted by the Project Archaeologist to the City and consulting Chumash Tribe(s) for review throughout the duration of Project disturbance activities. The City shall provide copies of the plan to the consulting Chumash Tribe(s) for review. Formal technical reports are required for any archaeological testing or data recovery conducted. Annual archaeological monitoring reports and any technical testing or data recovery reports shall be submitted to the City and Central Coast Information Center. Upon completion of all monitoring or treatment activities at Project completion, the Project Archaeologist shall submit a final report under confidentiality to the City summarizing all monitoring/treatment activities. The City shall provide copies of the confidential final report to the consulting Chumash Tribe(s). ▪ The Applicant or its designee(s) will consult with consulting Chumash Tribe(s) to develop measures for long term management of the resources including any routine operation and maintenance that may need to occur within culturally sensitive areas that retain resource integrity, including tribal cultural integrity, and including archaeological material, Traditional Cultural Properties, and cultural landscapes, in accordance with state and federal guidance including National Register Bulletin 30 (Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes), Bulletin 36 (Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archaeological Properties), and Bulletin 38 (Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties.							
MM TCR-5 Soil Remediation Activities Affecting Previously Known Cultural and/or Tribal Resources The Applicant or its designee shall consult with the City prior to conducting any soil remediation activities which could affect native soils and provide the City with adequate information to determine compliance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 and PRC §21074. The City shall consult with locally affiliated Chumash Tribe(s) prior to approving any soil remediation activities affecting previously known cultural and/or tribal resources.	Ensure Project Applicants consult with the City and provide adequate information on the activities when the project will affect native soils.	Prior to conducting any soil remediation activities	As needed	City of Solvang			
	Consult with locally affiliated Chumash tribes regarding soil remediation activities.	Prior to approving any soil remediation activities	As needed				

This page intentionally left blank.