

4.13 Land Use and Planning

This section describes effects on existing land uses that would be caused by the implementation of SWEF. The LWEF EIR addressed land use and policy consistency in the LWEF EIR Section 3.10 (Land Use) and concluded that land use conflicts would be less than significant with the exception of operational noise affecting quality of life to a significant but mitigable level. The following discussion identifies any changes to the existing environmental conditions in the Project area since 2008, and provides an update to applicable policies, potential impacts, and recommended mitigation measures.

4.13.1 Environmental Setting

As described in the LWEF EIR, the Project is located in a rural portion of unincorporated Santa Barbara County on ridges of the Santa Ynez Mountains. The Project's two primary components (i.e., WTG Site, and Transmission Line Route) are defined by two distinct geographic boundaries, as described below. A discussion of the Project's consistency with land use and zoning designations is included in Section 4.13.5.

SWEF WTG Site

The nearest WTG to the City of Lompoc would be approximately 3.7 miles southwest of the City, as measured from the City's southern boundary at San Miguelito Road. Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB) adjoins the Project site along the site's southern and western boundaries, and a detailed summary of the land uses within VAFB is included in the LWEF EIR, Section 3.10.1. Other land uses outside the Project boundary but within the immediate vicinity include VAFB's Sudden Peak Tracking Station near the southern perimeter, and the City of Lompoc's Frick Springs water facility on San Miguelito Road. Miguelito Canyon Park and Imerys Minerals California's Lompoc Plant are located further northeast along San Miguelito Road.

The Project site is accessed via San Miguelito Road and encompasses 11 privately owned parcels covering approximately 2,971 acres. Single-family residences or mobile homes are located on seven of the 11 parcels. The nearest private residence outside of the Project area boundary is located approximately 2,067 feet southeast of the proposed location for WTG N-7. Within the Project boundary are two parcels (0.66 acre total) that are owned by the federal government; no development or other Project activity would occur on or near these parcels. The Project would be located within the County's inland area, with the exception of the southern portion of the site that extends into the California coastal zone along portions of Station Road and the proposed east WTG string. Approximately 6.5 acres of permanent ground disturbance associated with grading and road improvements would occur within the coastal zone. The remaining Project components, including all WTGs and appurtenant structures, would be located within the inland area.

The entire Project area has a land use designation of Agriculture and the site is primarily used for cattle grazing. The inland portion of the Project site is zoned AG-II-100 (Agriculture II/Minimum parcel size 100 acres), while the coastal zone portion of the Project site is zoned both AG-II-100 and AG-II-320 (Agriculture II/Minimum parcel size is 320 acres).

SWEP Transmission Line Route

The Project's 115-kV transmission line would begin at the proposed substation and would be constructed along an eastern and northern route until it terminates at the proposed switchyard location as shown in Figures 2-4a and 2-4b (Project Transmission Line Route). The proposed switchyard site would be located within the Imerys Minerals property, approximately 140 feet south of the nearest residence.

Outside the WTG site boundary, the transmission line would traverse 10 additional parcels. The transmission line would remain within the County's inland area, and the entire route has a land use designation of Agriculture with a zoning of AG-II-100 (see consistency discussion in Section 4.13.5). The following land uses are located along the proposed transmission line route:

- **Residences.** Within the WTG site boundary, the transmission line would traverse three residential properties as it travels east from the proposed substation and crosses San Miguelito Road from south to north. The distance of the transmission line would be greater than 200 feet from the approximately seven existing homes located along the transmission route within the WTG site boundary. Further northeast, the transmission line would be constructed on the east side of San Miguelito Road, at a distance greater than 600 feet of approximately 20 residences. Five residences within the City of Lompoc would be located within 200 feet of the switchyard.
- **Parks.** The transmission line would be constructed approximately 250 feet north of Miguelito Canyon Park. A discussion of available recreational resources at Miguelito Canyon Park and recreational activities within the surrounding area is included in Section 4.19, *Recreation*, of this SEIR.
- **Industrial.** The transmission line would be constructed along the western and northern boundaries of the Imerys Minerals Plant for approximately 3.5 miles.

4.13.2 Regulatory Setting

This section identifies the federal, State, and local regulations that apply to the SWEP. Of the regulations listed below, those that were discussed in the LWEP EIR include references to that analysis. For applicable regulations that were not discussed in the LWEP EIR, or that require an updated summary, a reference is provided to direct the reader to the relevant discussion in the SEIR.

4.13.2.1 Federal

- **National Ambient Air Quality Standards** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.4.2.1)
- **Clean Water Act** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Sections 4.5.2.2 and 4.12.3)
- **Endangered Species Act** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.5.6)
- **Migratory Bird Treaty Act** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.5.6)
- **Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.5.6)
- **Plant Protection Act of 2000** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.5.2.2)
- **Federal Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.9.2.1)
- **Executive Order 11990- Wetlands** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.5.2.2)

- **Federal Aviation Administration**, Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations CFR Part 77 (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.10.2.1)
- **Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations** (49 CFR 350-399) (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.14.2.1)
- **U.S. Department of Energy’s Wind Vision** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.7.2.1)
- **National Electric Manufacturers Association and American National Standards Institute safety standards** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.13.2.1)
- **National Fire Protection Agency’s National Electric Code** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.8.2)
- **International Building Code** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.9.2.1)
- **Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers 693- Recommended Practices for Seismic Design of Substations** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.9.2.1)
- **International Electrotechnical Commission Standard 61400-1 – Wind Turbine Design Standards** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.9.2.1)

4.13.2.2 State

- **California Endangered Species Act** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.5.6)
- **California Species Preservation Act** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.5.6)
- **Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.5.2.2)
- **Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act of 1972** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.9.2.1)
- **California Seismic Hazards Mapping Act of 1990** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.9.2.1)
- **AB 32- California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.7.2.2)
- **California Integrated Solid Waste Management Act** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.18.3)
- **California Oak Woodlands Conservation Act** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.5.2.2)
- **California Ambient Air Quality Standards** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.4.2.2)
- **California Fish and Game Code §§ 3503, 3503.5, 3511, 3513, 4000, 4700, 5050, and 5515** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.5.6 and SEIR Section 4.5.2.2)
- **California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Streambed Alteration Program** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.5.2.2)
- **CARB Portable Equipment Registration Program** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.4.2.2)
- **Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, Rule 345- Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.4.2.2)
- **California’s Renewables Portfolio Standard** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.7.2.2)
- **Senate Bills 1107 and 1368** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.7.2.2)

- **California Public Utilities Commission’s General Order 95** - State of California Rules for Overhead Electric Line Construction (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.10.2.1)
- **California Code of Regulations:** Title 8 (Cal/OSHA regulations), Title 14 (Sections 1250 and 1255), and Title 24 (Building Code) (refer to full discussion in SEIR Sections 4.8.3 and 4.9.2.2)
- **California Public Resource Codes:** 4119, 4291-4296, 4435 (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.8.3)
- **California Health and Safety Code** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.8.3)
- **California Government Codes:** 51175 and 51189 (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.8.3)
- **California Strategic Fire Plan** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.8.3)
- **General Order 95:** Utility Vegetation Management Requirements (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.8.3)
- **California State Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.8.3)
- **CAL FIRE: Civil Cost Recovery Program and Power Line Fire Prevention Guide** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.8.3)
- **Caltrans regulations for transport and encroachment** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.14.2.2)
- **California Scenic Highway Program:** Sections 260 through 263 (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.2.2)
- **California Coastal Act.** The LWEP EIR did not include a consistency analysis of California Coastal Act policies. As the SWEP would involve grading, oak tree removal, and road improvements within the coastal zone, these activities would be subject to the California Coastal Act. The California Coastal Act establishes a comprehensive approach to govern land use planning along the entire California coast and sets forth general policies (Public Resources Code Section 30200 et seq.) that are used by the California Coastal Commission (Coastal Commission) to review permit applications and local plans. Coastal Act policies are implemented through the preparation of Local Coastal Programs (LCPs) by the cities and counties that are located in whole or in part within the coastal zone. The LCP consists of a land use plan (LUP) and a local implementation program that specify the relevant planning policies and zoning ordinances specific to the coastal zone within that jurisdiction. Once an LCP is certified by the Coastal Commission, coastal permitting authority is delegated to the appropriate local government, with the exception of certain specific lands for which the Coastal Commission retains original permit jurisdiction.

