

**CITY OF LOMPOC  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
LOMPOC MUNICIPAL POOL DEMOLITION**

**A. PROJECT INFORMATION:**

<b>Project Title:</b> Lompoc Municipal Pool Demolition	<b>Project No:</b> ER 08-0027
<b>Lead Agency Name and Address:</b> Dan McCaffrey, Director, Parks and Recreation Department 125 W. Walnut Avenue, Lompoc, CA 93436	<b>Contact Person and Phone Number:</b> Stacy Lawson, Community Development / Env. 805-875-8275 Kevin McCune, Public Works / Engineering 805-875-8260
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION / LOCATION:</b>	
<p>The existing structure at 105 South C Street, Lompoc, California (APN: 85-172-23) is a Municipal Swimming Pool constructed in 1956. The proposal is to demolish the pool structure and remove its foundation. The project will take 30 working days to complete. No future use of the site has been identified.</p> <p><b>Site Work</b> As a part of removing the structure and foundation, three yucca plants and two to three small trees are to be removed. Every effort will be made to remove the trees prior to February 1, 2009. As the existing site is higher in elevation than the surrounding area, it will be regraded and the excess material will be placed into the exposed pool excavation at 90% compaction. Once the structure is demolished and the site regraded grass seed will be planted in the disturbed areas.</p> <p><b>Construction Coordination</b> Approximately seven parking spaces in the City parking lot will be fenced off and will not be available during the time of demolition. These spaces will be used for equipment storage and staging. The sidewalks on Ocean Avenue and on "C" Street may be closed during construction, as necessary, to protect pedestrians. The "C" street frontage will be posted as no parking and used for staging and loading. There will be a construction entrance gate at "C" street on the east and another where the extension of the East-West Alley meets the western side of the perimeter site fencing. The concrete will be crushed in-place, rebar cut, then loaded for hauling offsite. Trucks entering the site from the west may use the alley entrance on "E" Street.</p> <p><b>Utilities</b> The water main located seven feet off the south edge of the building and directly under a tree shall be protected in place, as well as the hydrant at the southwest side of structure. The northernmost electrical transformer on the west side of the structure is to be removed, while the southernmost electrical transformer on the west side of the building will be protected in place. The 12,000 kv electrical line running east and west across the project site will need to be protected in place, as will the electrical vaults in the area. Other utilities, including fiber, gas, etc. will be capped. The Verizon pay phone at the front of the Municipal Pool structure will be removed, while the phone node in the street will be protected.</p>	
<b>Public Agencies with Approval Authority (Including permits, funding, or participation agreements):</b> City of Lompoc, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District	
<b>Project Applicant, Name and Address:</b> Dan McCaffrey, Director, Parks and Recreation Department City of Lompoc, P.O. Box 8001, Lompoc, CA 93438-8001	<b>Project Consultant:</b> N/A
<b>General Plan Designation:</b> Community Facility	<b>City Zoning Designation:</b> Public Facility
<b>Surrounding Land Use Designation:</b> North – Office Commercial South – Community Facility East - Office Commercial West - Office Commercial	
<b>Surrounding Land Uses:</b>	

North – Office South – Municipal offices East - Office / Residential West - Government and private offices		
<b>Environmental Setting:</b> Existing Civic Center Plaza.		
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:</b> The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact”, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning
<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Identify the potential for significant adverse impacts below. Note mitigation measures, if available, for significant adverse impacts.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the proposal:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not physically divide an established community, as it is located on a single parcel within an existing government civic center.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed pool demolition is to be accomplished in accordance with City requirements. Three Yuccas and two smaller trees will be removed.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, as there are no such plans developed for the project site or area and the existing area is urbanized.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the proposal:				
a) Induce substantial growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads and other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not induce substantial growth, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads and other infrastructure). The demolition is being sought because this aged building has been determined to be unsafe in an earthquake and is currently vacant.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not displace existing housing. The existing building to be demolished is vacant and there are no homes on or adjacent to the site that will be affected.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not displace any people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, the demolition will not eliminate any existing housing and the structure is currently vacant.

