

Lompoc General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report Addendum #7

State Clearinghouse No. 2008081032



Prepared by:
City of Lompoc
Community Development Department

Prepared with the assistance of:
Rincon Consultants, Inc.



December 2021

Bailey Avenue Sphere of Influence Amendment

Addendum #7 to the Lompoc General Plan Update 2010 Final EIR
SCH#2008081032

prepared by

City of Lompoc

Community Development Department

100 Civic Center Plaza

Lompoc, California 93436

Contact: Brian Halvorson, Planning Manager

prepared with the assistance of

Rincon Consultants

1530 Monterey Street, Suite D

San Luis Obispo, California 93401

December 2021



RINCON CONSULTANTS, INC.

Environmental Scientists | Planners | Engineers

rinconconsultants.com

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
	A. Summary	1
	B. Legal Framework	1
2	Background and Previous Environmental Review	4
3	Project Description	5
4	Discussion	7
5	Conclusion.....	8
6	References	9

Figures

Figure 1	Project Location and Sphere of Influence Boundaries.....	6
----------	--	---

Appendices

Appendix A Addendum #3 to the Lompoc General Plan Update 2010 Final EIR

1 Introduction

A. Summary

In October 2017, the City of Lompoc (City) submitted an application (referred to herein as the Application; also referred to as ANX No. 76) to the Santa Barbara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), which included a proposed adjustment to the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) and an annexation (Annexation) proposal for the following properties (as shown on Figure 1 below): (i) **the Bailey Property** (constituting approximately 40.6 acres) located on Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 093-070-065, and (ii) **the Bodger Property** (constituting approximately 107.7 acres), located on APNs 093-111-007, -008, -009, -010, -011, and -012 (collectively referred to herein as the Bailey Ave. Properties because both properties are located on Bailey Avenue).

The City intends to amend its Application in order to separate out the City's SOI adjustment proposal from its Annexation proposal for the Bailey Ave. Properties and, instead, proceed solely with the SOI adjustment proposal (Project) for the Bailey Ave. Properties.

In the event that the City's proposed SOI adjustment/amendment for the Bailey Ave. Properties (Amendment) is approved by LAFCO, any future Annexation application for the Bailey Ave. Properties will require additional environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the *State CEQA Guidelines* and, among other things, the rezoning in accordance with the Cortese/Knox/Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act).

A prior Addendum (Addendum #3 to the Final Environmental Impact Report [Final EIR] for the City of Lompoc's 2030 General Plan Update, as described below) was prepared in December 2016 in accordance with CEQA for the City's Annexation Application to LAFCO for the Bailey Ave. Properties. However, the 2016 Annexation Application ultimately did not proceed. Addendum #3, including the Initial Study for the Bailey Ave. Properties, is provided for reference in Appendix A.

This Addendum #7 to the Final EIR includes this introduction, background and previous environmental review related to the Project, a description of the Project, and a comparison of the impacts for all environmental issues areas listed in Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

The City of Lompoc shall consider this Addendum prior to the submission of the Amendment to LAFCO for review. This Addendum and the Final EIR are available for review at the Planning Division of the City of Lompoc Economic & Community Development Department, located at 100 Civic Center Plaza, Lompoc, California 93436.

B. Legal Framework

This Addendum was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. This document is an Addendum to the Final EIR that was previously prepared and certified on October 19, 2010, for Phase 1 of an update to the City of Lompoc's 2030 General Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 2008081032). The Final EIR included an evaluation of an update to the Land Use, Circulation, and Housing Elements in the 2030 General Plan, including evaluation of a buildout scenario that included the development of the then-proposed Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area (i.e., all properties between W. Olive Avenue and W. North Avenue to the east of Bailey Avenue [also referred to as the

Bailey Avenue Corridor]) as an Expansion Area for the City (within the City's proposed Urban Limit Line [ULL]). Following the adoption of the Final EIR by the City in 2010, in 2016, the City determined to proceed with a SOI and Annexation proposal with LAFCO solely for the Bailey Ave. Properties, not the entire Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area. The 2016 proposal (i.e., ANX No. 76) was analyzed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines under Addendum #3.

When an EIR has been adopted and a project is modified or otherwise changed after adoption, additional CEQA review may be necessary. The key considerations in determining the need for the appropriate type of additional CEQA review and associated documentation are outlined in Section 21166 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15162, 15163 and 15164 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

According to Section 15164(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* an addendum to an EIR is the appropriate environmental document in instances where "only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred."

Section 15162(a) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* provides that a Subsequent EIR is not required for a project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following has occurred:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The changes that are being proposed by the Amendment/Project analyzed in this Addendum are considered minor in the sense they would not create potentially significant environmental impacts in addition to those already identified in the Final EIR and/or Addendum #3. The Project would not substantially increase the magnitude or severity of impacts that were previously identified. This Addendum does not require public circulation because it does not provide significant new information that changes the Final EIR or Addendum #3 in a way that deprives the public of a

meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect.

The scope of possible development analyzed in this Addendum was previously analyzed under Addendum #3, includes the same properties that were previously analyzed under Addendum #3, and does not involve any changes to the potential development or land uses within the Bailey Avenue Corridor in comparison to what was previously studied under Addendum #3. However, the Project analyzed herein only involves a SOI Amendment, and does not include the Annexation proposal that was previously analyzed under Addendum #3. This Addendum has been prepared in order to clarify that the proposal that the City intends to submit to LAFCO is solely a SOI Amendment in order for the City's SOI Application to be accepted by LAFCO and to clarify that the Project proposal does not include an annexation proposal. The City has no specific development proposal to analyze under CEQA at this time for the Bailey Ave. Properties and, therefore, no additional CEQA analysis is necessary for the City's proposed SOI Amendment. Moreover, no project development can occur unless and until additional CEQA review is prepared for a specific project proposal or annexation proposal in the future.

2 Background and Previous Environmental Review

The City's Land Use Element defines the SOI as the "probable ultimate physical boundaries and service area of the City", which must be formally determined by LAFCO, in accordance with Government Code Section 56076 and the CKH Act. The City's existing SOI is shown on the City Land Use Element Map for informational purposes.

In November 1998, the City applied for a SOI amendment for the full 272-acre Bailey Avenue Corridor to LAFCO, which included the Bailey and Bodger Properties and the properties in between. The original request and a subsequent request in March 1999 to include the Bailey Avenue Corridor in the City's SOI ultimately were not approved by LAFCO.

In January 2010, the City of Lompoc adopted its 2030 General Plan along with the Final EIR, which evaluated a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area/Bailey Avenue Corridor as an Expansion Area (an area that was already included within the City's ULL under the City's 1997 General Plan). The Final EIR assumed that development of the Bailey Avenue Corridor would include a maximum of 2,718 dwelling units, including low and very low density residential development; approximately 228,700 square feet of commercial with a mixed-use overlay; and 22 acres of park area, open space on 37 acres, and 10 acres of streets and trails. Environmental impacts associated with this level of development were identified throughout the Final EIR, along with applicable mitigation measures where feasible. However, prior to any development within the Bailey Avenue Corridor, the City was required to obtain approval from LAFCO for a SOI change and annexation of the properties within the corridor along with all required environmental review under CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

Subsequently, the City decided to no longer proceed with a SOI adjustment or Annexation proposal for the full Bailey Avenue Corridor and, instead, proceed with only a SOI adjustment and Annexation proposal for just the Bailey Ave. Properties (representing a reduction in the overall acreage by approximately 123.7 acres). An Addendum to the City's 2030 General Plan Final EIR was prepared in December 2016 (Addendum #3), which evaluated the City's proposed adjustment to its SOI and annexation proposal for the Bailey Ave. Properties into the City (pursuant to the Application/ANX No. 76) without any land use changes beyond what was allowed by the City's 2030 General Plan. The 2016 Addendum #3 determined that the proposed actions would not result in any physical impacts that could exceed those analyzed under the Final EIR for the City's 2030 General Plan (see Appendix A for reference to Addendum #3). However, the SOI change/annexation proposal pursuant to ANX No. 76 was not brought forward for approval by the LAFCO Board and has not yet been implemented. Instead, the City has determined to proceed solely with its original SOI proposal for the Bailey Ave. Properties (with only minor modifications and clarifications to the original Application [ANX No. 76]). If the current SOI Amendment proposal is approved by the LAFCO Board, any annexation proposal for the Bailey Ave. Properties by the City will require environmental review under CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*, among other pre-requisites, including compliance with the CKH Act.

3 Project Description


The proposed Project area consists of the Bailey Property and the Bodger Property - two non-contiguous properties located within the northerly and southerly portions of the Bailey Avenue Corridor (see Figure 1). These two properties are located within the City's ULL (pursuant to the boundaries defined by the 2030 General Plan) but lie outside of the City limits. The two properties are described as follows:

- The Bailey Property is a single approximately 40.6-acre parcel (APN 093-070-065) in unincorporated Santa Barbara County. The Bailey Property has County land use designations of Rural and Agricultural Commercial and is zoned AG-II-100 (minimum gross lot area of 100 acres). The property is currently in use for irrigated crops.
- The Bodger Property consists of six parcels totaling approximately 107.7 acres in unincorporated Santa Barbara County (APNs 093-111-007, -008, -009, -010, -011, and -012). The Bodger Property has County land use designations of Rural and AG-II and is zoned AG-II-40 (minimum gross lot area of 40 acres). The current land uses include flowers, irrigated field crops, maintenance facilities, storage sheds, greenhouses, and a farmhouse/residence.

The proposed Project would involve expanding the City's SOI to include the Bailey Ave. Properties, which was previously analyzed under Addendum #3 to the Final EIR (as described above). The Project does not include any annexation of the Bailey Ave. Properties to the City of Lompoc, and no specific development plan is proposed at this time.

Any future annexation proposal for the Bailey Property or Bodger Property will require, at a minimum, further CEQA analysis and environmental review pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, to evaluate the City's proposed pre-zoning for the properties and/or any development plan proposed for the properties.

Figure 1 Project Location and Sphere of Influence Boundaries



Imagery provided by Esri, Microsoft Bing and their licensors © 2021.

Fig 1 SOI Boundary...

4 Discussion

The potential environmental effects of the current Project (i.e., the proposed amendment to the SOI to include the Bailey Ave. Properties), do not require any further environmental review or impact analysis beyond what was previously provided under the Final EIR and Addendum #3. The Final EIR analyzed a full buildout scenario for the entire Bailey Avenue Corridor, while Addendum #3 specifically analyzed the potential environmental impacts expected to result from the proposed annexation of the Bailey Ave. Properties. No further analysis is warranted because the City's proposed SOI Amendment/Project represents a reduction in the potential for any possible development and does not propose any actual development, annexation, or land use changes. In summary, the Project would not result in additional development potential beyond that evaluated and disclosed in the Final EIR and Addendum #3.