4.13.2.3 Local

- **Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.10.2.3)
- **Santa Barbara County Coastal Land Use Plan.** The LWEP EIR did not include a consistency analysis of the County’s Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP). The coastal zone portion of the SWEP would be subject to the policies and regulations established in the County’s Coastal LUP, which was certified by the Coastal Commission in 1982 (CCC, 2017). The SWEP’s development activities within the coastal zone would require a Coastal Development Permit (CDP). The certified LUP provides permitting authority to Santa Barbara County for Project activities within the coastal zone.

- **Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.10.2.3)
- **Santa Barbara County Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance.** The LWEP EIR did not include a consistency analysis of the County’s Coastal Zoning Ordinance because no LWEP components were proposed in the coastal zone. SWEP activities within the coastal zone would be subject to the regulations contained in Article II of the Coastal Zoning Ordinance, which implement the certified Coastal LUP (Santa Barbara County, 2018a).
- **Santa Barbara County Uniform Rules for Agricultural Preserves and Farmland Security Zones** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.3.2.2)
- **Santa Barbara County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Business Plan** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.13.2.3)
- **Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.8.3)
- **Santa Barbara County Association of Governments Congestion Management Program** (refer to full discussion in LWEP EIR Section 3.14.2)
- **City of Lompoc General Plan** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Sections 4.8.3 and 4.14.2)
- **City of Lompoc Municipal Code** (refer to full discussion in SEIR Section 4.14.2)

4.13.3 Significance Thresholds

The following significance thresholds have been developed by the County to address land use and planning-related concerns in the Project area. These thresholds are identical to those used in the LWEP EIR. The proposed Project would have a significant land use and planning impact if it would:

- Physically divide an established community.
- 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.
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (No such plans have been developed in the Project area, and this criterion is not considered further.)

In addition, Project impacts related to VAFB operations and local airports are addressed in this section based upon the following threshold of significance:

- Would the project conflict with military or local airport operations, be inconsistent with FAA or other relevant regulations, or create a navigational hazard?

The following five Thresholds of Significance for “Quality of Life,” as outlined in Section 14 of the County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, are also relevant and used herein to determine Project impacts (Santa Barbara County, 2018c):

- Loss of privacy
- Neighborhood incompatibility

- Nuisance noise levels (not exceeding noise thresholds)
- Increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods (not exceeding traffic thresholds)
- Loss of sunlight/solar access.

4.13.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table 4.13-1 below lists the impacts and mitigation measures identified for land use and planning in Section 3.10 of the LWEPP EIR. These same impacts are addressed in this section for the SWEPP. The right-hand column of the table below indicates whether the SWEPP impacts or mitigation measures have been modified for the LWEPP.

Table 4.13-1. LWEPP Impacts and Mitigation Measures – Land Use and Planning

Impact No.	LWEPP Impact Statements	LWEPP Mitigation Measures	SWEPP Changes
LU-1	LUDC Visual Impact Development Standards. The Project would comply with development standards because impacts to aesthetic/visual resources would be mitigated to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 3.2.5.8 (Aesthetics/Visual Resources).	None identified.	Modified impact statement and relabeled as LU-1a. Updated impact discussion.
LU-1b	None	None	New impact statement. New impact discussion. New significance conclusion. Referenced Biological Resource mitigation.
LU-2	FAA Air Navigation Requirements. The Project would affect air navigation if helicopters were used during construction and the installation of WTGs and meteorological towers.	None identified	Modified impact statement. Updated impact discussion.
LU-3	Compatibility with VAFB Operations. The Project would be designed to avoid interference with VAFB operations, such as radar, telemetry antennas, and microwave links, specifically VTRS located on Sudden Peak. The Project footprint is within existing space launch hazard corridors that need to be evacuated periodically to ensure public safety and evacuation agreements would be pursued.	None identified.	Modified impact statement. Updated impact discussion.
LU-4	Quality of Life – Traffic. Construction activities would result in increased traffic in relatively quiet neighborhoods.	Referenced MM TC-1 from SEIR Section 4.17 (Transportation and Traffic).	Modified impact statement. Updated impact discussion. Significance conclusion change (construction). Revised/updated mitigation.

Impact No.	LWEP Impact Statements	LWEP Mitigation Measures	SWEP Changes
LU-5	Quality of Life – Noise. The Project would result in increased noise levels during construction. Noise from WTG operation would impact quality of life of certain residences near the turbine corridors.	Referenced MMs NOI-2 through NOI-6 from SEIR Section 4.14 (Noise).	Modified impact statement and relabeled as LU-5a. Updated impact discussion. Significance conclusion change (construction). Revised/updated mitigation.
LU-5b	None	None	New impact statement. New impact discussion. New significance conclusion. Referenced Noise mitigation.
LU-6	None	None	New impact statement. New impact discussion. New significance conclusion. Revised/updated mitigation.
LU-7	None	None	New impact statement. New impact discussion. New significance conclusion. Revised/updated mitigation.

The land use and planning impacts of the proposed SWEP are discussed below. See Section 4.13.5 for a full discussion of the Project’s consistency with the County’s plans, policies, standards, and coastal zoning ordinance.

LU-1a LUDC Visual Impact Development Standards. The Project poses potential inconsistency with County Plans, Policies, and Development Standards concerning visual impacts.

The LWEP analysis for Impact LU-1 discussed the consistency of the LWEP with LUDC standards that are intended to minimize visual impacts from wind energy projects (LUDC Chapter 35.57: Wind Energy Conversion Systems). The LWEP EIR concluded that although the residual visual impacts of the LWEP would be significant, the LWEP would conform to the development standards because further reduction in visual impacts would be infeasible. The impacts associated with compliance with the LUDC were determined to be adverse but less than significant.

As discussed in SEIR Section 4.2 and LWEP Section 3.2, the SWEP would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to views from San Miguelito Road at KOP 11 and from Jalama Beach County Park at KOP 4. WTGs visible from Upper San Miguelito Road would be the dominant features within the existing rural landscape, adversely affecting “moderate-high quality” views as illustrated in Figures 4.2-12A/12B (see LWEP Table 3.2-2 for a summary of KOP aesthetic quality). From Jalama Beach County Park, WTGs would extend above the ridgeline, adversely affecting “high quality” views from this publicly accessible beach as illustrated in Figures 4.2-5A/5B. These impacts could not be mitigated to a less than significant level. However, although the residual visual impacts of the SWEP would be significant, the SWEP would continue to conform to the development standards within LUDC Section 35.57.050 (Development Standards for Wind Energy Conversion Systems) because the Project has been designed to reduce visual impacts to the degree feasible (see mitigation measures

(MMs) VIS-1, VIS-2, and VIS-4 in SEIR Section 4.2.4). These measures will reduce aesthetic impacts during construction with restrictions on siting activities and material storage and will also minimize the visual contrast between rock/soils and vegetation with implementation of a landscaping plan. A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the LUDC is presented in Section 4.13.5 of this SEIR. Impacts associated with the SWEP's compliance with the County's development standards would remain adverse but not significant (Class III).