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the proposal:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong Seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to				X

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
life or property?				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic related ground failure, liquefaction or landslides. The pool demolition is proposed in order to eliminate an existing hazard. The structure has been determined to be unsafe in an earthquake. The removal of this structure will protect people from harm during a seismic event. The proposed demolition will not result in ground failure or landslides. The project site is not within a liquefaction zone, based on the Geologic and Soils Hazards Map in the Safety Element of the City's General Plan. The project site is flat and any future structure will be properly engineered to address any potential for ground failure. At this time, there is no identified future use. As a result of the demolition, people will not be exposed to impacts of seismic activity and seismic activities will not be accentuated by the existence of the pool, once it is demolished.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, as the project area is flat and will remain flat and vegetated after the demolition is completed.

c) The proposed pool demolition is not on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the demolition, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse, based on the Geologic and Soils Hazards Map in the Safety Element of the City's General Plan.

d) The proposed pool demolition will not be adversely impacted by expansive soil. The project does not involve any new construction, only demolition.

e) The proposed pool demolition does not include septic systems or any other alternative sewer system. Elements of the existing sewer system will be removed and lines will be capped.

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

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, as there will be no discharge from the project site during demolition.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge, as the removal of this vacant structure will not result in an increase in water use.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including, through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. There is no stream or river adjacent to or within the project site, based on personal observation. The project site is located in an urbanized area. Drainage from the project site will continue to drain into street inlets, however, once the demolition is completed, the site will be seeded and the majority of surface drainage from the site is expected to be absorbed into or percolated through the soil.

d) The proposed pool demolition will not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including, through the

alteration of the course of a stream or river, or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The proposed pool demolition will create additional pervious area that will allow for increased percolation into the soil. There are no streams or watercourses in the area of the project site. The drainage pattern will remain the same.

e) The proposed pool demolition will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The demolition of the pool structure and its replacement with seeded grass will reduce surface flows from the site. The drainage pattern will remain the same.

f) The proposed pool demolition will not degrade water quality, as demolition materials will be properly managed on-site until removal and after the demolition is complete, the site will be covered in grass.

g) The proposed pool demolition will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, as the project site is not within a flood hazard area and does not propose any housing.

h) The proposed pool demolition will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows, as the project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area and no structures are proposed.

i) The proposed pool demolition will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, as the demolition of the pool structure will not increase the potential for flooding or failure of a levee or dam.

j) The proposed pool demolition will not result in or increase the likelihood of inundation of the project site or surroundings by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The project site is currently improved and urbanized. The site is located approximately nine miles from the ocean, is not near a lake and is on flat ground.

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

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, as it only involves the demolition of an existing, vacant structure.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, as a survey of the property for asbestos and lead paint will be conducted and any asbestos or lead paint will be properly removed, pursuant to an SBCAPCD permit. (See Mitigation Measure AQ-1) The proposed

demolition will have a very limited, less than significant impact on global warming, as no new project is proposed and the demolition will require only a small amount of equipment on-site and a limited number of short distance haul trips.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors), as demolition of an existing vacant structure will not result in an increase in criteria pollutants.

d) The proposed pool demolition will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as the proposed project will not generate pollutants either during or after demolition. Water shall be used to ensure adequate dust control on-site. (See Mitigation Measure AQ-2)

e) The proposed pool demolition will not create objectionable odors, as it is merely a demolition project and will not result in the creation of any new emissions or sources of air pollution or odor.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial, in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. pool demolitions, bicycle racks)?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not cause an increase in traffic, in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, as the current structure is vacant and no new use is proposed for the site.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not result in an exceedance, either individually or cumulatively, of a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. The current structure is vacant and its demolition will not result in increased traffic.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, as it does not involve any new construction.

d) The proposed pool demolition will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment), as no new construction is proposed. Sidewalks will

be closed as necessary to protect pedestrians and adjacent parking spaces will not be in use during the demolition effort.