The precise location, timing, and details of any development in the Project area are not known at this time, and no development plan, rezoning, or annexation is currently proposed. An evaluation of the environmental impacts of such actions/potential projects would be speculative and, therefore, is not provided in this Addendum.

If the Project is approved by LAFCO, further environmental analysis and CEQA documentation would be required if and when a rezoning, annexation, and/or development application is provided for the Bailey Property or Bodger Property. Any future annexation proposal and/or development of the Bailey Property or Bodger Property would be subject to City and LAFCO requirements and approvals for land use changes and development projects, including CEQA review and analysis in accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

5 Conclusion

In accordance with Section 15164 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the City of Lompoc has determined this Addendum to the Final EIR is necessary to document changes that have occurred in the Project description for the Bailey Avenue Corridor since the Final EIR and Addendum #3 were originally prepared. As established in the analysis above regarding the potential environmental effects that may be generated by the proposed SOI Amendment as compared to the development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area, no new or more severe environmental impacts beyond those disclosed in the Final EIR or Addendum #3 would occur as a result of the Project. The City of Lompoc has reviewed and considered the information contained in this Addendum in its consideration of the Final EIR and Addendum #3 and finds the preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

6 References

- Lompoc, City of. 2010. Lompoc General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
<https://www.cityoflompoc.com/government/departments/economic-community-development/planning-division/planning-documents-and-maps/-folder-109>. Accessed November 2021.
- Lompoc, City of. 2010a. 2030 General Plan Land Use Element.
<https://www.cityoflompoc.com/home/showpublisheddocument/1762/63733607907550000>. Accessed November 2021.

Appendix A

Addendum #3 to the Lompoc General Plan Update 2010 Final EIR

Lompoc General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report Addendum #3

State Clearinghouse No. 2008081032



Prepared by:
City of Lompoc
Community Development Department

Prepared with the assistance of:
Rincon Consultants, Inc.



December 2016

City of Lompoc General Plan Update

Final Environmental Impact Report Addendum #3

State Clearinghouse No. 2008081032

Prepared by:

**City of Lompoc
Community Development Department
100 Civic Center Plaza
Lompoc, California 93438**

Contact:

Ms. Lucille Breese, AICP, Planning Manager

Prepared with the assistance of:

**Rincon Consultants, Inc.
1530 Monterey Street, Suite D
San Luis Obispo, California 93401**

December 2016

This report produced on 50% recycled post-consumer content paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Previous Environmental Review	3
3. Project Description	3
4. Impact Analysis.....	4
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	4
Noise.....	6
Transportation and Circulation.....	7
5. Determination.....	8

Appendices

Appendix A: Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation Initial Study

Appendix B: Existing Conditions Analysis for the Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation



ADDENDUM #3 TO FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT CITY OF LOMPOC GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

1. INTRODUCTION

This document is an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) that was previously prepared and certified on October 19, 2010, for Phase 1 of an update to the City of Lompoc 2030 General Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 2008081032). The Final EIR for Phase 1 included an evaluation of an update to the Land Use, Circulation, and Housing Elements in the 2030 General Plan, including evaluation of a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area for the City. The Final EIR was previously subject to two other Addenda. Addendum #1 was prepared in 2011 to update the greenhouse gas emissions analysis based on new information, and to address revised policy language in the Land Use Element and Circulation Element. Addendum #2 was prepared in 2014 to evaluate the environmental effects associated with adoption of Phase 2 of the General Plan Update Program, which included the Safety, Noise, Conservation and Open Space, Parks and Recreation, Public Services, Urban Design and Economic Development Elements. This current document is Addendum #3 to the General Plan Update Final EIR.

This Addendum #3 has been prepared in accordance with the relevant provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 (as amended) and the State CEQA Guidelines as implemented by the City of Lompoc. According to Section 15164(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an addendum to an EIR is the appropriate environmental document in instances when “only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15261 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.” Section 15162(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines states no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for a project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental



effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The changes that are being proposed with the Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation (Project) are minor in the sense they would not create potentially significant environmental impacts in addition to those already identified in the Final EIR. The Project would also not substantially increase the magnitude or severity of impacts that were previously identified. This Addendum #3 does not require public circulation because it does not provide significant new information that changes the Final EIR in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect.

This Addendum #3 includes this introduction, a description of the Project, and a comparison of the impacts for all environmental issues areas listed in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines.

The City of Lompoc shall consider this Addendum #3 with the Final EIR prior to making a decision on the Project. The Final EIR is available for review at the Planning Division of



the City of Lompoc Economic & Community Development Department, located at 100 Civic Center Plaza, Lompoc, CA 93436.

2. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Lompoc 2030 General Plan Final EIR evaluated a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area. Consistent with a previously proposed Specific Plan that was subsequently withdrawn by the applicants at the request of the City, the Final EIR assumed that development of the Bailey Avenue Corridor would include a maximum of 2,718 dwelling units (a mix of single-family and multi-family development); approximately 228,700 square feet of commercial with a mixed-use overlay; and 22 acres of park area, open space on 37 acres, and 10 acres of streets and trails. Environmental impacts associated with this level of development were identified throughout the Final EIR, along with applicable mitigation measures where feasible.

As part of the adopted Land Use and Circulation Element and associated Final EIR, the City Council retained the Bailey Avenue Corridor within the Urban Limit Line (ULL) with the Low and Very-Low Density Residential Designation from the 1997 General Plan. Those land use designations would allow for the development of 87 residential units on the Bailey property, 382 residential units on the Bodger property, and 364 residential units on the balance of the Bailey Avenue Corridor, for a total of 833 residential units. No commercial development is allowable under the existing General Plan land use designations.

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Project area consists of two non-contiguous properties located within the northerly and southerly portions of the Bailey Avenue Corridor. The two properties are held under separate ownership, but are being processed together under the Project. The Project is described as follows, specific to each property involved:

The Bailey Property (Annexation Area A) is a 40.6-acre property, owned by LB & L-DS Ventures Lompoc II LLC. The Project would involve annexation of the Bailey Property to the City of Lompoc, which includes adjustments to the City's municipal boundaries and sphere of influence (SOI).

The Bodger Property (Annexation Area B) is a 107.7-acre property, owned by John Bodger & Sons Co., a corporation. The south-central portion of the property is currently developed with the Bodger seed complex, which consists of agricultural support



buildings including maintenance facilities, storage sheds, greenhouses and farmhouse/residence. The Project would involve the annexation of the Bodger Property to the City of Lompoc, which includes adjustments to the City's municipal boundaries and SOI. The City's ULL along Bailey Avenue would remain unchanged.

Those proposed actions would not result in physical impacts that exceed those associated with City buildout, as described in the Final EIR for Phase 1 of the Lompoc 2030 General Plan.

4. IMPACT ANALYSIS

The Final EIR evaluated a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area. The current Project, the annexation and SOI modification without land use changes, was reviewed in relation to the certified Final EIR, and relative to the current baseline environmental conditions, in an Initial Study (IS; see Appendix A). The IS determined none of the conditions that trigger the need to prepare a Subsequent EIR are likely to occur with respect to the Project, and an Addendum to the Final should be prepared. The IS identified the need for Addendum #3 to provide additional information with respect to hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and traffic to confirm this conclusion, because updated baseline condition information was not available.

This section addresses each of those environmental issue areas discussed in the Final EIR and updates the analysis based on current conditions. Evaluation of other environmental issue areas is provided in the Initial Study (see Appendix A).

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As described in the Initial Study, the proposed Bailey Avenue Corridor annexation and SOI modification, when compared to the evaluation of a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan, would not result in any new or substantially more severe hazard impacts to the public or environment through transport, use, disposal, or release of hazardous materials, to surrounding schools due to hazardous emissions and/or hazardous materials handling, to safety associated with nearby airport operations, or associated with wildland fire hazards. However, an updated search of a hazardous materials database was conducted for the IS and identified a Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) cleanup site at the Bodger Seed development on the Bodger Property. The presence of that cleanup site is new information that was not described in the Final EIR and is evaluated further herein.



Rincon conducted a search of the following databases in November 2016 for the most up-to-date records relating to any known hazardous materials contamination within the Bailey Avenue Corridor project site:

- The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Geotracker database;
- Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS; formerly Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System [CERCLIS]) database;
- Department of Toxic Substances Control's Envirostor database;
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) solid waste disposal sites, active Cease and Desist Orders (CDOs), and Cleanup and Abatement Orders (CAOs); and
- The Cortese list.

The search of the SWRCB Geotracker database identified one listing of the Bailey Property and five listings of the Bodger Property in the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP), a program which regulates discharges from irrigated agricultural land to prevent impairment of the receiving waters. Two listings of the Bodger Property in the ILRP were terminated, while the site is listed with "enrolled" ILRP status under the three other listings. Under the ILRP, SWRCB regulates agricultural discharge by issuing waste discharge requirements (WDRs) or conditional waivers of WDRs (Orders) to growers that contain conditions requiring water quality monitoring of receiving waters and corrective actions when impairments are identified. The SWRBC Geotracker database also identified a Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) cleanup site at the Bodger Seed development on the Bodger Property. The facility is identified to have three former gasoline and waste oil underground storage tanks. The identified LUST cleanup site has an "Open - Assessment and Interim Remedial Action" cleanup status and is currently being managed to avoid and/or minimize impacts due to hazardous materials release.

On May 1, 2012, the State Water Board adopted a Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy (LTCP). The LTCP applies to petroleum UST sites subject to Chapter 6.7 of the Health and Safety Code and establishes both general and media-specific criteria. If both the general and applicable media-specific criteria are satisfied, then the LUST case is generally considered to present a low threat to human health, safety and the environment. The LTCP recognizes, however, even if all of the specified criteria in the LTCP are met, then there may be unique attributes of the case or site-specific conditions that increase the risk associated with the residual petroleum constituents. A LTCP checklist was completed for the LUST cleanup site on the Bodger Property on June 15, 2016. The checklist identifies an exemption for the site because the upper 10 feet of soil is free of petroleum contamination and, therefore, is considered low-threat for direct contact and outdoor air exposure. However, the site did



not meet other criteria to determine the site to be of low-threat to human health, safety, and the environment. If a case does not satisfy the criteria in the LTCP or does not present a low-risk based upon a site-specific analysis, then impediments to closure are required to be identified. Accordingly, a Path to Closure Plan was prepared for the site and includes the identified impediments at the site and steps for resolution of such impediments. Those steps include, but are not limited to, submittal of recent groundwater monitoring results, complete site assessment, APCD permitting approvals, proper abandonment of all wells, removal of the treatment system, and removal of all wastes from the site.

The SEMS, EnviroStor, SWRCB solid waste disposal site, CDO, CAO, and Cortese databases did not list any potential contamination sites within the Bailey Avenue Corridor. No other sites with known hazardous materials contamination were identified on the Project site.