LU-1b Tree Protection. The proposed Project is inconsistent with County Plans, Policies, and Development Standards concerning tree removal.

~~This impact is new with the SWEP.~~ The EIR for the LWEP did not identify significant impacts to trees or inconsistencies with County tree protection policies or ordinances. The LWEP would have resulted in some tree removals, but a detailed tree inventory was not completed by the previous applicant or PG&E (the entity that would have constructed the transmission line). For SWEP, a detailed tree inventory and analysis was conducted to estimate the number of trees that would need to be removed to implement the Project. The reason SWEP would have significant impacts to trees, whereas the LWEP would not, is due to differences in design and layout of the two projects.

Construction of WTGs E-7 and E-8 and associated access roads, as proposed in the SWEP Project Description (SEIR Section 2), would result in an estimated loss of 382 trees, of which 35 are coast live oaks. Approximately 81 of these trees, including 24 coast live oaks, are located in the Coastal Zone. Additionally, 5 trees would be lost for construction of WTGs E-3 and N-5. Widening of San Miguelito Road would result in a loss of 158 trees, of which 150 are coast live oaks. Construction of the transmission line would result in a loss of 62 trees, all of them coast live oaks. None of these additional 225 trees are in the Coastal Zone (see Section 4.5.4.2 and Table 4.5-4 for the impact analysis). The grading plans for WTGs and access roads and San Miguelito Road work have been revised by the applicant to reduce loss of trees, and the transmission line route has been shifted to avoid coast live oaks to the extent feasible. Mitigation measures have also been recommended to minimize impacts to oak trees (see Section 4.5.4.2, MMs BIO-4a through BIO-4c). Nevertheless, the impacts to trees described above would occur if the Project were built as proposed.

The Modified Project Layout Alternative in Section 5.5.2 of this SEIR would eliminate WTGs E-7, WTG E-8 and associated access roads, reducing trees lost from approximately 607 to 225 trees and eliminating the loss of 81 trees in the Coastal Zone.

There are several County policies and ordinances pertaining to protection for coast live oaks. As discussed below (see Section 4.13.5), the proposed Project would be inconsistent with plans and policies of the Oak Tree Protection Supplement of the Conservation Element, the Land Use Element, the Coastal Land Use Plan, and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance. The rationale for finding the Project inconsistent with these policies and ordinances is that a feasible Project alternative exists that would result in substantially fewer oak tree losses (see Section 5.5.2). Therefore, the Project as proposed would result in unnecessary impacts to trees and woodlands, coast live oaks in particular, which is contrary to all these policies and ordinances. The impacts are considered significant and unavoidable (Class I).

It should be noted that the Modified Project Layout Alternative would be consistent with the Coastal Land Use Plan and Coastal Zoning Ordinance, because there would be no tree removal in the Coastal Zone. It would also be consistent with the Oak Tree Protection Supplement and the Land Use Element,

notwithstanding that some 225 trees (most of them oaks) would be removed for transmission line construction and San Miguelito Road widening. The consistency determination can be made, because (with the mitigation measures described in Section 4.5.4.2), impacts to trees, and oak trees in particular, would be avoided to the maximum extent feasible.

Mitigation Measures

See Section 4.5, *Biological Resources*, for the full text of these mitigation measures:

- MM BIO-1** **Worker Education and Awareness Program**
- MM BIO-2** **Ground Disturbance**
- MM BIO-4a** **Tree Protection Plan**
- MM BIO-4b** **Tree Replacement Plan**
- MM BIO-4c** **Invasive Plant Pathogen Abatement (SOD Prevention)**
- MM BIO-11c** **Biological Monitoring**
- MM BIO-11d** **Monitoring Report**

LU-2 FAA Air Navigation Requirements. Potential conflict with FAA air navigation requirements from installation of WTGs and meteorological towers, and possible use of helicopters during construction.

The LWEP concluded that the Project would have adverse but less-than-significant impacts ~~to FAA~~ on aircraft navigation. There would be no notable change to ~~FAA~~ navigation impacts under the SWEP. The proposed SWEP must comply with FAA requirements, and Project approval would require a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (FAA Form 7460-1), a determination regarding the Project's impact to air navigation, and ~~the receipt of a~~ WTG Lighting Plan from the FAA. Additionally, the FAA would evaluate the meteorological towers to determine whether they would be subject to lighting requirements. The FAA would impose conditions as needed to prevent aircraft collisions with the WTGs and meteorological towers. Potential impacts under the SWEP would remain less than significant (Class III).

LU-3 Compatibility with VAFB Operations. Potential incompatibility with VAFB operations, such as radar, telemetry antennas, and microwave links.

The LWEP EIR determined that the Project would not conflict with VAFB operations. The SWEP is subject to the same constraints as the LWEP given its proximity to VAFB property, and potential impacts to VAFB operations would be similar to the analysis provided in the LWEP EIR. The Applicant has been working with VAFB to ensure compliance with military requirements, and VAFB has confirmed the proposed WTG sites would not interfere with telemetry equipment or otherwise conflict with VAFB operations (B. King, personal communication, February 28, 2018). Furthermore, the Applicant has executed Agreement No. USAF-AFSPC-XUMU-15-1-0142, which establishes policies for evacuation and termination of transmissions of specified turbines during launch or pre-launch

activities upon notice to do so by the VAFB. Given ongoing consultation and an executed agreement with the Airforce, the Project's impacts to VAFB operations would not be significant (Class III).

LU-4 Quality of Life – Traffic. Construction activities would result in increased traffic in relatively quiet neighborhoods.

The LWEP EIR determined that impacts to the quality of the human environment as it pertains to traffic would be adverse but less than significant. The SWEP's potential quality of life impacts from construction traffic would be similar to the analysis provided in the LWEP EIR. Compared to LWEP, transportation of the larger SWEP turbine blades would result in greater disruption of traffic in the rural, relatively quiet portions of the Project area, such as along San Miguelito Road. As discussed in Section 4.17, *Transportation and Traffic*, a Traffic Management Plan would be implemented to reduce congestion impacts (see MM TC-1 in SEIR Section 4.17.4). Although the Project would generate increased traffic in relatively quiet neighborhoods, quality of life impacts would be short term, lasting approximately ten months, and would cease upon completion of construction activities. Construction traffic impacts would be significant, but mitigable (Class II). With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, residual impacts would be less than significant.¹

Traffic-related impacts during Project operation would be negligible. Similar to LWEP, operation of the SWEP would require a small number of staff (approximately five to seven employees), as well as occasional subcontractors onsite for road or transmission line maintenance activities, resulting in minimal traffic increases. No impacts to quality of life would be associated with operational traffic.

Mitigation Measure

See Section 4.17, *Transportation and Traffic*, for the full text of this mitigation measure:

MM TC-1 Traffic Management Plan

LU-5a Quality of Life – Noise. Noise from Project construction could cause temporary impacts to quality of life of residences within and surrounding the Project area.