e) The proposed pool demolition will not result in inadequate emergency access, as the site is surrounded by two streets and a parking area and the project is limited to the demolition of a single structure.

f) The proposed pool demolition will not result in inadequate parking capacity, as no new parking will be needed. The demolition will result in the site's seeding with grass and use as open space, until a future use is identified.

g) The proposed pool demolition will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. pool demolitions, bicycle racks) as the project is limited to the removal of an existing, vacant structure.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X		
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as the pool structure proposed for demolition is located in an urbanized developed area without natural habitat. Two to three small non-native trees are to be removed prior to February 1, 2009 as a part of the proposed demolition.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as the demolition site is located in an urbanized, developed area.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by



Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means as the project site is located in an urbanized, developed area on a paved street. Only ornamental manicured landscaping will be impacted.

d) The proposed pool demolition will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, as the demolition site is located in an urbanized, developed area on a paved street. Only ornamental manicured landscaping will be impacted.

e) The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, as this mitigated negative declaration identifies the fact that two to three smaller trees will be removed. Mitigation, in the form of replacement trees at a 1:1 replacement ratio, is proposed. The location and type of replacement trees shall be at the discretion of the City's Urban Forester or designee. (See Mitigation Measure B-1)

f) The proposed pool demolition will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, as there is no such plan applicable to the project site.

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the proposal:				
a) Result in a loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not result in a loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of California, as the project site is located in an urbanized area that does not incorporate a designated mineral resource.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan, as the project site is within the City's urban core and is not identified on the City's General Plan, in a specific plan or other land use plan as an important mineral resource recovery site.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the proposal:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste, within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The demolition of the pool will not require or expose significant amounts of hazardous materials. The Citywide Best Management Practices will be followed to ensure proper handling and disposal of any substances which could be hazardous. No routine transport or use of hazardous materials will occur as a result of the demolition of the pool.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, as the Citywide Best Management Practices will be followed to ensure proper handling and disposal of any substances which could be hazardous. Should a spill of any potentially hazardous material occur it will be cleaned up immediately.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not result in hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste, within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Asbestos will be identified and properly removed prior to demolition (See Mitigation Measure AQ-1). No other hazardous materials will be released by the proposed demolition.

d) The proposed pool demolition is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and is not listed as a Leaking Underground Fuel Tank site or a Site Mitigation Unit on the Certified Unified Program Agency's list of hazardous materials sites.

e) The proposed pool demolition is not located within the Lompoc Airport Master Plan. The pool demolition will not result in an airport-related safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No large cranes are required for the demolition.

f) The proposed pool demolition is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, based on information received from the City's Aviation and Transportation Administrator, Richard Fernbaugh.

g) The proposed pool demolition will not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, as the project site adjoins two roads which will not be blocked during demolition and a parking lot with interior access drives to which access will not be restricted beyond the use of approximately seven parking spaces and truck traffic necessary for removal of processed demolition materials.

h) The proposed pool demolition will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The pool demolition site is not located in an area where wildland fire is a hazard. The area around the vacant municipal pool is developed and urbanized.

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

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of, standards established in the general plan. The demolition of the pool is not expected to result in a significant temporary increase in noise levels in the area of the project. Hours of operation will be limited to be from 7:00 – 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays. No work shall take place on Sundays or Holidays. This will ensure that any noise impacts are not experienced during evening or nighttime hours.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not expose persons to, or generate, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The structure will be demolished using a crusher wherever possible, which is not expected to result in groundborne vibration. A limited amount of jackhammering is expected to be necessary, however, because of the distance to adjacent properties groundborne vibration will not be generated.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, because the site will be vacant and covered in grass once the demolition is complete.

d) The proposed pool demolition will not result in a potentially significant temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, during demolition. The use of the crusher in demolition will reduce noise levels to below significant levels. Hours of operation will be limited to be from 7:00 – 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays. No work shall take place on Sundays or Holidays. (See Mitigation