The evaluation of a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan concluded impacts associated with identified hazardous materials sites would be potentially significant. The existing hazards and hazardous materials conditions identified herein would not result in any new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts when compared to those that were anticipated in the Final EIR. As described in the Final EIR, the Project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations, as well as Lompoc 2030 General Plan Safety Element policies 6.1 through 6.4, 6.7, and 6.7, which are intended to minimize impacts to health and quality of life associated with exposure to hazardous materials and Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 of the General Plan EIR, to ensure the public and environment are protected from exposure to previously unidentified hazardous materials that may exist on the Project site.

Noise

As described in the IS, the proposed Bailey Avenue Corridor annexation and SOI modification, when compared to the evaluation of a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan, would not result in any new or substantially more severe noise impacts related to airport-noise exposure or associated with exposure of new noise-sensitive land uses to traffic noise.

The Final EIR identified several roadway segments along which receptors would be exposed to unacceptable noise levels due to vehicle traffic associated with General Plan buildout. Identified roadways included segments of Ocean Avenue, Central Avenue, and V Street. Each of those roadways would carry traffic generated by future development in



the Bailey Avenue area. General Plan Noise and Circulation Element policies were identified that would reduce noise exposure impacts to a less than significant level. Those policies included a requirement to use the noise standards presented in the table entitled "Interior and Exterior Noise Standards" in determining land use designations and maximum noise levels allowable for new developments.

Associated Transportation Engineers, Inc. (ATE) prepared an existing conditions traffic analysis for the Project in December 2016 (see Appendix B). The existing conditions analysis concluded all intersections that were operating at acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) when the Final EIR was prepared in 2009 are still operating at acceptable levels. Under existing conditions, the H Street/Central Avenue intersection is operating at LOS D during the P.M. peak hour, exceeding the City's LOS C standard. However, that intersection also operated at LOS D during the P.M. peak hour when the Final EIR was prepared. As such, existing traffic conditions are not substantially different when compared to the evaluation of a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan and, thus, would not result in substantial changes to the existing noise environment in the City. Therefore, the Bailey Avenue Corridor annexation and SOI modification would not result in any new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts related to traffic noise when compared to those that were anticipated in the Final EIR.

Transportation and Circulation

As described in the IS, the proposed Bailey Avenue Corridor annexation and SOI modification, when compared to the evaluation of a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan, would not result in any new or substantially more severe transportation and circulation impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns, hazardous design features, inadequate emergency access, or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities.

The Final EIR identified impacts to various intersections in the City associated with buildout, including future development of the Bailey Avenue Expansion Area; and mitigation measures were identified. Potential buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the Final EIR. Therefore, the Project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts to circulation and congestion when compared to what was analyzed for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Final EIR. In addition, General Plan Circulation Element improvements and policies were identified that would reduce traffic impacts to a less than significant level.



As described in the evaluation of potential noise impacts above, ATE prepared an existing conditions traffic analysis for the Project in December 2016 (see Appendix B). The analysis concluded existing traffic conditions are not substantially different when compared to the evaluation of a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area in the Final EIR. Therefore, the Project would not result in any new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts to area roadways and intersections when compared to those that were anticipated in the Final EIR.

Furthermore, the City has identified an improvement project for H Street/Central Avenue intersection, which operates at LOS D during the P.M. peak hour, exceeding the City's LOS standard. Those proposed improvements include installing dual left-turn lanes on the northbound and southbound approaches. The intersection is forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS with those improvements. Although no development approvals are requested as part of the Project, more detailed traffic impact studies will be prepared at the time of development applications to determine the amount of traffic that would be added to the H Street/Central Avenue intersection in order to determine the fair-share contributions for each development. Contributions toward that improvement would reduce potential impacts to area roadways and intersections upon future development within the Project area.

5. DETERMINATION

In accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Lompoc has determined this Addendum #3 to the Final EIR is necessary to document changes or additions that have occurred in the Project description since the Final EIR was originally prepared. No new or more severe environmental impacts beyond those disclosed in the Final EIR would occur as a result of the proposed annexation project. The City has reviewed and considered the information contained in this Addendum #3 in its consideration of the Final EIR and finds the preparation of a subsequent EIR is not necessary.



REFERENCES

- Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE). December 14, 2016. *Existing Conditions Analysis for the Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation Project, City of Lompoc*.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2016. EnviroStor database.
Accessed at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
- Lompoc, City of. October 2009. General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
Available at:
http://www1.cityoflompoc.com/departments/comdev/Environmental/GeneralPlan/GPUpdateDEIR_NoAppendices.pdf
- Lompoc, City of. 2030 General Plan. Available at:
<http://www.cityoflompoc.com/comdev/GeneralPlan.htm>
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2016. Geotracker database. Accessed at:
<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>
- State Water Resources Control Board, California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2016. Cortese List: Section 65962.5(c). Available at:
<http://www.calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/SectionC.htm>
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2016. Superfund Enterprise Management System. Accessed at:
<https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/CurSites/srchsites.cfm>



Appendix A

Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation Initial Study



City of Lompoc

BAILEY AVENUE CORRIDOR ANNEXATION

Initial Study



September 2016

Environmental Scientists Planners Engineers

BAILEY AVENUE CORRIDOR ANNEXATION

Initial Study

Prepared by:

City of Lompoc
100 Civic Center Plaza
Lompoc, California 93438
Lucille Breese, AICP, Planning Manager
Economic Development Department
(805) 875-8273

Prepared with the assistance of:

Rincon Consultants, Inc.
1530 Monterey Street, Suite D
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
(805) 547-0900

September 2016

This report prepared on 50% recycled paper with 50% post-consumer content.

Table of Contents

	Page
INITIAL STUDY.....	1
Project Title	1
Lead Agency	1
Contact Person.....	1
Project Location.....	1
Project Sponsor’s Name and Address.....	1
General Plan Designations.....	1
Zoning	1
Project Description.....	1
Surrounding Land Uses and Setting.....	2
Required Entitlements.....	3
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required.....	3
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED.....	6
DETERMINATION.....	7
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	8
I. Aesthetics	8
II. Agriculture and Forest Resources	9
III. Air Quality	10
IV. Biological Resources	11
V. Cultural Resources.....	13
VI. Geology and Soils	14
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	15
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	15
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality	18
X. Land Use and Planning.....	20
XI. Mineral Resources.....	20
XII. Noise	21
XIII. Population and Housing.....	22
XIV. Public Services.....	23
XV. Recreation.....	24
XVI. Transportation and Traffic.....	25
XVII. Utilities and Service Systems.....	27
XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance	28
REFERENCES.....	30

List of Figures

Figure 1	Regional Location	4
Figure 2	Proposed Annexation Areas.....	5



INITIAL STUDY

Project Title	Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
Lead Agency	City of Lompoc Economic Development Department 100 Civic Center Plaza Lompoc, CA 93438
Contact Person	Lucille Breese, AICP, Planning Manager Telephone: (805) 875-8273 Email: l_breese@ci.lompoc.ca.us
Project Location	<p>The project includes two sets of parcels within the Bailey Avenue Corridor, also known as Expansion Area A: Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area, as designated in the City of Lompoc General Plan. The specific location of the two sets of parcels are described as follows:</p> <p><i>Bailey Property – Annexation Area A</i> (Assessor’s Parcel Number [APN] 093-070-065) is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of West North Avenue and Bailey Avenue within the unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County, contiguous to the City of Lompoc existing municipal boundary and within the City’s Urban Limit Line (ULL).</p> <p><i>Bodger Property – Annexation Area B</i> (APNs 093-111-007, -008 -009, -010, -011, -012) is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Ocean Avenue and Bailey Avenue within the unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County, contiguous to the City of Lompoc’s existing municipal boundary and within the City’s ULL.</p>
Project Sponsor’s Name and Address	Harridge Development Group, LLC (c/o Marc Annotti) 6363 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 600 Los Angeles, CA 90048
General Plan Land Use Designation	<i>Bailey Property – Annexation Area A:</i> Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) <i>Bodger Property – Annexation Area B:</i> Very Low Density Residential (VLDR), Low Density Residential (LDR)
Zoning	<i>Bailey Property – Annexation Area A:</i> Residential-Agricultural District (RA) <i>Bodger Property – Annexation Area B:</i> Residential-Agricultural District (RA)
Project Description	The proposed project consists of two non-contiguous properties located within the northerly and southerly portions of the Bailey Avenue Corridor. The two properties are held under separate



ownership, but are being processed together under the project. The project is described as follows, specific to each property involved:

The Bailey Property (Annexation Area A) is a 40.6-acre property, owned by LB & L-DS Ventures Lompoc II LLC. The project would involve annexation of the Bailey Property to the City of Lompoc, which includes adjustments to the City's municipal boundaries and sphere of influence (SOI).

The Bodger Property (Annexation Area B) is a 107.7-acre property, owned by John Bodger & Sons Co., a Corporation. The south-central portion of the property is currently developed with the Bodger seed complex, which consists of agricultural support buildings including maintenance facilities, storage sheds, greenhouses and farmhouse/residence. The project would involve the annexation of the Bodger Property to the City of Lompoc, which includes adjustments to the City's municipal boundaries and SOI. The City's ULL along Bailey Avenue would remain unchanged.

Figure 1 shows the regional location of the project. Figure 2 shows the project site location and proposed annexation Areas A and B, which would require adjustments to the City's municipal boundaries and SOI.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The Bailey Property is located in the northernmost portion of Bailey Avenue Corridor. The site is bordered on the north and east by LDR uses within the City's existing SOI. The property to the south of the site is also within the Bailey Avenue Corridor, outside of the City's existing SOI, and is designated for VLDR land uses. The site is bordered on the west by Agricultural Commercial (AC) land uses in the Lompoc Valley Rural Region of Santa Barbara County.

The Bodger Property is located in the southernmost portion of the Bailey Avenue Corridor. The site is bordered on the south by LDR and Community Facility (CF) land uses, on the east by Open Space (OS) with High Density Residential (HDR) uses beyond, and on the north-northeast by Neighborhood Commercial (NC), LDR, and HDR uses. The property to the north-northwest of the site is within the Bailey Avenue Corridor, outside of the City's existing SOI, and is designated for VLDR land uses. The site is bordered on the west by AC land uses in the Lompoc Valley Rural Region of Santa Barbara County.

Previous Environmental Review. The Lompoc 2030 General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluated a buildout scenario that included development of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan as an Expansion Area. Consistent with a previously proposed Specific Plan that was subsequently withdrawn by the applicants at the



request of the City, the EIR assumed that development of the Bailey Avenue Corridor would include a maximum of 2,718 dwelling units (a mix of single-family and multi-family development); approximately 228,700 square feet of commercial with a mixed-use overlay; and 22 acres of park area, open space on 37 acres, and 10 acres of streets and trails. As part of the adopted Land Use and Circulation Element and associated certified General Plan EIR, the City Council retained the Bailey Avenue Corridor within the ULL with the Low and Very-Low Density Residential Designation from the 1997 General Plan. These land use designations would allow for the development of 87 residential units on the Bailey property, 382 residential units on the Bodger property, and 364 residential units on the balance of the Bailey Avenue Corridor, for a total of 833 residential units. No commercial development is allowable under the existing General Plan land use designations.