The LWEP EIR determined that Project construction noise would be adverse but less than significant to the quality of the human environment. The SWEP's potential impacts to the community's quality of life would be similar to the analysis provided in the LWEP EIR. The Project would result in increased noise levels during construction resulting from heavy equipment and vehicular traffic. Noise from transmission line construction would be of brief duration at any given location, although residents along San Miguelito Road would be exposed to noise from truck traffic throughout the duration of construction. Construction noise impacts would be minimized by implementation of mitigation measures described in Section 4.14, *Noise*. Construction noise would be typical of that associated with other construction projects and would cease upon completion of construction

¹ Note that the LWEP EIR conclusion was substantively the same, i.e., the residual impacts would be less than significant, with mitigation. However, the EIR classified the impacts as adverse, but less than significant (Class III).

activities. Construction noise impacts would be significant, but mitigable (Class II). With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, residual impacts would not be significant.²

Mitigation Measures

See Section 4.14, *Noise*, for the full text of these mitigation measures:

- MM NOI-2 Construction Hours**
- MM NOI-3 Telephone Number for Noise Complaints**
- MM NOI-4 Noise Complaint Resolution Plan**
- MM NOI-5 Maintenance of Construction Equipment**
- MM NOI-6 Resident Notification**

LU-5b Quality of Life – Noise. Noise from WTG operation could potentially impact quality of life of nearby residences.

The LWEP EIR determined that noise from WTG operation would result in significant but mitigable impacts to the quality of the human environment (Class II). The SWEP’s potential impacts to the quality of life for certain residences during operation would be similar to the analysis provided in the LWEP EIR. SEIR Section 4.14.4, *Noise*, describes the predicted WTG noise levels for participating and nonparticipating residences within the Project area. The threshold for a substantial increase in noise levels was determined to be 50 dBA (A-weighted sound level measurement) Day Night Average Sound Level (Ldn) for nonparticipating residences, and 65 dBA Ldn for participating residences. The noise analysis conducted for SWEP (summarized in Table 4.14-6) indicates that none of the five adjacent nonparticipating residences would be exposed to noise levels greater than 49 dBA Ldn, and none of the eight participating residences would be exposed to noise levels greater than 59 dBA Ldn.

Potential noise impacts from WTG operation would be minimized to the extent feasible through implementation mitigation measures listed below. Noise from WTG operation would result in adverse but mitigable impacts to the quality of life of residences near the turbine corridors (Class II). With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, residual impacts would not be significant.

Mitigation Measures

See Section 4.14, *Noise*, for the full text of these mitigation measures:

- MM NOI-1 WTG Maintenance**
- MM NOI-3 Telephone Number for Noise Complaints**
- MM NOI-4 Noise Complaint Resolution Plan**
- MM NOI-7 Acoustical Analysis**
- MM NOI-8 Noise Monitoring and Control Plan**
- MM NOI-9 Maintenance Hours**

² See Note 1, above.

LU-6 Coastal Resources. Possible unpermitted encroachment into the Coastal Zone, impacting coastal resources.

The proposed grading, tree removal, and road improvements that would occur within the coastal zone would be subject to a County-issued CDP. All activities within the coastal zone must adhere to the permit conditions specified in the CDP. To prevent any construction work occurring outside of the permitted area, implementation of MM LU-1 (Staking of Coastal Zone) is recommended. With the aid of exclusion fencing included as part of MM LU-1, permitted and non-permitted areas within the coastal zone would be clearly identifiable to construction workers. Impacts associated with coastal zone encroachment would not be significant with implementation of recommended mitigation (Class II).

Mitigation Measure

The LWEP's mitigation to require staking within the coastal zone (MM LU-2) would continue to apply to the SWEP and has been renumbered in this SEIR as MM LU-1.

MM LU-1 Staking of Coastal Zone. The Applicant shall install exclusion fencing or stake the coastal zone boundary to ensure that no construction activities occur within the coastal zone area, except where specifically permitted under a Coastal Development Permit (CDP). In areas where road work is permitted under the CDP for modifications of access roads, the Applicant shall install exclusion fencing or staking to ensure that no construction occurs beyond the designated construction boundaries.

Requirements and Timing. The installation of exclusion fencing or staking shall be completed prior to the start of construction activities within the WTG corridors adjacent to the coastal zone.

Monitoring. County staff will conduct inspections prior to and during construction to confirm and enforce compliance.

LU-7 Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan. Long-term impacts to land use following end of Project.

As part of the County's review of the SWEP's permit application, the Applicant must submit a detailed plan for the Project's decommissioning and site reclamation, consistent with the County's Energy Element Policy 5.1, Environmental Analysis. Implementation of MM LU-2 (Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan) and MM LU-3 (Financial Assurance for Decommissioning and Reclamation) are recommended to ensure that long-term impacts to land uses within the Project area remain less than significant (Class II). See Section 4.13.5 for a full discussion of the Project's consistency with County plans, policies, and standards.

Mitigation Measures

The LWEP's mitigation to require a Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan (MM LU-3) would continue to apply to the SWEP and has been renumbered in this SEIR as MM LU-2. One new mitigation measure (MM LU-3) has been included to facilitate restoration of the Project site following decommissioning.

MM LU-2 Decommissioning & Reclamation Plan. The Applicant shall develop a Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan that addresses facility decommissioning, abandonment, and post-abandonment reclamation efforts.

Requirements and Timing. The Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan shall be submitted to the County for review and approval as part of the Applicant's permit application for a discretionary permit for facility decommissioning and abandonment. The plan shall be implemented during facility abandonment, with reclamation efforts following. This requirement shall apply in the case of partial decommissioning as well as decommissioning of the entire Project.

Monitoring. County staff will review and approve the Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan as part of discretionary permit review, and implementation of the plan shall be conducted during County inspections of abandonment and reclamation activities.

MM LU-3 Financial Assurance for Decommissioning and Reclamation. The Applicant shall submit to the County:

- a. An itemized cost estimate for removal of all structures and equipment and reclamation of the Project site and an estimate from a qualified party of the reclamation value of the SWEP infrastructure. The bases for all estimates shall be identified and documented. The estimates shall be revised and updated and resubmitted to County staff every five years.
- b. The Applicant shall submit to County staff a financial assurance mechanism acceptable to the County for the cost of removal of structures and equipment and reclamation of the Project site. The amount of the assurance shall be based on the itemized cost estimate. The financial security shall be in place for the life of the Project. The County will release the security upon successful completion of structure and equipment removal and site reclamation, as determined by County staff.

Requirements and Timing. The financial assurance for decommissioning and reclamation shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to issuance of zoning clearance. The permittee shall update and resubmit the financial assurance every five years.

Monitoring. County staff shall monitor successful completion of structure and equipment removal and site reclamation. The County shall release financial assurance upon determination that all structures and equipment have been removed and the site reclaimed pursuant to the approved Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan.

4.13.5 Consistency with Plans and Policies

This section provides an analysis of the SWEP's consistency with the County's Comprehensive Plan, Coastal Land Use Plan, Land Use and Development Code, and Coastal Zoning Ordinance. Applicable policies and standards that were not analyzed in the LWEP Final EIR are identified below.

4.13.5.1 Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan

Agricultural Element

Goal I. Santa Barbara County shall assure and enhance the continuation of agriculture as a major viable production industry in Santa Barbara County. Agriculture shall be encouraged. Where conditions allow, (taking into account environmental impacts) expansion and intensification shall be supported.

Consistent. The Project would provide financial support to property owners, who could use that funding to enhance the viability of their agricultural operations. The Project also would maintain roads in agricultural areas, which would allow property owners greater access to their land which could also enhance agricultural operations.