Measure N-1)

e) The proposed pool demolition will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport related noise levels, as the pool demolition will not result in a change in traffic or operations at the Lompoc Airport. In addition, the proposed project is located a significant distance from the area covered by the Lompoc Airport Master Plan.

f) The proposed pool demolition is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, based on information obtained from Richard Fernbaugh, the City’s Aviation and Transportation Administrator.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the proposal result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				X
b) Fire Protection?				X
c) Police protection?				X
d) Schools?				X
e) Parks?				X
f) Other public facilities?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services, as the project consists only of the demolition of an existing vacant building that poses a safety hazard. Once the pool is removed the site will be covered in grass.

b&c) The proposed pool demolition will not adversely impact fire protection or police protection, as the project consists only of the demolition of an existing vacant building that poses a safety hazard. Once the pool is removed the site will be covered in grass.

d&e) The proposed pool demolition will not adversely impact schools, parks or other public facilities, as the project consists only of the demolition of an existing vacant building that poses a safety hazard. Once the pool is removed the site will be covered in grass.

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

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Coast Region of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, as no new wastewater treatment facilities are needed or proposed.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, as the building is being demolished and only a grassy open area will remain after the project is complete.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. No additional impervious space will result from this project. The project will add pervious area.

d) The proposed pool demolition will not require water to be served to the project site. The pool will be demolished and there is no new development proposed.

e) The proposed pool demolition will not require a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments, as new wastewater facilities are not proposed and a need for additional facilities will not be generated by the pool's demolition.

f) The proposed pool demolition is served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Few disposal needs are anticipated, beyond the need for storage of crushed concrete and other materials for reuse and disposal of those products of demolition which cannot be recycled. The Lompoc landfill has adequate capacity to address these needs.

g) The proposed pool demolition will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste,

as once demolished it will not result in new waste generation.

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

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista, as it is not located at or near a scenic vista designated in the Urban Design Element of the City’s General Plan and the resulting open space will not detract visually from the surrounding area.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway, as the project site is not located on a state scenic highway.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, as the project site is located on a busy major arterial roadway. Once demolished, the site will remain in open space until such time as a new use for the site is proposed.

d) The proposed pool demolition will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, as once the pool building is removed, the result of the demolition will be an area of vegetated open space.

XIV. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use, as the project site is in a fully developed urban area and is

surrounded by urbanized uses. The proposed project is not growth inducing, as it will only demolish the existing pool and no new use of the site has been identified.

b) The proposed pool demolition will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract, as the pool site is located in a developed, urbanized area.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The proposed project is not growth inducing and will merely remove an unsafe building in an urban area, allowing the site to be redeveloped at a future time.

XV. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as identified in Section 15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as identified in Section 15064.5, as there are no locally designated or National Register Eligible historic resources within or adjacent to the project area.

The Lompoc Municipal Pool at 105 South C Street, Lompoc, California is more than 50 years old. Originally, the pool was built on a portion of Floresta Park (now the Civic Center).

The pool structure was designed by Cline & Zerkle, Engineer and Architect, Berkeley, CA in 1954 and finished construction in 1956. The original office addition was by Pierce Claeysens, with no specified date on the plans. The later office addition and remodel drawings were prepared by Robert B. Wong, AIA in 1982. None of these designers have been identified as notable.

The construction of the pool enclosure is pre-cast concrete tilt-up and measures 64-feet by 100-feet. Each section weighed from 13 to 30 tons. The pool is standard collegiate size, 47 feet wide and 75 feet long. Later, a pool annex was added, housing the Parks and Recreation Department offices and classrooms for the department's leisure class program.

In December 1999 a structural report prepared by Fred Schott, professional engineer, of Fred Schott & Associates, concluded the structure was not sound enough to withstand a very minor seismic event. The Municipal Pool structure was closed in May, 2000 after a peer review of Fred Schott's report was prepared by Peter L. Liu, Structural Engineer, of WILLDAN, concluding that "the pool building poses an immediate potential for collapse in a moderate to major earthquake", absent adequate retrofit.