**Required
Entitlements**


The project requires the following discretionary approvals:

- City Sphere of Influence modification and annexation request
- Santa Barbara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Sphere of Influence modification and annexation approval

**Other Public
Agencies Whose
Approval is
Required**

Santa Barbara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)





Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2016.

★ Project Location



Regional Location

Figure 1
City of Lompoc



ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is “Potentially Significant” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |



DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, and a SUBSEQUENT EIR will be prepared.
- I find that substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, and a SUBSEQUENT EIR will be prepared.
- I find that new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows that: the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR; significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR; mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; and a SUBSEQUENT EIR will be prepared.
- I find that none of the conditions described above calling for preparation of a Subsequent EIR are likely to occur with respect to the proposed project, and an EIR ADDENDUM will be prepared and will focus on:
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
 - Noise
 - Transportation and Circulation

Signature

Date

Printed Name



ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
I. AESTHETICS. Would the Project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Impact AES-1	No	No	No	N/A
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Impact AES-1	No	No	No	N/A
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Impact AES-3	No	No	No	N/A
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Impact AES-2	No	No	No	N/A

a-c) Visual conditions on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Similarly, no new scenic vistas or scenic highways with views of the project site have been designated since preparation of the General Plan EIR. The project does not propose any land use changes on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor, and buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than evaluated in the General Plan EIR. As such, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts to a scenic vista or scenic resources when compared to what was analyzed for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area, which included residential and commercial buildout of the Bailey and Bodger properties, in the General Plan EIR.

d) Light and glare conditions on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Potential buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive than evaluated in the General Plan EIR. As such, the project would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare beyond what was analyzed for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe impact related to light and glare.



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. -- Would the project:</p>					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, 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?	Impact LU-3	No	No	No	N/A
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Impact LU-3	No	No	No	N/A
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	N/A; New CEQA checklist item added subsequent to General Plan EIR	No	No	No	N/A
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	N/A; New CEQA checklist item added subsequent to General Plan EIR	No	No	No	N/A
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	Impact LU-3	No	No	No	N/A

a-e) As determined in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, the Bailey Property, Bodger Property, and surrounding properties are composed primarily of Prime Farmland and in use as cultivated farmland with agricultural support structures located on the Bodger Property. The northern portion of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area, which includes the Bailey Property, was also determined to be under a Williamson Act Contract. Land use on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property has not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the General Plan EIR and a Williamson Act Contract is still in effect on the Bailey Property. No forest land is located on the site. Additionally, potential buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than evaluated in the General Plan



EIR and Mitigation Measure LU-3, included therein, would serve to mitigate potential impacts to the maximum extent feasible through implementation of a City program for the purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts to agriculture or forest resources.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
III. AIR QUALITY. Would the Project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Impact AQ-1	No	No	No	N/A
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Impact AQ-2	No	No	No	N/A
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)?	Impact AQ-2	No	No	No	N/A
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Impact AQ-2	No	No	No	N/A
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Impact AQ-3	No	No	No	N/A

a) Analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR determined that development under the proposed land use changes and development plans for the Bailey Avenue Corridor would result in inconsistencies with the local clean air plan (CAP) due to the projected population growth. The project does not propose any land use changes or development on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor that would result in an increase to the City of Lompoc’s population. As such, the project would not result in population growth that exceeds forecasts or results in inconsistencies with the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District’s CAP for the region. Additionally, potential buildout of the project site under existing designations would not result in growth to the City’s population beyond what was analyzed for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts relative to implementation of the local CAP.

b-d) Operational emissions sources on the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Potential buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive than evaluated in the General Plan EIR. As such, the project would



not violate air quality standards, contribute substantially to existing or projected violations, result in a net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the region is in non-attainment, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration beyond what was analyzed for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts to air quality.

e) No new sources of odors have been located on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure AQ-3(a) to reduce potential odor impacts to a less than significant level by developing an Odor Abatement Plan for any potential odor generators. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts relative to odor nuisance.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:					
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?	Impact BIO-2	No	No	No	N/A
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Impact BIO-4	No	No	No	N/A
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Impact BIO-1	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact BIO-3	No	No	No	N/A



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:					
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Impacts BIO-1 through BIO-4	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Section 4.15.1	No	No	No	N/A

a-c) Biological conditions on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. The Bailey Property and Bodger Property are comprised of farmland and agricultural structures with no permanent ditches or ponds present on the site. No native or otherwise undisturbed habitats are present on the properties. The Bailey Wetland, located north of the Bailey Property, would not be affected by the annexation. The project does not propose any land use changes on the Bailey and Bodger properties. As such, potential buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure BIO-2(a) to encourage the protection of significant biological resources, including sensitive plant and animal species. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to sensitive plant and animal species or communities, or wetlands.

d) As determined in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, the proximity of the Bailey Property and Bodger Property to agricultural and urban land use areas decreases the likelihood of wildlife movement on or through the properties. The project does not propose any land use changes on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor. As such, buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in interference with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife.

e, f) According to the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, no habitat conservation or natural community plans apply to the City of Lompoc or the Bailey Avenue Corridor within the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area. These conditions have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the General Plan EIR. Additionally, the project does not propose any land use changes on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor and potential buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, or a habitat conservation plan.



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	Impact CR-2	No	No	No	N/A
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?	Impact CR-1	No	No	No	N/A
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Impact CR-1	No	No	No	N/A
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Impact CR-1	No	No	No	N/A

a) According the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, the Bailey Property and Bodger Property do not contain known historical buildings or structures. Conditions related to historic buildings or structures on the property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the General Plan EIR, as no new historic structures or building are known to have been identified on the properties. As such, buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would not result in the disturbance or adverse change in the significance of historical resources on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts to historical resources.

b) As determined in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, the Bailey Property, Bodger Property, and surrounding properties are located within a low archeological sensitivity zone. The project does not propose any land use changes on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor and buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would not result in additional site disturbance beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR for the properties. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts to archeological resources on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor.

c, d) The Bailey Property and Bodger Property are comprised of farmland and agricultural structures and no known paleontological or unique geologic resources are recorded on the site. As such, the project would not result in the destruction of unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor. The project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts to paleontological resources or unique geological features.



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the Project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	Impact GEO-1	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact GEO-1	No	No	No	N/A
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	Impact GEO-1	No	No	No	N/A
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Impact GEO-2	No	No	No	N/A
iv) Landslides?	Impact GEO-4	No	No	No	N/A
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Impact GEO-3	No	No	No	N/A
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	Impact GEO-3	No	No	No	N/A
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	Impact GEO-1	No	No	No	N/A
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	Impact GEO-3	No	No	No	N/A

a-e) Geological conditions on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and would be required to comply with the California Building Code (CBC), the City’s municipal code and General Plan Safety Element policies to minimize and/or avoid risks to life and property associated with geologic and soil hazards. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts relative to geological conditions.



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the Project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Impact AQ-4; General Plan EIR Addendum	No	No	No	N/A
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Impact AQ-4; General Plan EIR Addendum	No	No	No	N/A

a, b) Sources of greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. The project does not propose any land use changes or development on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor. As such, the project would not result in the generation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or conflict with any applicable GHG reduction plan, policy or regulation. Additionally, buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Future development would be required to comply with General Plan policies required by Mitigation Measures AQ-4(a) and AQ-4(b) in the General Plan EIR for the purpose of reducing and/or avoiding potential impacts associated with GHG emissions. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts associated with GHG emissions.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the Project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Impact HAZ-2	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact HAZ-2	No	No	No	N/A



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the Project:					
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?	Impact HAZ-1	No	No	No	N/A
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material 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?	Impact HAZ-1	No	Yes	Yes	Partially; Additional analysis is required
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?	Impact HAZ-4	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact HAZ-4	No	No	No	N/A
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Impact HAZ-3	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact HAZ-3	No	No	No	N/A

a, b) As identified in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, the Bodger Property the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area is bordered on the north by Ocean Avenue. The Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) corridor is located approximately half way between the Bailey and Bodger properties within the Bailey Avenue Corridor. Ocean Avenue and UPRR may be used in the transport of hazardous materials in close proximity to the properties involved in the project. Hazardous materials transport conditions are not known to have changed since preparation of the General Plan EIR. Potential buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or substantially more severe hazard impact to the public or environment through transport, use, disposal, or release of hazardous materials.



c) Hazardous material use on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property is not known to have changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. The Bodger Property is located less than one quarter mile from Miguelito Elementary School. However, the project does not propose any land use changes, and buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would not result in any uses that would involve hazardous materials on the Bailey or Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to surrounding schools due to hazardous emissions and/or hazardous materials handling.

d) According to the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, no sources of contamination were listed in the GeoTracker database for the Bailey Property and Bodger Property. However, an updated search of the database was conducted and identified enrollment in the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program for both properties. A Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) cleanup site at the Bodger Seed development on the Bodger Property was also identified. The identified LUST cleanup site has an “Open – Assessment and Interim Remedial Action” cleanup status and is currently being managed to avoid and/or minimize impacts due to hazardous materials release. Buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and would be required to comply with existing local, state, and federal regulations that require remediation of contamination that exceeds action levels. Further research, testing and remediation, including soil and groundwater sampling, under the appropriate oversight agency would reduce the risk of possible contamination. In addition, General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 requires reporting and actions to ensure that previously unidentified hazardous materials do not result in hazards to the public or the environment. Nevertheless, this issue requires further study in additional CEQA documentation.

e, f) The Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area is located within the Lompoc Airport Influence Area (AIA) but, outside of the Airport Safety Zones 1 through 6, as specified in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and would be subject to the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts to safety associated with nearby airport operations.

g, h) According to the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, the majority of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan expansion area was classified as a Low Wildland Fire Hazard Area with the southern portion of the area designated as a Moderate Wildland Fire Hazard Area. The Bailey and Bodger properties are located outside of the identified High and Very High wildfire hazard areas. Although there is moderate risk of nearby wildland fires spreading into the project site, the project would not result in the increase of such risks. Additionally, buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and would be required to comply with policies in the General Plan Public Services and Safety Elements to reduce the risk of injury or damage from wildland fires. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts associated with wildland fire hazards.