Policy I.A. The integrity of agricultural operations shall not be violated by recreational or other non-compatible uses.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project would not violate the integrity of agricultural operations, because existing grazing and dryland farming activities would be able to continue throughout the life of the Project. Temporary gates/fences would be installed to protect cattle during the construction phase. Further, LUDC Section 35.57 permits wind projects on agricultural properties, subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

The County Agricultural Preserve Advisory Committee (APAC) reviewed the ~~LWEP~~ SWEP preliminarily on September 7, 2018, June 2, 2006 and then again on May 3, 2019, and determined where it voted unanimously that to find the Project consistent with the Uniform Rules, specifically Rule 2-9C and 2-1 and determined that the onsite contracts: 01-AP-006, 78-AP-019, 73-AP-029, 73-AP-027, 78-AP-004, 73-AP-077, and 69-AP-039 meet the ongoing eligibility requirements. Therefore, pursuant to the APAC's review and action, the Project is considered that it is a compatible use under the County's Uniform Rules for Agricultural Preserves. At the time of publication of the Draft SEIR, SWEP has not completed the APAC review and hearing process. However, due to the strong similarity of SWEP and LWEP with respect to project design and potential agricultural impacts, it is anticipated that SWEP will also be found consistent with the Uniform Rules in an upcoming hearing. The Agricultural Advisory Committee received an update on the SWEP on May 2, 2019.

Policy I.D. The use of the Williamson Act (Agricultural Preserve Program) shall be strongly encouraged and supported. The County shall also explore and support other agricultural land protection programs.

Consistent. See discussion under the Agricultural Element's Policy I.A, above.

Policy I.F. The quality and availability of water, air, and soil resources shall be protected through provisions including but not limited to, the stability of Urban/Rural Boundary Lines, maintenance of buffer areas around agricultural areas, and the promotion of conservation practices.

Consistent. The Project would include mitigation measures such as segregating excess topsoil stockpiled onsite from other soils to facilitate future land restoration and protection of stockpiled soils, as well as measures to minimize water quality and air quality impacts. Agricultural activities would be able to continue under the Project.

Goal II. Agricultural lands shall be protected from adverse urban influence.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* See discussion under the Agricultural Element's Policies I.A and I.F, above. Also, the presence of the wind farm will deter conversion from agriculture use to suburban development for the life of the Project.

Policy II.D. Conversion of highly productive agricultural lands whether urban or rural, shall be discouraged. The County shall support programs which encourage the retention of highly productive agricultural lands.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The SWEP would be located on Grazing Land as designated by the Department of Conservation. No temporary or permanent disturbance would occur to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance.

Goal III. Where it is necessary for agricultural lands to be converted to other uses, this use shall not interfere with remaining agricultural operations.

Consistent. See discussion under Policy II.D. of the Agricultural Element. In addition, grazing would be able to continue during and after construction, and the permanent loss of grazing land would not significantly impair agricultural productivity or operations.

Circulation Element

B. Roadway Standards. The Policy capacities provided in this Element shall be used as guidelines for evaluating consistency with this section of this Element. A project's consistency with this section shall be determined as follows:

- a) A project that would contribute Average Daily Traffic (ADT) to a roadway where the Estimated Future Volume does not exceed the policy capacity would be considered consistent with this section of this Element.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Service levels of area roadways potentially affected by Project traffic would experience minimal changes from existing conditions, although there would be a temporary increase during the construction phase. Temporary traffic delays caused by construction traffic and transport of large loads could lead to potentially significant impacts. Implementation of implement MM TC-1 (Traffic Management Plan) would reduce temporary construction traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level. Project-related traffic volumes fall below County significance thresholds during the operational phase.

Conservation Element

Ecological Systems Conclusions and Recommendations. In making the following recommendations, we have been guided by the conviction that it is imperative to preserve for the future as much biological diversity, that is, as many different species and communities, as possible.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project would not result in the elimination of any species or communities. It would result in potentially significant impacts to vegetation and wildlife, but mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce impacts to these biological resources to the maximum extent feasible (see Table 4.5-8). In most cases, impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Impacts to avian and bat species resulting from collisions with WTGs are expected to be significant and unavoidable, but the implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.5.4.2 would reduce these impacts to the maximum extent feasible. Although individual birds and bats may be killed, the overall

populations of the affected species would not be eliminated. Similarly, impacts to oak woodland and forest would be significant and unavoidable, but the impacts would be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible by implementation of several mitigation measures, including a Tree Protection Plan and a Tree Replacement Plan. Moreover, the Project would ensure that the SWEP site would remain in open space, which would support the goal of preserving biological diversity.

Agricultural Resources Conclusions and Recommendations

Agricultural preservation in the County has been extremely successful to date in placing lands adjacent to urban areas, as well as more remote lands, under Williamson Act agreements. The County and the cities should adopt the following policies to protect and enhance their agricultural resources:

- The County and cities should take all measures necessary to protect agricultural lands from urban impacts, e.g. trespassing and theft.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project would help preserve the land in productive agriculture and open space. Because the area is accessible to the public only via San Miguelito Road, and VAFB provides a buffer zone on the south and west sides, urban-related impacts at the site would be minimal. Presence of project personnel at the O&M building and around the project site on a daily basis would enhance security in the area. Site security measures are described in Section 2.7.4 of the *Project Description*.

Archaeological Sites Conclusions and Recommendations

A systematic ground survey of the project area and alternative areas should be carried out by the archaeologist selected. Preliminary testing of sites within the designated construction area may be included.

A report should be submitted by the archaeologist to the planners and developers concerned with the project and to responsible government agencies. This report should include details on surface and sub-surface finds, evaluation of the area and the sites it may contain, and suggestions for further actions concerning archaeological resources.

Consistent. A Cultural Resources Survey was prepared in 2018 as part of the SEIR, and a Phase 2 California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) Eligibility evaluation was conducted in 2019. The results of these surveys are ~~and is~~ described in Section 4.6, *Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources*. The Project would also include mitigation measures, such as avoiding known resources when feasible (MM CULT-6); noting areas of known cultural resources as “unbuildable” on final plans (MM CULT-7); installing temporary fencing around known resources (MM CULT-8); ~~conducting a Phase 1 Archaeological Survey in areas of construction impacts (and Phase 2 and 3 testing as required);~~ conducting contractor/construction personnel pre-construction ~~briefings~~ training; and having a County-approved archaeologist and Native American monitor ground disturbances in all areas containing archaeological materials (CULT-10) to mitigate impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Oak Tree Protection Supplement of the Conservation Element

The Oak Tree Protection Goal. Santa Barbara County shall promote the conservation and regeneration of oak woodlands in the County over the long term, and, where feasible, shall work to

increase the native oak population and extent of woodland acreage. The highest priority for conservation, protection, and regeneration shall be for valley oak trees, valley oak woodlands, and valley oak savanna.

Oak Tree Protection Policy 1. Native oak trees, native oak woodlands and native oak savannas shall be protected to the maximum extent feasible in the County's rural and/or agricultural lands. Regeneration of oak trees shall be encouraged. Because of the limited range and increasing scarcity of valley oak trees, valley oak woodlands and valley oak savanna, special priority shall be given to their protection and regeneration.

Inconsistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project would not cause impacts to valley oaks, but would cause significant and unavoidable impacts to coast live oak woodland and forest. Coast live oaks would be removed during construction of some WTGs, access roads, and for modifications of San Miguelito Road and transmission line poles. Although the Applicant has submitted revised grading plans to substantially reduce loss of oak trees, while preserving the proposed overall layout of the wind farm, the impacts would still be significant and unavoidable. The impacts would be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible by implementation of several mitigation measures, including a Tree Protection Plan and a Tree Replacement Plan (see Section 4.5.4.2).

This SEIR includes a Project alternative (*Modified Project Layout, Including Elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8*), which would substantially reduce the number of oak trees removed for access roads and WTG sites. Given that this alternative layout is considered feasible and would substantially reduce impacts to oak trees, the proposed Project (as described in the Project Description) cannot be found consistent with Oak Tree Protection Policy 1.

Development Standards for Development

The following standards shall apply to all development (as defined in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan) in the rural areas of the County requiring a permit.