Consideration was given to the potential cost of the retrofit, the needs of the community and the age and condition of the existing structure. At the time the pool was closed, the pool had exceeded its designed life expectancy by almost 20 years and was operating only 26 to 28 weeks a year, due to required closures for repair and maintenance. Since the municipal pool's construction, the population of Lompoc and the surrounding area had grown substantially and even when the pool was operating fourteen to sixteen hours a day, seven days a week, it could not meet the public demand for its use. Thus, it was determined the cost of operating, maintaining and structurally retrofitting the Municipal Pool was not justified, given its age and the demand for aquatic facilities in the community.

While consideration was given to other possible uses of the structure, because of its design as an enclosed pool, the fact that it has limited non-pool area housing restrooms, dressing rooms and office space for aquatic staff management, re-

use of the structure for other than a municipal pool was not determined to be feasible.

On inquiry, the Lompoc Parks and Recreation Director, Dan McCaffrey stated that he did not know of any famous people who had ever swum at the Municipal Pool.

Based on the above information, the City of Lompoc does not find that the demolition of the Lompoc Municipal Pool structure is potentially significant, pursuant to CEQA.



Southeast corner



East side



Northeast Side



Northwest Side

b) The proposed pool demolition will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. The project site is not located in an Archaeological Sensitivity Zone, as identified in the City's General Plan, Resource Management Element. The site was previously excavated during its construction and therefore, the discovery of new in situ cultural resources is highly unlikely in this location.

c) The proposed pool demolition will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, as the project site was previously excavated during its construction and therefore, the discovery of paleontological resources is highly unlikely in this location.

d) The proposed pool demolition will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The site was previously excavated during its construction and therefore, the discovery of new in situ cultural resources is highly unlikely in this location

XVI. RECREATION Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational				



XVI. RECREATION Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Comments:

a) The proposed pool demolition will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. A replacement aquatic center has been constructed and is in current use. The old municipal pool structure is currently vacant and has been determined by two separate engineers to be structurally unsafe in an earthquake.

b) The proposed pool demolition does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The City has conducted a separate environmental evaluation and constructed an new three pool aquatic center, which is currently in use.

<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b> Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause direct or indirect substantial adverse effects on human beings?				X
<b>DETERMINATION:</b> On the basis of this initial evaluation:				
X	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.			

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stacy L. Lawson

\_\_\_\_\_  
August 26, 2008

I hereby confirm that the project description is correct.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin McCune, City Engineer

\_\_\_\_\_  
August 26, 2008

## **MITIGATION MEASURES – Municipal Pool Demolition**

### **AQ-1**

A survey of the structure for asbestos and lead paint shall be conducted and any asbestos or lead paint shall be properly removed, pursuant to an SBCAPCD permit, prior to demolition.

*Monitoring – The project engineer shall ensure that an evaluation of asbestos and lead paint is made of the structure and any asbestos or lead paint is properly removed, pursuant to APCD requirements and permit, prior to demolition of the structure.*

### **AQ-2**

All demolition areas shall be sprinkled with water (recycled when possible) as needed, but at least twice a day, to reduce fugitive dust emissions.

*Monitoring – The project engineer shall ensure that all demolition areas shall be sprinkled with water (recycled when possible) as needed, but at least twice a day, to reduce fugitive dust emissions.*

### **B-1**

Trees shall be planted at a 1:1 ratio to replace those which are to be removed as a part of the project. The replacement trees' location and type shall be as determined by the City's Urban Forester or designee.

*Monitoring – The project engineer shall ensure that the replacement trees are purchased and planted within six months of the conclusion of the demolition project.*

### **N-1**

Construction hours shall be limited to between 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays, when noise will have the least impact on adjacent residents or other sensitive receptors.

*Monitoring – The project engineer shall ensure that the construction hours are observed by all contractors and subcontractors.*