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the Project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Impact HWQ-4	No	No	No	N/A
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)?	Impact HWQ-3	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact HWQ-4	No	No	No	N/A
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Impact HWQ-4	No	No	No	N/A
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Impact U-4	No	No	No	N/A
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Impact HWQ-4	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact HWQ-1	No	No	No	N/A
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	Impact HWQ-1	No	No	No	N/A



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the Project:					
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?	Impact HWQ-2	No	No	No	N/A
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Section 4.5	No	No	No	N/A

a-f) Hydrological conditions on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not substantially changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. The project does not propose any land use changes on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor. As such, buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and would be required to comply with the General Plan Land Use Element policies to reduce potential development impacts to water quality. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality.

g, h) The Bailey Property and Bodger Property are not located within the 100-year floodplain according to the analysis for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. The identified 100-year floodplain areas on and around the project site have not changed since the preparation of the General Plan EIR. Potential buildout under the existing designations would be located outside of the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts to hydrology or water quality associated with a 100-year floodplain.

i) The Bailey Property is within the inundation area for the Bradbury Dam according to the analysis for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Buildout of the Bailey Property under the existing designations be substantially less intensive that what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and would be required to comply with the County of Santa Barbara Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan to ensure that impacts related to the potential for dam inundation would be less than significant. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts due to hazards associated with dam or levee failure.

j) According to the analysis for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, the Bailey Property and Bodger Property are not located within an area subject to tsunamis or seiches. Due to the distance of the project site from the Pacific Ocean and major water bodies, these conditions have not changed since the preparation of the General Plan EIR and potential buildout under existing designations would be located outside of the areas subject to inundation by tsunamis or seiches. Additionally, buildout under the existing



conditions would occur on a relatively flat landscape and would not be subject to inundation by mudflow. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts associated with inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	Section 4.8	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact LU-1	No	No	No	N/A
c) Conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Section 4.15.3	No	No	No	N/A

a-c) Land uses on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. The proposed project would be consistent with the the current land use designations on the site. Buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts associated with land use or applicable land use plans.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	Initial Study	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Initial Study	No	No	No	N/A



a, b) Based on the City’s General Plan and the County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan Environmental Resources Management Element map for the Lompoc Area, the project site does not contain any valuable mineral resources or delineated mineral resource recovery sites (City of Lompoc, 2014; County of Santa Barbara, 2009). As such, changes to the project site as a result of potential buildout under the existing designations would not directly result in loss of availability of a known or locally important mineral resource. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts relative to mineral resources.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XII. NOISE. Would the Project Result in:					
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?	Impacts N-2 and N-3	No	Potentially; Additional analysis required.	No	Partially; Additional analysis required.
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	Impact N-1	No	No	No	N/A
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the project?	Impacts N-2 and N-3	No	No	No	N/A
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Impacts N-1 and N-5	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact N-4	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact N-4	No	No	No	N/A

a-d) According to the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, development on the Bailey and Bodger properties could result in exposure of existing and proposed noise-sensitive uses to temporary construction and long term operational noise in excess of local standards. No new sources of noise within the project site have been



developed since preparation of the General Plan EIR and buildout of the site under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive than evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Additionally, buildout under the existing designations would be required to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance (Section 8.08 of the Lompoc Municipal Code and policies in the General Plan Noise and Circulation Elements that reduce and/or avoid potential noise impacts associated with exposure of new noise-sensitive land uses to traffic noise.

The General Plan EIR identified several roadway segments along which receptors would be exposed to unacceptable noise levels due to vehicle traffic associated with General Plan buildout. Identified roadways included segments of Ocean Avenue, Central Avenue, and V Street. Each of these roadways would carry traffic generated by future development in the Bailey Avenue area. General Plan Noise and Circulation Element policies were identified that would reduce noise exposure impacts to a less than significant level. These policies included a requirement to use the noise standards presented in the table entitled "Interior and Exterior Noise Standards" in determining land use designations and maximum noise levels allowable for new developments. In addition, the General Plan EIR evaluated a Low Growth Alternative, which assumed future development in the H Street Infill Area, but no development in potential expansion areas including the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area, and concluded that the alternative would not result in noise impacts. Although this suggests that the programmatic noise impacts of future development of the annexation area would not be significant at these receptors, current baseline and future traffic and related noise conditions have not been programmatically updated since the preparation of the General Plan EIR. This issue requires further study in additional CEQA documentation to confirm this conclusion.

e, f) According to the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area is located within the 60 dBA noise contour area of the Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB). The closest public use airport is the Lompoc Municipal Airport, located at 1801 North H Street. The project study area is not located within the Lompoc Airport Master Plan (LAMP) planning area. The City of Lompoc 2030 General Plan Noise Element (Figure N-3) identifies Airport Noise Contours for both the Lompoc Municipal Airport and the VAFB. The project site is wholly outside the influence of the Lompoc Municipal Airport. Buildout of the project site under the existing land use and zoning designations would be less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Future development would be required to coordinate with the Airport Land Use Commission and comply with City regulations to avoid potential airport-related noise impacts. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to airport-noise expose.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the Project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or	Impact PH-2	No	No	No	N/A



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the Project:					
indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?					
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Impact PH-1	No	No	No	N/A
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Impact PH-1	No	No	No	N/A

a) Population and housing on the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Potential buildout of the project site under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive and would result in a lower population generation than what was analyzed for the area in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to an increase in population in the City.

b, c) The Bailey Property and Bodger Property have remained undeveloped with the exception of agricultural support uses, which do not include any housing or residential uses, since the analysis of the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts relative to population growth or housing/ population displacement.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES					
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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:					
i) Fire protection?	Impact PS-1	No	No	No	N/A
ii) Police protection?	Impact PS-3	No	No	No	N/A
iii) Schools?	Impact PS-4	No	No	No	N/A



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES					
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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:					
iv) Parks	Impact REC-1	No	No	No	N/A
v) Other public facilities?	Impacts PS-5 and PS-6	No	No	No	N/A

a) As determined in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR, development within the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area would be served by the City of Lompoc Fire Department, Police Department, Unified School District, and other public facilities. Annexation of the Bailey and Bodger Properties would require the Fire Department to amend their Five Minute Response Zone Map to include the project sites as well as require the area to develop emergency access. Potential buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive than evaluated in the General Plan EIR and would be required to pay in-lieu fees for public services. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to the provision of new or expanded public services.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XV. RECREATION.					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	REC-1	No	No	No	N/A
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?	REC-1	No	No	No	N/A

a, b) Recreational use in the vicinity of the Bailey Property and Bodger Property has not substantially changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. The project does not propose any additional recreational uses or



permanent alterations of existing recreational uses on the Bailey and Bodger properties in the Bailey Avenue Corridor, and buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than evaluated in the General Plan EIR and would be required to pay in-lieu park fees. Additionally, General Plan Land Use Element Policy 4.6 specifies that the City will ensure requested annexations meet needs for parks, open spaces, and/or public facilities. As such, the project would not result in an increase use of recreational facilities that would induce physical deterioration or require construction with a potential adverse effect on the environment when compared to what was analyzed for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts to parks or recreational facilities in the City.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC. Would the Project:					
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways, and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	Impact TC-1	No	Potentially; Additional analysis required	No	Partially; Additional analysis required.
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Impact TC-1	No	Potentially; Additional analysis required	No	Partially; Additional analysis required.
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?	Impact HAZ-4	No	No	No	N/A
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?	Impact TC-2	No	No	No	N/A
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	Impact TC-2	No	No	No	N/A



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC. Would the Project:					
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	Impact TC-3	No	No	No	N/A

a, b) The General Plan EIR identified impacts to various intersections in the City associated with buildout, including future development of the Bailey Avenue Expansion Area. Potential buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive than what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in new or substantially more severe impacts to circulation and congestion when compared to what was analyzed for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the General Plan EIR.

General Plan Circulation Element improvements and policies were identified that would reduce traffic impacts to a less than significant level. Nevertheless, current baseline and future traffic conditions have not been programmatically updated since the preparation of the General Plan EIR. This issue requires further study in additional CEQA documentation, including updated traffic conditions and impacts to area roadways and intersections based on buildout of the project site under the existing designations, to confirm this conclusion.

c-e) Safety conditions on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Potential buildout under the existing designations would be substantially less intensive than evaluated in the General Plan EIR. As such, the project would not result in new or substantial increase in hazards to the project site when compared to what was analyzed for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the General Plan EIR.

f) Transit, bikeway and pedestrian policies and facilities on and adjacent to the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. The project would not result in new or substantially more severe conflict with plans, policies, or programs for these facilities than what was analyzed in the General Plan EIR.



Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the Project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Impact U-2	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact U-1	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Impact U-4	No	No	No	N/A
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Impact U-1	No	No	No	N/A
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Impact U-2	No	No	No	N/A
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Impact U-5	No	No	No	N/A
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Impact U-5	No	No	No	N/A

a-e) Analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR determined that development on the Bailey Property and Bodger Property would not significantly impact the wastewater treatment or water supply in the City of Lompoc. The General Plan EIR also determined that an increase in impervious surfaces within the City would result in the need for additional stormwater infrastructure in compliance with the City's Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP). Potential buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive that what was evaluated for the Specific Plan area in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts to water, wastewater, or stormwater service systems in the City.



f, g) Solid waste disposal needs on the Bailey Property and Bodger Property have not changed since the analysis of the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR. Buildout under the existing land use and zoning designations would be substantially less intensive than evaluated in the General Plan EIR. As such, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to solid waste when compared to what was analyzed for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the General Plan EIR.

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Address/ Resolve New or More Severe Project Impacts?
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Would the Project:					
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, 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?	Impacts BIO-1 through BIO-4, CR-1, CR-2	No	No	No	N/A
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	Sections 4.1 through 4.15	No	Potentially; Additional analysis required.	No	Partially; Additional analysis required.
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	Sections 4.1 through 4.15	No	Potentially; Additional analysis required.	No	Partially; Additional analysis required.

a) The project would not result in potentially significant impacts to sensitive plant and animal species, sensitive communities, jurisdictional waters and wetlands, or cultural resources, beyond those identified in the General Plan EIR.

b) As described throughout this report, the project is not expected to result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than what was analyzed for the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area in the Lompoc 2030 General Plan EIR in most environmental issue areas. However, additional analysis to determine the level of impacts associated with noise, and transportation and circulation will be required in an EIR Addendum.



c) The project is not anticipated to result in new or substantially more severe environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, beyond what was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. This is evidenced in the preceding discussions of each of the environmental issue areas. Nevertheless, additional analysis of exposure to hazardous materials, noise, and traffic congestion are necessary in the EIR Addendum to confirm this conclusion.