Development Standard 1: Protection of all species of mature oak trees.

All development shall avoid removal of or damage to mature oak trees, to the maximum extent feasible. Mature oak trees are considered to be live oak trees six inches or greater diameter at breast height and blue oak trees four inches or greater diameter at breast height, or live and blue oaks six feet or greater in height. Native oak trees that cannot be avoided shall be replanted on site. When replanting oak trees on site is not feasible, replanting shall occur on receiver sites known to be capable of supporting the particular oak tree species, and in areas contiguous with existing woodlands or savannas where the removed species occurs. Replanting shall conform to the County's Standard Conditions and Mitigation Measures. (This development standard applies to oak trees other than valley oaks. Valley oak trees are addressed in separate Development Standards.)

Inconsistent. *[New Analysis]* Significant and unavoidable impacts to coast live oaks would be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible by implementation of several mitigation measures, including a Tree Protection Plan and a Tree Replacement Plan (see Section 4.5.4.2). However, given the extent of oak tree removal required, the proposed Project is inconsistent with Development Standard 1. This SEIR includes a Project alternative (*Modified Project Layout, Including Elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8*), which would substantially reduce the number of oak trees removed for access roads and WTG sites. Given

that this alternative layout is considered feasible and would substantially reduce impacts to oak trees, the proposed Project (as described in the Project Description) cannot be found consistent with this development standard.

Energy Element

Goal 4: Water Use and Solid Waste. Increase the efficiency of water and resource use to reduce energy consumption associated with various phases of using resources (pumping, distribution, treatment, heating, etc.)

Policy 4.1: Construction. Encourage recycling and reuse of construction waste to reduce energy consumption associated with extracting and manufacturing virgin materials.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Construction debris would be recycled to the extent feasible, as discussed in Section 4.18.4. Compliance with MM USS-1 (Source Reduction and Solid Waste Management Plan) would ensure that a minimum of 65 percent of construction waste generated from the Project be recycled. Rocks excavated during construction would be crushed and reused onsite as backfill or roadway material where appropriate.

Goal 5: Alternative Energy. Encourage the use of alternative energy for environmental and economic benefits, and encourage opportunities for businesses that develop or market alternative energy technologies.

Consistent. The County's Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) provides a permit path for wind energy projects, which establishes permit procedures and development standards for such projects. The Project is a wind energy project, which is considered an alternative energy source for producing electricity from a renewable source.

Policy 5.1: Environmental Analysis. In the consideration of alternative energy, the County shall consider the full life-cycle environmental effects and embedded energy requirements to provide such alternative energy. The County shall encourage the use of those alternatives determined to present sufficient environmental benefits.

Consistent. Although a full life-cycle analysis has not been done for this specific project, studies for other wind energy projects show that wind projects have a high net energy payback and low greenhouse gas emissions compared to other energy sources.

Land Use Element

Fundamental Goals:

Agriculture. In the rural areas, cultivated agriculture shall be preserved and, where conditions allow, expansion and intensification should be supported. Lands with both prime and non-prime soils shall be reserved for agricultural uses.

Consistent. The Project is located in a rural area used primarily for cattle grazing, although a limited amount of dryland farming occurs immediately on either side of San Miguelito Road between the Scolari and North properties. See discussion under the Policies and Goals of the Agricultural Element. The Project would not interfere with cultivated agriculture.

Land Use Development Policies

Policy 4. Prior to issuance of a development permit, the County shall make the finding, based on information provided by environmental documents, staff analysis, and the applicant, that adequate public or private services and resources (i.e., water, sewer, roads, etc.) are available to serve the proposed development. The applicant shall assume full responsibility for costs incurred in service extensions or improvements that are required as a result of the proposed project. Lack of available public or private services or resources shall be grounds for denial of the project or reduction in the density otherwise indicated in the land use plan.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Adequate services and resources would be available for construction and operation of the Project (see Section 4.18.4). Although water for construction (including the concrete batch plant and dust control) could be supplied by either new on-site well(s) and/or the City of Lompoc, utilizing well water during construction could cause a significant adverse impact to the water level in adjacent wells (see analysis in SEIR Section 4.12.4). Compliance with MM WAT-3 (Construction Water Source) would avoid this impact by requiring that construction water be obtained from sources other than onsite wells. The City of Lompoc has issued a “Can and Will Serve” letter for provision of up to 20,000 gallons per day of recycled water for the Project. On-site wells would be used for O&M facility operations which would require less than 250 gallons per day. This daily volume would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

Effluent from the O&M drains would be disposed of through a leach line system to be installed near the O&M facility and would not require treatment by the regional wastewater treatment plant.

The Project substation, the transmission line, and the switchyard would be constructed and maintained by the Applicant. In addition, the Applicant would enter into an encroachment permit and road use agreement with Santa Barbara County Public Works Department to ensure that any damage to San Miguelito Road and other County roadways attributable to Project construction traffic is mitigated through repair or restoration to original condition.

Construction debris would be recycled to the extent feasible, and landfill impacts would be less than significant, with required mitigation (see Section 4.18.4).

Access roads would be constructed as part of the Project to provide access to the Project site and transmission line, but to no other locations.

Storm drainage facilities would not be required other than those included as part of the Project and would serve no other projects.

The Applicant would be responsible for providing electricity for the SWEP. Power lines are already present in the Project area, and adequate power is available.

Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies

Policy 1. Plans for development shall minimize cut and fill operations. Plans requiring excessive cutting and filling may be denied if it is determined that the development could be carried out with less alteration of the natural terrain.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Due to the site topography and Project design, many of the WTGs and roads would require locations on steep slopes. Upon completion of construction, access roads would be retained at their width of 22-40 feet; cut and fill areas would be revegetated. The Project would include cut and fill operations only as required to construct Project components. Mitigation measures in Sections 4.2, *Aesthetics/Visual*, and 4.9, *Geology/Soils*, would minimize impacts from cut and fill to less-than-significant levels.

Policy 2. All developments shall be designed to fit the site topography, soils, geology, hydrology, and any other existing conditions and be oriented so that grading and other site preparation is kept to an absolute minimum. Natural features, landforms, and native vegetation, such as trees, shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Areas of the site which are not suited to development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards shall remain in open space.

Inconsistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project would include measures to minimize geologic impacts as discussed in Section 4.9, *Geology and Soils*. See discussion under Policy 1 and Policy 3, Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies. As discussed in the Oak Tree Protection Supplement of the Conservation Element, the proposed Project is inconsistent with maximum feasible preservation of trees, because a feasible Project alternative would result in substantially less impacts to oak trees. This SEIR includes a Project alternative (*Modified Project Layout, Including Elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8*), which would substantially reduce the number of oak trees removed for access roads and WTG sites. Given that this alternative layout is considered feasible and would substantially reduce impacts to oak trees, the proposed Project (as described in the Project Description) cannot be found consistent with this policy.

Policy 3. For necessary grading operations on hillsides, the smallest practical area of land shall be exposed at any one time during development and the length of exposure shall be kept to the shortest practicable amount of time. The clearing of land should be avoided during the winter rainy season and all measures for removing sediments and stabilizing slopes should be in place before the beginning of the rainy season.

Consistent. The Project would include mitigation measures limiting grading to the dry season, to the extent practicable; and if grading needed to be done outside of the dry season, the Applicant would coordinate grading work with the County and follow all applicable guidelines, including implementing erosion control measures to control runoff and erosion in the event that revegetation was not completed prior to the rainy season. The Project would also include mitigation measures to minimize the size of the disturbed area associated with grading and construction and would require the stockpiling of all excavated soils and protecting them from wind and water erosion. See discussion under Policy 5, Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies.