REFERENCES

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Envirostor Database. Available at:
<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>

Lompoc, City of. 2014. 2030 General Plan. Available at:
<http://www.cityoflompoc.com/comdev/GeneralPlan.htm>

Lompoc, City of. 2009. 2030 General Plan EIR. Available at:
http://www.cityoflompoc.com/comdev/plan_docs_maps.htm

Lompoc, City of. 2011. 2030 General Plan Final EIR Addendum. Available at:
http://www.cityoflompoc.com/comdev/plan_docs_maps.htm

Lompoc, City of. Municipal Code. Available at: <http://qcode.us/codes/lompoc/>

Santa Barbara, County of. May 2009. Comprehensive Plan. Available at:
http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/programs/genplanreformat/PDFdocs/GP_main.pdf

Santa Barbara, County of. September 2011. Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.
Available at:
ftp://pwftp.countyofsb.org/Water/FTP/State%20request/Flood%20management/Multi_hazard%20Report/Cover%20Page%202011.pdf

Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). October 1993. Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan. Available at: <http://www.sbcag.org/airport-land-use-commission.html#documents>

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Geotracker Database. Available at:
<http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>



Appendix B

*Existing Conditions Analysis for the
Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation*





ASSOCIATED TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS

100 N. Hope Avenue, Suite 4, Santa Barbara, CA 93110 • (805) 687-4418 • FAX (805) 682-8509

Since 1978

Richard L. Pool, P.E.
Scott A. Schell, AICP, PTP

December 14, 2016

16099L01

Richard Dalton
Rincon Consultants
1530 Monterey Street, Suite D
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS FOR THE BAILEY AVENUE CORRIDOR ANNEXATION PROJECT, CITY OF LOMPOC

Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) is submitting the following existing conditions analysis for the Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation (the "Project") proposed in the western area of Lompoc.

Project Description

The Project includes two sets of parcels within the Bailey Avenue Corridor, also known as Expansion Area A: Bailey Avenue Specific Plan Area, as designated in the City of Lompoc General Plan. The Bailey Property – Annexation Area A – is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of West North Avenue and Bailey Avenue within the unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County. The Bodger Property – Annexation Area B – is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Ocean Avenue and Bailey Avenue within the unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County.

Scope of Analysis

The proposed annexations within the Bailey Avenue Specific Plan were analyzed as part of the General Plan EIR prepared in 2009. Given the age of the General Plan EIR analysis, ATE used new count data (2015-2016) to calculate Existing levels of service for key intersections in the vicinity of the Project sites in order to determine if conditions have changed substantially since 2009. The key intersections are listed below and the new count data is attached for reference.

Study Intersections

V Street/Central Avenue

V Street/North Avenue

V Street/Ocean Avenue

O Street/Central Avenue

H Street/Central Avenue

Levels of Service

As stated in the City of Lompoc General Plan, the City's traffic impact threshold is: *"The City shall maintain intersection traffic levels of service (LOS) at LOS C or better throughout the City, with the exception of intersections monitored in accordance with the Congestion Management Program (CMP) administered by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). CMP intersections shall maintain a LOS in accordance with the most recent CMP standards (at LOS D or better), when it can be demonstrated that all feasible mitigation measures have been applied to the project and LOS C, with said mitigation, cannot be achieved."*

Tables 1 and 2 compare the A.M. and P.M. peak hour levels of service reported in the General Plan EIR with the levels of service based on the current counts (level of service calculation worksheets are attached for reference).

**Table 1
Existing Levels of Service – A.M. Peak Hour**

Intersection	Control	Delay/LOS(a)	
		GP EIR(a)	Current Data(b)
V Street/Central Avenue	Signal	13.9 Sec./LOS B	9.5 Sec./LOS A
V Street/North Avenue	All-Way Stop	9.4 Sec./LOS A	15.8 Sec./LOS C
V Street/Ocean Avenue	All-Way Stop	11.4 Sec./LOS B	17.2 Sec./LOS C
O Street/Central Avenue	Signal	29.5 Sec./LOS C	20.8 Sec./LOS C
H Street/Central Avenue	Signal	23.7 Sec./LOS C	31.1 Sec./LOS C

(a) LOS taken from Table 4.13-3, Lompoc General Plan Update EIR, 2009.

(b) LOS based on counts collected in 2015-2016.

Table 2
Existing Levels of Service – P.M. Peak Hour

Intersection	Control	Delay/LOS(a)	
		GP EIR(a)	Current Data(b)
V Street/Central Avenue	Signal	13.9 Sec./LOS B	11.8 Sec./LOS B
V Street/North Avenue	All-Way Stop	10.0 Sec./LOS A	15.3 Sec./LOS C
V Street/Ocean Avenue	All-Way Stop	10.7 Sec./LOS B	11.8 Sec./LOS B
O Street/Central Avenue	Signal	21.5 Sec./LOS C	26.3 Sec./LOS C
H Street/Central Avenue	Signal	35.6 Sec./LOS D	37.3 Sec./LOS D

(a) LOS taken from Table 4.13-3, Lompoc General Plan Update EIR, 2009.

(b) LOS based on counts collected in 2015-2016.

Bolded values exceed City's LOS C standards.


As shown in Tables 1 and 2, most of the intersections currently operate at LOS C or better based on the new count data, which meets the City's LOS C standard. The H Street/Central Avenue intersection currently operates at LOS D during the Weekday P.M. peak hour period, which exceeds the City's LOS C standard. The H Street/Central Avenue intersection also operated at LOS D during the P.M. peak hour in 2009 when the General Plan EIR was prepared. The City has identified an improvement project for the intersection, which includes installing dual left-turn lanes on the northbound and southbound approaches. The H Street/Central Avenue intersection is forecast to operate at LOS C with the planned improvements.

Recommendations

It is our understanding that the Project includes Sphere of Influence modifications and annexation approvals only. No development approvals are being requested at this time. It is recommended that more detailed traffic impact studies be prepared at the time of development applications. The traffic studies should be completed pursuant to City requirements and include assessment of potential impacts to streets and intersections in the vicinity of the Project sites. The traffic studies should also determine the amount of traffic that would be added to the H Street/Central Avenue intersection so that fair-share contributions to the planned improvements can be calculated for each development.

This concludes our existing conditions analysis for the Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation proposed in the western area of Lompoc. Please give us a call to discuss any questions.


Associated Transportation Engineers

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dan Dawson', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Dan Dawson, PTP
Supervising Transportation Planner

SAS/DLD

Attachments



Metro Traffic Data Inc.
 310 N. Irwin Street - Suite 20
 Hanford, CA 93230
 800-975-6938 Phone/Fax
 www.metrotrafficdata.com

Turning Movement Report

Prepared For:
 Associated Transportation Engineers
 100 N. Hope Avenue, Suite 4
 Santa Barbara, CA 93110


LOCATION V Street @ Central Avenue LATITUDE 34.6610
 COUNTY Santa Barbara LONGITUDE -120.4752
 COLLECTION DATE Tuesday, November 15, 2016 WEATHER Clear


Time	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound			
	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR
7:00 AM - 7:15 AM	24	1	36	20	2	2	0	0	1	14	7	2	10	82	0	0
7:15 AM - 7:30 AM	24	6	29	16	5	3	0	0	0	24	2	1	19	53	1	1
7:30 AM - 7:45 AM	23	0	44	36	2	1	0	0	0	17	12	4	24	57	2	2
7:45 AM - 8:00 AM	22	0	77	49	2	0	1	1	0	27	9	2	35	56	3	2
8:00 AM - 8:15 AM	16	0	50	38	0	2	0	0	0	35	11	3	21	41	3	2
8:15 AM - 8:30 AM	11	0	43	35	4	0	0	0	0	29	10	4	28	32	2	2
8:30 AM - 8:45 AM	6	1	26	19	2	0	0	0	0	22	4	0	22	29	3	3
8:45 AM - 9:00 AM	12	1	30	21	2	1	1	1	0	27	5	2	21	32	4	2
TOTAL	138	9	335	234	19	9	2	2	1	195	60	18	180	382	18	14

Time	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound			
	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR
4:00 PM - 4:15 PM	15	1	34	23	2	0	0	0	0	101	31	6	48	38	1	1
4:15 PM - 4:30 PM	12	0	44	35	0	1	0	0	0	97	32	11	46	37	0	0
4:30 PM - 4:45 PM	11	0	51	34	2	1	0	0	1	89	25	7	34	43	1	0
4:45 PM - 5:00 PM	15	3	38	19	2	0	0	0	1	89	28	6	54	29	0	0
5:00 PM - 5:15 PM	11	0	48	32	2	1	0	0	0	95	49	14	52	38	0	0
5:15 PM - 5:30 PM	6	0	42	35	0	1	0	0	1	92	26	4	58	38	0	0
5:30 PM - 5:45 PM	9	0	32	21	1	0	0	0	0	62	26	6	40	34	0	0
5:45 PM - 6:00 PM	5	0	37	30	0	0	0	0	0	56	25	7	36	31	0	0
TOTAL	84	4	326	229	9	4	0	0	3	681	242	61	368	288	2	1

PEAK HOUR	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound			
	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR	Left	Thru	Right	RTOR
7:00 AM - 8:00 AM	93	7	186	121	11	6	1	1	1	82	30	9	88	248	6	5
4:15 PM - 5:15 PM	49	3	181	120	6	3	0	0	2	370	134	38	186	147	1	0

	PHF
AM	0.818
PM	0.914





Metro Traffic Data Inc.
 310 N. Irwin Street - Suite 20
 Hanford, CA 93230
 800-975-6938 Phone/Fax
 www.metrotrafficdata.com

Turning Movement Report

Prepared For:
 Associated Transportation Engineers
 100 N. Hope Avenue, Suite 4
 Santa Barbara, CA 93110


LOCATION V Street @ North Avenue LATITUDE 34.6536
 COUNTY Santa Barbara LONGITUDE -120.4753
 COLLECTION DATE Tuesday, November 15, 2016 WEATHER Clear


Time	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound			
	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks
7:00 AM - 7:15 AM	8	41	8	1	0	18	4	2	8	8	10	0	11	10	7	2
7:15 AM - 7:30 AM	8	44	8	1	1	31	0	3	7	13	15	0	10	9	11	2
7:30 AM - 7:45 AM	9	54	17	3	4	22	6	0	9	7	25	0	15	8	5	0
7:45 AM - 8:00 AM	12	69	11	4	9	40	8	4	22	18	27	0	18	15	3	0
8:00 AM - 8:15 AM	8	63	11	1	3	38	0	0	10	7	8	1	13	7	4	1
8:15 AM - 8:30 AM	17	40	8	1	3	38	4	0	10	4	7	1	9	3	2	1
8:30 AM - 8:45 AM	4	22	7	1	5	19	6	2	4	4	4	0	5	3	5	0
8:45 AM - 9:00 AM	6	33	8	1	2	27	1	0	3	13	12	0	9	3	4	1
TOTAL	72	366	78	13	27	233	29	11	73	74	108	2	90	58	41	7

Time	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound			
	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks
4:00 PM - 4:15 PM	15	53	11	2	9	65	4	1	3	7	10	0	8	13	4	0
4:15 PM - 4:30 PM	15	56	15	2	14	50	7	3	3	10	19	0	16	10	2	0
4:30 PM - 4:45 PM	22	48	14	1	7	51	2	1	6	8	11	0	7	13	5	0
4:45 PM - 5:00 PM	28	51	10	3	8	66	4	1	8	9	16	0	16	9	6	0
5:00 PM - 5:15 PM	23	50	14	1	26	69	5	2	7	13	13	0	20	11	5	0
5:15 PM - 5:30 PM	18	38	19	0	5	62	11	0	4	12	18	0	17	13	3	0
5:30 PM - 5:45 PM	10	43	13	0	17	50	6	0	5	7	11	0	22	14	7	0
5:45 PM - 6:00 PM	14	36	7	0	6	55	6	0	6	5	13	0	12	8	6	0
TOTAL	145	375	103	9	92	468	45	8	42	71	111	0	118	91	38	0

PEAK HOUR	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound			
	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks
7:15 AM - 8:15 AM	37	230	47	9	17	131	14	7	48	45	75	1	56	39	23	3
4:45 PM - 5:45 PM	79	182	56	4	56	247	26	3	24	41	58	0	75	47	21	0

	PHF	Trucks
AM	0.756	2.6%
PM	0.891	0.8%





Metro Traffic Data Inc.
 310 N. Irwin Street - Suite 20
 Hanford, CA 93230
 800-975-6938 Phone/Fax
 www.metrotrafficdata.com

Turning Movement Report

Prepared For:
 Associated Transportation Engineers
 100 N. Hope Avenue, Suite 4
 Santa Barbara, CA 93110


LOCATION V Street @ Ocean Avenue LATITUDE 34.6391
 COUNTY Santa Barbara LONGITUDE -120.4755
 COLLECTION DATE Tuesday, November 15, 2016 WEATHER Clear

Time	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound			
	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks
7:00 AM - 7:15 AM	9	19	6	0	24	23	14	5	1	9	2	1	8	78	14	2
7:15 AM - 7:30 AM	15	21	9	0	23	15	12	1	3	22	0	0	12	54	12	4
7:30 AM - 7:45 AM	8	29	20	0	23	29	23	0	4	19	0	0	24	59	13	3
7:45 AM - 8:00 AM	10	28	40	1	51	17	25	0	5	31	0	2	34	75	25	4
8:00 AM - 8:15 AM	5	28	21	1	47	17	10	1	4	21	1	1	9	34	32	2
8:15 AM - 8:30 AM	2	13	7	2	29	12	5	3	3	22	2	2	8	24	17	2
8:30 AM - 8:45 AM	1	17	5	2	18	10	7	2	8	27	1	4	9	32	23	3
8:45 AM - 9:00 AM	2	17	6	0	33	11	6	1	6	18	2	3	5	18	15	1
TOTAL	52	172	114	6	248	134	102	13	34	169	8	13	109	374	151	21

Time	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound			
	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks
4:00 PM - 4:15 PM	3	17	7	1	17	19	6	0	19	55	3	2	8	16	28	0
4:15 PM - 4:30 PM	1	21	5	0	31	21	6	1	11	62	6	2	8	18	32	3
4:30 PM - 4:45 PM	0	16	7	2	30	19	4	1	19	60	6	2	9	21	36	1
4:45 PM - 5:00 PM	1	14	6	0	27	21	12	0	17	63	5	4	8	15	49	3
5:00 PM - 5:15 PM	2	14	5	0	32	29	7	1	24	66	5	4	11	26	50	2
5:15 PM - 5:30 PM	2	18	2	1	29	21	7	1	21	54	6	2	11	9	28	2
5:30 PM - 5:45 PM	1	23	4	0	33	15	3	0	10	46	8	2	13	18	48	1
5:45 PM - 6:00 PM	2	16	3	0	26	15	8	0	7	34	3	3	8	10	38	1
TOTAL	12	139	39	4	225	160	53	4	128	440	42	21	76	133	311	13

PEAK HOUR	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound			
	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks	Left	Thru	Right	Trucks
7:15 AM - 8:15 AM	38	106	90	2	144	78	70	2	16	93	1	3	79	222	82	13
4:15 PM - 5:15 PM	4	65	23	2	120	90	29	3	71	251	22	12	36	80	169	9

	PHF	Trucks
AM	0.747	2.0%
PM	0.886	2.7%



ITM Peak Hour Summary




National Data & Surveying Services


H St (SR-1) and Central Ave, Lompoc

Date: 2/19/2015
 Day: Thursday


Project #: 15-8019-001
 City: Lompoc



Total Ins & Outs



Total Volume Per Leg



Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
1: CENTRAL AVENUE & V STREET

Existing A.M. Peak Hour
HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Volume (vph)	1	82	30	88	248	6	93	7	186	11	6	1
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt	1.00	0.96		1.00	1.00		1.00	0.86		1.00	0.98	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3396		1770	1856		1770	1594		1770	1828	
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.75	1.00		0.61	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3396		1770	1856		1402	1594		1140	1828	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82
Adj. Flow (vph)	1	100	37	107	302	7	113	9	227	13	7	1
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	28	0	0	1	0	0	177	0	0	1	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	1	109	0	107	308	0	113	59	0	13	7	0
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Turn Type	Prot		Prot		Perm			Perm				
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8			2				6
Permitted Phases							2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)	0.5	7.3		4.1	10.9		6.6	6.6		6.6	6.6	
Effective Green, g (s)	0.5	7.3		4.1	10.9		6.6	6.6		6.6	6.6	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.02	0.24		0.14	0.36		0.22	0.22		0.22	0.22	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	30	826		242	674		308	351		251	402	
v/s Ratio Prot	0.00	0.03		c0.06	c0.17			0.04			0.00	
v/s Ratio Perm							c0.08			0.01		
v/c Ratio	0.03	0.13		0.44	0.46		0.37	0.17		0.05	0.02	
Uniform Delay, d1	14.5	8.9		11.9	7.3		9.9	9.5		9.2	9.2	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	0.5	0.1		1.3	0.5		0.7	0.2		0.1	0.0	
Delay (s)	15.0	8.9		13.2	7.8		10.7	9.7		9.3	9.2	
Level of Service	B	A		B	A		B	A		A	A	
Approach Delay (s)		9.0			9.2			10.0			9.3	
Approach LOS		A			A			B			A	

Intersection Summary

HCM Average Control Delay	9.5	HCM Level of Service	A
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio	0.46		
Actuated Cycle Length (s)	30.0	Sum of lost time (s)	12.0
Intersection Capacity Utilization	32.0%	ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)	15		

c Critical Lane Group

Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
1: CENTRAL AVENUE & V STREET

Existing P.M. Peak Hour
HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	↙	↑↗		↙	↑↗		↙	↑↗		↙	↑↗	
Volume (vph)	2	370	134	186	147	1	49	3	181	6	3	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt	1.00	0.96		1.00	1.00		1.00	0.85		1.00	1.00	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3398		1770	1861		1770	1587		1770	1863	
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.76	1.00		0.73	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3398		1770	1861		1408	1587		1355	1863	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91
Adj. Flow (vph)	2	407	147	204	162	1	54	3	199	7	3	0
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	51	0	0	0	0	0	172	0	0	0	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	2	503	0	204	163	0	54	30	0	7	3	0
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Turn Type	Prot		Prot		Perm			Perm				
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8			2				6
Permitted Phases							2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)	0.6	15.9		7.4	22.7		5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5	
Effective Green, g (s)	0.6	15.9		7.4	22.7		5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.01	0.39		0.18	0.56		0.13	0.13		0.13	0.13	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	26	1324		321	1035		190	214		183	251	
v/s Ratio Prot	0.00	c0.15		c0.12	0.09			0.02			0.00	
v/s Ratio Perm							c0.04			0.01		
v/c Ratio	0.08	0.38		0.64	0.16		0.28	0.14		0.04	0.01	
Uniform Delay, d1	19.8	8.9		15.5	4.4		15.9	15.6		15.3	15.3	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	1.3	0.2		4.1	0.1		0.8	0.3		0.1	0.0	
Delay (s)	21.1	9.1		19.5	4.5		16.7	15.9		15.4	15.3	
Level of Service	C	A		B	A		B	B		B	B	
Approach Delay (s)		9.1			12.8			16.0			15.4	
Approach LOS		A			B			B			B	

Intersection Summary			
HCM Average Control Delay	11.8	HCM Level of Service	B
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio	0.43		
Actuated Cycle Length (s)	40.8	Sum of lost time (s)	12.0
Intersection Capacity Utilization	46.2%	ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)	15		

c Critical Lane Group

Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
2: CENTRAL AVENUE & O STREET

Existing A.M. Peak Hour
HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Volume (vph)	38	295	9	83	260	87	51	52	209	27	30	16
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Lane Width	12	16	12	12	16	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.95		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	
Frt	1.00	1.00		1.00	0.96		1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	0.95	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3993		1770	3860		1770	1863	1583	1770	3355	
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3993		1770	3860		1770	1863	1583	1770	3355	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89
Adj. Flow (vph)	43	331	10	93	292	98	57	58	235	30	34	18
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	3	0	0	51	0	0	0	193	0	15	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	43	338	0	93	339	0	57	58	42	30	37	0
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Turn Type	Prot			Prot			Prot		Perm	Prot		
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8		5	2		1	6	
Permitted Phases									2			
Actuated Green, G (s)	1.4	11.5		3.2	13.3		1.4	6.8	6.8	0.6	6.0	
Effective Green, g (s)	1.4	11.5		3.2	13.3		1.4	6.8	6.8	0.6	6.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.04	0.30		0.08	0.35		0.04	0.18	0.18	0.02	0.16	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	65	1205		149	1347		65	333	283	28	528	
v/s Ratio Prot	0.02	0.08		c0.05	c0.09		c0.03	c0.03		0.02	0.01	
v/s Ratio Perm									0.03			
v/c Ratio	0.66	0.28		0.62	0.25		0.88	0.17	0.15	1.07	0.07	
Uniform Delay, d1	18.1	10.1		16.9	8.8		18.3	13.3	13.2	18.8	13.7	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	22.5	0.1		7.9	0.1		69.4	0.3	0.2	192.9	0.1	
Delay (s)	40.6	10.3		24.8	8.9		87.6	13.5	13.4	211.6	13.7	
Level of Service	D	B		C	A		F	B	B	F	B	
Approach Delay (s)		13.7			12.0			25.5			86.1	
Approach LOS		B			B			C			F	

Intersection Summary			
HCM Average Control Delay	20.8	HCM Level of Service	C
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio	0.25		
Actuated Cycle Length (s)	38.1	Sum of lost time (s)	8.0
Intersection Capacity Utilization	34.7%	ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)	15		
c Critical Lane Group			

Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
2: CENTRAL AVENUE & O STREET