Policy 4. Sediment basins (including debris basins, desilting basins, or silt traps) shall be installed on the project site in conjunction with the initial grading operations and maintained through the development process to remove sediment from runoff waters. All sediment shall be retained on site unless removed to an appropriate dumping location.

Consistent. The Project would include the implementation of mitigation measures to minimize runoff and erosion including implementing Best Management Practices (BMPs); submitting a final Grading and Drainage Plan; using diversion structures and spot grading to reduce siltation into adjacent streams/drainages during grading and construction activities;

and ensuring that wetland areas within 50 feet of ground disturbance would be protected from siltation by imposition of silt fence, straw bales (composed of certified weed free straw), or other barriers placed prior to ground disturbance. Moreover, Project construction would be done in accordance with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

Policy 5. Temporary vegetation, seeding, mulching, or other suitable stabilization method shall be used to protect soils subject to erosion that have been disturbed during grading or development. All cut and fill slopes shall be stabilized as rapidly as possible with planting of native grasses and shrubs, appropriate non-native plants, or with accepted landscaping practices.

Consistent. The Project would include mitigation measures to minimize impacts to soils including stabilizing any disturbed area that would not be covered with base or paving within 14 days after completion of disturbing activities by use of soil coating mulch, dust palliatives, compaction, reseeding, or other approved methods; reseeding all temporarily disturbed areas with an appropriate mix of native plant species as soon as possible after construction is completed to accelerate the revegetation of these areas; and reseeding all exposed graded surfaces with native ground cover to minimize erosion within 60 days of the completion of grading.

Policy 6. *[New Analysis]* Provisions shall be made to conduct surface water to storm drains or suitable watercourses to prevent erosion. Drainage devices shall be designed to accommodate increased runoff resulting from modified soil and surface conditions as a result of development. Water runoff shall be retained onsite whenever possible to facilitate groundwater recharge.

Consistent. Drainage structures, including water bars, berms, V-ditches and culverts would be installed to direct drainage and prevent erosion. Construction work would be performed under an approved Grading and Drainage Plan and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

Policy 7. Degradation of the water quality of groundwater basins, nearby streams, or wetlands shall not result from development of the site. Pollutants, such as chemicals, fuels, lubricants, raw sewage, and other harmful waste, shall not be discharged into or alongside coastal streams or wetlands either during or after construction.

Consistent. See consistency discussion under the Land Use Element's Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies 4, 5 and 6. In addition, the Project would include mitigation measures to protect creeks, seeps, springs, wetlands, and other sensitive areas from fuel spills, hazardous materials, runoff from concrete, and trash and litter.

Streams and Creeks Policies

Policy 1. All permitted construction and grading within stream corridors shall be carried out in such a manner as to minimize impacts from increased runoff, sedimentation, biochemical degradation, or thermal pollution.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* As discussed in the Project Description, Table 2-6 (Summary of Road Crossings and Culvert Sizes), the Project may include up to 8 watercourse crossings involving improvements or upgrades to access roads or culverts. Implementation of BMPs, Grading and Drainage Plan, and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and compliance with mitigation measures (including MMs BIO-3, BIO-10, and WAT-1) would minimize impacts. The Applicant would coordinate with the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District regarding plan approval for stream crossings, as well as comply with possible CDFW requirements for a Streambed Alteration Agreement.

Historical and Archaeological Sites Policies

Policy 2. When developments are proposed for parcels where archaeological or other cultural sites are located, project design shall be required which avoids impacts to such cultural sites if possible.

Policy 3. When sufficient planning flexibility does not permit avoiding construction on archaeological or other types of cultural sites, adequate mitigation shall be required. Mitigation shall be designed in accord with guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State of California Native

Policy 4. *[New Analysis]* Off-road vehicle use, unauthorized collection of artifacts, and other activities other than development which could destroy or damage archaeological or cultural sites shall be prohibited.

Consistent. Presence of SWEP operational personnel on site and Project security measures will reduce unauthorized activities. MMs ~~CULT-4, CULT-5, and CULT-9~~ CULT-6 through CULT-9, will deter authorized artifact collection.

Policy 5. Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted which impact significant archaeological or cultural sites.

Consistent. Project includes mitigation measures to protect and avoid cultural resources (see Section 4.6.4). The Native American Heritage Commission has also been consulted. See discussion under the Archaeological Sites Conclusions and Recommendations of the Conservation Element above.

Other Open Lands Policies

Policy 1. Preservation of open lands shall be encouraged under the Williamson Act.

Consistent. See discussion under the Agricultural Element's Policies I.A and I.D, above.

Policy 2. Utilization of open lands shall be consistent with protection and long-term productivity of County watersheds.

Consistent. See discussion of the Land Use Element's Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies 1 through 7, above.

Visual Resources Policies

Policy 1. All commercial, industrial, and planned developments shall be required to submit a landscaping plan to the County for approval.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* A site restoration and revegetation plan will be implemented (MM BIO-3). The plan includes reseeding of disturbed with suitable native vegetation. The Project substation and switchyard footprints would be surfaced with gravel, as required for safety. The O&M facility area would be landscaped with a Hollister Seed mix approved by the County Central Board of Architectural Review (CBAR).

Policy 2. In areas designated as rural on the land use plan maps, the height, scale, and design of structures shall be compatible with the character of the surrounding natural environment, except where technical requirements dictate otherwise. Structures shall be subordinate in appearance to natural landforms; shall be designed to follow the natural contours of the landscape; and shall be sited so as not to intrude into the skyline as seen from public viewing places.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The WTGs and power poles associated with the Project would be visible from public viewing places and would result in potentially significant impacts to views from Jalama Beach, San Miguelito Road, a residential area in southern Lompoc, and in the immediate Project vicinity (see Section 4.2.4.4). Mitigation measures would reduce some visual impacts to less-than-significant levels, but several significant and unavoidable impacts would still occur, including views from Jalama Beach, views in the immediate Project vicinity, and views of the transmission line from certain locations in south Lompoc and along portions of San Miguelito Road. In addition, FAA-required obstruction lighting of the WTGs would be visible from the Lompoc Valley and Jalama Beach at night, resulting in significant and unavoidable visual impacts.

The Project would be consistent with this policy because the height, scale, location and design of the WTGs and power poles are dictated by technical requirements, and impacts would be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible.

Policy 5. Utilities, including television, shall be placed underground in new developments in accordance with the rules and regulations of the California Public Utilities Commission, except where cost of undergrounding would be so high as to deny service.

Consistent. *[New Analysis]* The proposed 115-kV transmission line would be constructed aboveground, consistent with accepted industry standards, protective measures, and established industry guidelines. Undergrounding of portions of the transmission line was considered in possible project alternatives in the LWEF EIR, but was discarded as infeasible due to technical difficulties associated with steep slopes, as impacts to biological, geological, and cultural resources, and high costs. Each string of WTGs would be interconnected via 34.5-kV, electrically insulated, collector cables and communication cables. These cables would be installed underground, except for one 0.3-mile segment that would span a steep canyon, where undergrounding would cause adverse impacts. Also, a collector line would be underbuilt on the same poles as the transmission line in a 0.5-mile stretch near the Project substation.

Land Use Element Area/Community Goals Applicable to the Lompoc Area

Land Use: The natural backdrop of the area should be preserved through strict controls on hillside development. Hillside grading over 30 percent on residential and commercial land should be severely restricted.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project was sited strategically to minimize its visibility from the surrounding area. However, it would result in potentially significant visual impacts, some of which would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Significant and unavoidable visual impacts include adverse effects on views from Jalama Beach and the immediate Project vicinity, views of the transmission line from certain locations in south Lompoc and along portions of San Miguelito Road, and the visibility of FAA-required obstruction lighting. The location of WTGs and power poles on or near steep slopes is necessitated by technical requirements (see discussions under Land Use Element: Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies and Visual Resources Policies, above).