Existing P.M. Peak Hour
HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Volume (vph)	69	377	67	220	274	26	18	96	238	103	101	63
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Lane Width	12	16	12	12	16	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.95		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	
Frt	1.00	0.98		1.00	0.99		1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	0.94	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1736	3845		1736	3883		1736	1827	1553	1736	3272	
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1736	3845		1736	3883		1736	1827	1553	1736	3272	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	75	410	73	239	298	28	20	104	259	112	110	68
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	25	0	0	11	0	0	0	201	0	49	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	75	458	0	239	315	0	20	104	58	112	129	0
Turn Type	Prot			Prot			Prot		Perm	Prot		
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8		5	2		1	6	
Permitted Phases									2			
Actuated Green, G (s)	3.4	13.3		8.1	18.0		0.7	11.9	11.9	4.1	15.3	
Effective Green, g (s)	3.4	13.3		8.1	18.0		0.7	11.9	11.9	4.1	15.3	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.06	0.25		0.15	0.34		0.01	0.22	0.22	0.08	0.29	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	111	958		263	1309		23	407	346	133	937	
v/s Ratio Prot	0.04	c0.12		c0.14	0.08		0.01	c0.06		c0.06	c0.04	
v/s Ratio Perm									0.04			
v/c Ratio	0.68	0.48		0.91	0.24		0.87	0.26	0.17	0.84	0.14	
Uniform Delay, d1	24.5	17.1		22.3	12.8		26.3	17.1	16.7	24.3	14.2	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	15.1	0.4		32.1	0.1		127.6	0.3	0.2	35.7	0.1	
Delay (s)	39.5	17.5		54.4	12.9		153.9	17.4	17.0	60.1	14.2	
Level of Service	D	B		D	B		F	B	B	E	B	
Approach Delay (s)		20.4			30.4			24.3			31.9	
Approach LOS		C			C			C			C	

Intersection Summary

HCM Average Control Delay	26.3	HCM Level of Service	C
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio	0.56		
Actuated Cycle Length (s)	53.4	Sum of lost time (s)	20.0
Intersection Capacity Utilization	48.8%	ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)	15		

c Critical Lane Group

Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
3: CENTRAL AVENUE & H STREET

Existing A.M. Peak Hour
HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Volume (vph)	535	115	48	74	174	347	80	459	40	230	516	324
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor	0.97	0.95		1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.95	1.00
Frt	1.00	0.96		1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	0.99		1.00	1.00	0.85
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)	3367	3318		1736	3471	1553	1736	3430		1736	3471	1553
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)	3367	3318		1736	3471	1553	1736	3430		1736	3471	1553
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	582	125	52	80	189	377	87	499	43	250	561	352
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	44	0	0	0	328	0	6	0	0	0	212
Lane Group Flow (vph)	582	133	0	80	189	49	87	536	0	250	561	140
Turn Type	Prot			Prot		Perm	Prot			Prot		Perm
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8		5	2		1	6	
Permitted Phases						8						6
Actuated Green, G (s)	18.4	13.1		17.1	11.8	11.8	8.0	26.8		17.0	35.8	35.8
Effective Green, g (s)	18.4	13.1		17.1	11.8	11.8	8.0	26.8		17.0	35.8	35.8
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.20	0.15		0.19	0.13	0.13	0.09	0.30		0.19	0.40	0.40
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	688	483		330	455	204	154	1021		328	1381	618
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.17	0.04		0.05	c0.05		0.05	c0.16		c0.14	0.16	
v/s Ratio Perm						0.03						0.09
v/c Ratio	0.85	0.27		0.24	0.42	0.24	0.56	0.52		0.76	0.41	0.23
Uniform Delay, d1	34.4	34.2		31.0	35.9	35.1	39.3	26.3		34.6	19.5	17.9
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	0.84	0.81		1.00	1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2	9.4	0.3		0.4	0.6	0.6	4.6	1.9		10.0	0.9	0.9
Delay (s)	43.8	34.5		31.3	36.5	35.7	37.5	23.2		44.6	20.4	18.8
Level of Service	D	C		C	D	D	D	C		D	C	B
Approach Delay (s)		41.7			35.4			25.2			25.1	
Approach LOS		D			D			C			C	

Intersection Summary

HCM Average Control Delay	31.1	HCM Level of Service	C
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio	0.64		
Actuated Cycle Length (s)	90.0	Sum of lost time (s)	16.0
Intersection Capacity Utilization	60.7%	ICU Level of Service	B
Analysis Period (min)	15		
c Critical Lane Group			

Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
3: CENTRAL AVENUE & H STREET

Existing P.M. Peak Hour
HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Volume (vph)	571	334	172	136	277	269	182	686	104	259	646	411
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor	0.97	0.95		1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.95	1.00
Frt	1.00	0.95		1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	0.98		1.00	1.00	0.85
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)	3367	3294		1736	3471	1553	1736	3403		1736	3471	1553
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)	3367	3294		1736	3471	1553	1736	3403		1736	3471	1553
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	621	363	187	148	301	292	198	746	113	282	702	447
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	78	0	0	0	249	0	13	0	0	0	304
Lane Group Flow (vph)	621	472	0	148	301	43	198	846	0	282	702	143
Turn Type	Prot			Prot		Perm	Prot			Prot		Perm
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8		5	2		1	6	
Permitted Phases						8						6
Actuated Green, G (s)	18.0	17.8		13.4	13.2	13.2	14.0	25.5		17.3	28.8	28.8
Effective Green, g (s)	18.0	17.8		13.4	13.2	13.2	14.0	25.5		17.3	28.8	28.8
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.20	0.20		0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.28		0.19	0.32	0.32
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	673	651		258	509	228	270	964		334	1111	497
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.18	0.14		0.09	c0.09		0.11	c0.25		c0.16	0.20	
v/s Ratio Perm						0.03						0.09
v/c Ratio	0.92	0.73		0.57	0.59	0.19	0.73	0.88		0.84	0.63	0.29
Uniform Delay, d1	35.3	33.8		35.6	35.9	33.7	36.2	30.8		35.1	26.1	22.9
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	0.79	0.78		1.00	1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2	18.3	4.0		3.1	1.8	0.4	9.3	10.5		17.4	2.7	1.5
Delay (s)	53.6	37.8		38.7	37.7	34.1	38.0	34.6		52.5	28.8	24.4
Level of Service	D	D		D	D	C	D	C		D	C	C
Approach Delay (s)		46.2			36.5			35.2			32.1	
Approach LOS		D			D			D			C	

Intersection Summary

HCM Average Control Delay	37.3	HCM Level of Service	D
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio	0.83		
Actuated Cycle Length (s)	90.0	Sum of lost time (s)	16.0
Intersection Capacity Utilization	73.9%	ICU Level of Service	D
Analysis Period (min)	15		
c Critical Lane Group			

Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
4: N STREET & V STREET

Existing A.M. Peak Hour
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↕	↗		↕			↕			↕	↗
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Volume (vph)	48	45	75	56	39	23	37	230	47	17	131	14
Peak Hour Factor	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76
Hourly flow rate (vph)	63	59	99	74	51	30	49	303	62	22	172	18


Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2
Volume Total (vph)	122	99	155	413	195	18
Volume Left (vph)	63	0	74	49	22	0
Volume Right (vph)	0	99	30	62	0	18
Hadj (s)	0.31	-0.65	0.03	-0.02	0.11	-0.65
Departure Headway (s)	7.1	6.1	6.9	6.1	6.5	5.8
Degree Utilization, x	0.24	0.17	0.30	0.70	0.35	0.03
Capacity (veh/h)	463	531	467	569	512	573
Control Delay (s)	11.1	9.1	12.9	22.2	11.9	7.7
Approach Delay (s)	10.2		12.9	22.2	11.5	
Approach LOS	B		B	C	B	

Intersection Summary

Delay	15.8
HCM Level of Service	C
Intersection Capacity Utilization	48.1%
ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)	15

Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
4: N STREET & V STREET

Existing P.M. Peak Hour
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↔	↗		↔			↔			↔	↗
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Volume (vph)	24	41	58	75	47	21	79	182	56	56	247	26
Peak Hour Factor	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89
Hourly flow rate (vph)	27	46	65	84	53	24	89	204	63	63	278	29

Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2
Volume Total (vph)	73	65	161	356	340	29
Volume Left (vph)	27	0	84	89	63	0
Volume Right (vph)	0	65	24	63	0	29
Hadj (s)	0.20	-0.68	0.03	-0.04	0.11	-0.68
Departure Headway (s)	7.2	6.3	7.0	6.1	6.2	5.4
Degree Utilization, x	0.15	0.11	0.31	0.61	0.59	0.04
Capacity (veh/h)	428	483	463	562	559	633
Control Delay (s)	10.3	8.9	13.1	18.1	16.3	7.4
Approach Delay (s)	9.6		13.1	18.1	15.6	
Approach LOS	A		B	C	C	

Intersection Summary	
Delay	15.3
HCM Level of Service	C
Intersection Capacity Utilization	58.0%
ICU Level of Service	B
Analysis Period (min)	15

Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
5: OCEAN AVENUE & V STREET

Existing A.M. Peak Hour
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↔			↔			↔			↔	↔
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	Stop
Volume (vph)	16	93	1	79	222	82	38	106	90	144	78	70
Peak Hour Factor	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
Hourly flow rate (vph)	21	124	1	105	296	109	51	141	120	192	104	93

Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2
Volume Total (vph)	83	63	253	257	312	296	93
Volume Left (vph)	21	0	105	0	51	192	0
Volume Right (vph)	0	1	0	109	120	0	93
Hadj (s)	0.16	0.02	0.24	-0.26	-0.16	0.36	-0.67
Departure Headway (s)	8.1	7.9	7.4	6.9	7.0	7.6	6.5
Degree Utilization, x	0.19	0.14	0.52	0.49	0.61	0.62	0.17
Capacity (veh/h)	403	409	467	493	491	452	525
Control Delay (s)	11.8	11.0	17.0	15.2	20.3	21.0	9.6
Approach Delay (s)	11.4		16.1		20.3	18.2	
Approach LOS	B		C		C	C	

Intersection Summary	
Delay	17.2
HCM Level of Service	C
Intersection Capacity Utilization	50.0%
ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)	15

Bailey Avenue Corridor Annexation
5: OCEAN AVENUE & V STREET

Existing P.M. Peak Hour
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↔			↔			↕			↕	↗
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Volume (vph)	71	251	22	36	80	169	4	65	23	120	90	29
Peak Hour Factor	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89
Hourly flow rate (vph)	80	282	25	40	90	190	4	73	26	135	101	33

Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2
Volume Total (vph)	221	166	85	235	103	236	33
Volume Left (vph)	80	0	40	0	4	135	0
Volume Right (vph)	0	25	0	190	26	0	33
Hadj (s)	0.23	-0.05	0.29	-0.52	-0.09	0.34	-0.65
Departure Headway (s)	6.5	6.2	6.7	5.8	6.8	6.9	5.9
Degree Utilization, x	0.40	0.28	0.16	0.38	0.19	0.45	0.05
Capacity (veh/h)	529	553	509	583	476	491	563
Control Delay (s)	12.5	10.4	9.7	11.2	11.4	14.3	8.1
Approach Delay (s)	11.6		10.8		11.4	13.5	
Approach LOS	B		B		B	B	

Intersection Summary

Delay	11.8
HCM Level of Service	B
Intersection Capacity Utilization	46.4%
ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)	15