The unique character of the area should be protected and enhanced with particular emphasis on protection of agricultural lands, grazing lands, and natural amenities.

Consistent. See discussion under the policies and goals of the Agricultural Element.

Commercial and industrial development that complements and expands the existing agricultural industry of the area should be encouraged.

Consistent. See discussion under Goal I of the Agricultural Element.

Prime agricultural lands should be preserved for agricultural use only. Preservation of lesser grades of presently producing or potential agricultural land should be actively encouraged.

Consistent. See discussion under the policies and goals of the Agricultural Element.

Encouragement should be given to the preservation of significant archeological resources and sites reflecting the County's Indian, Mexican, Spanish, and Early California cultural historical heritage now in both public and private ownerships.

Consistent. See discussion under the Historical and Archeological Sites Policies of the Land Use Element and the Archaeological Sites Conclusions and Recommendations of the Conservation Element, above.

Changes in natural or re-established topography, vegetation, biological communities should be minimized in an attempt to avoid the destruction of natural habitats.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Due to the nature of the Project and technical feasibility issues, some Project components would be located in steep areas. The Project would not include more access roads than necessary. Project design and required mitigation measures (grading and erosion control plan, SWPPP, revegetation, and others) would minimize impacts to land, streams, and biology. The Project would result in significant impacts to vegetation and wildlife, but mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce impacts to these biological resources to the maximum extent feasible. For example, impacts to avian and bat species resulting from collisions with WTGs are expected to be significant and unavoidable, but the implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.5.4.2 would reduce these impacts to the maximum extent feasible; although individual birds and bats may be killed, the overall populations of the affected species would not be eliminated. The Project also would support continued use of the property for agriculture and could reduce pressure for residential expansion into the area.

Development, construction, and roads cut in steep areas should be limited to ensure safety and protection of the terrain, as well as environmental and scenic values.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Due to the nature of the Project and technical feasibility issues, some Project components would be located in steep areas. The Project would not include more access roads than necessary. Project design and required mitigation measures (grading and erosion control plan, SWPPP, revegetation, and others) would minimize impacts to land, streams, and biology. Scenic values would be protected to a great extent by the Project siting at the end of a dead-end country road; the site would be surrounded on two sides by undeveloped portions of VAFB and views from the surrounding area would be screened by intervening topography. Although the Project was sited strategically to minimize its visibility from the surrounding area, it would result in potentially significant visual impacts, some of which would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Adverse impacts on views from Jalama Beach and the immediate Project vicinity, views of the transmission line from certain locations in south Lompoc and along portions of San Miguelito Road, and impacts from FAA-required obstruction lighting would be significant and unavoidable. The location of

WTGs and power poles on or near steep slopes is necessitated by technical requirements (see discussions under Land Use Element: Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies and Visual Resources Policies, above). The Project also would support continued use of the property for agriculture and reduce pressure for residential expansion into the area.

Circulation. Improvements to or alterations of existing roadways must minimize environmental and visual impact.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project would include new access roads and the widening of existing roads on private property at the SWEP site and several locations along the transmission line route. The road improvements would be consistent with other agricultural roads in the Project area. All grading would be subject to a final, approved grading and erosion control plan to minimize erosion and ensure adequate slope stabilization. Cut and fill areas would be revegetated following the roadwork. All identified potentially significant impacts due to access road construction would be mitigated to the greatest extent feasible. Grading and removal of trees at certain tight curves along San Miguelito Road would be required to enable transport of large WTG blades to the Project site. Loss of oak trees at the project site, along the transmission line route, and along San Miguelito Road would be a significant and unavoidable impact; this is the only significant and unavoidable impact identified for Project road construction or alterations. The impact would be minimized with implementation of a Tree Protection Plan, a Tree Replacement Plan, and other measures described in Section 4.5.4.2. The visual impacts of tree removal along San Miguelito Road are considered significant and unavoidable (see Section 4.2.4).

Environment:

The County should plan for and encourage the maximum conservation of energy.

Consistent. See discussion under the Goals and Policies of the Energy Element.

Pollution of streams, sloughs, drainage channels, underground water basins, estuaries, the ocean, and areas adjacent to such waters should be minimized.

Consistent. See discussion under the Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies and Streams and Creeks Policies of the Land Use Element above.

Good air quality should be maintained as one of our greatest assets.

Consistent. The Project would include mitigation measures to minimize air quality impacts during construction. During operations, the Project would benefit air quality by increasing the amount of power generated by renewable sources.

Noise Element

1) Conclusions and Recommendations. In the planning of land use, 65 dB Day-Night Average Sound Level should be regarded as the maximum exterior noise exposure compatible with noise-sensitive uses unless noise mitigation features are included in project designs.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Temporary construction noise would not exceed 65 dBA (DN) at residences not participating in the project and would exceed that threshold at only one participating property. Implementation of required mitigation measures would minimize temporary exceedances. Noise from WTG operation would be less than 50 dB (DN) at non-participating properties and less than 60 dB (DN) at participating properties. Implementation

of required mitigation measures would ensure operational noise thresholds are not exceeded. (See Section 4.14.4.)

Open Space Element

The Open Space Element identifies four factors for designating land in open space and includes:

- Open Space for Public Health and Safety (e.g., fire hazard areas, steep slopes);
- Open Space for Managed Production of Resources (such as grazing lands, agricultural lands and mineral resources);
- Open Space for Outdoor Recreation;
- Open Space for the Preservation of Natural Resources (e.g. scenic areas, rare and endangered plant and wildlife communities).

Project areas include all of these designations. The purpose of the Open Space Design Concept (discussed in the Element) is to delineate lands that have the potential for open space preservation to serve one or more of the purposes prescribed in the State Planning Law (i.e., the four factors identified above). In areas with slopes 20 to 30 percent or greater, limited or no development is recommended (this includes Project areas).

Consistent. Due to the nature of the Project and technical feasibility issues, some Project components would be located in an open space area and on steep slopes. The Project would include measures to ensure adequate slope stabilization and would increase fire protection and other environmental protection measures. In addition, mitigation measures are included to minimize visual, fire, and other environmental impacts. The Project would have minimal impacts on mineral or recreational resources. See also the discussion under the Agricultural Element goals and policies as well as the Conservation and Land Use Element discussions above.

Scenic Highways Element

Goal A. To enhance and preserve the valuable scenic resources located along roadways within the County.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Highway 1 is a designated Scenic Highway south of the southern city limit of Lompoc. WTGs would be glimpsed in the distance from some vantage points for northbound travelers on Highway 1, but the impacts would not be significant. An existing 115-kV PG&E transmission line runs along the east side of Highway 1 in Lompoc and crosses over to the east side of the highway near the southern Lompoc city limit. From there it travels westward between a hill and a Lompoc neighborhood to the Project switchyard. The 0.6-mile section of the transmission line between the PG&E substation in Lompoc and the Project switchyard would be reconductored by PG&E to accommodate the power generated by the Project. The reconductoring will not result in a significant impact to the Scenic Highway. See Section 4.2.2 for a detailed discussion of Scenic Highway policies.

Goal C. To help maintain the economic contribution of tourism to the County.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project would not negatively affect tourism in the County, as visual impacts to Scenic Highways would be relatively minor (see Goal A, above).

Seismic Safety and Safety Element

Section V of the Seismic Safety and Safety Element includes Land Use Planning Objectives that are designed to provide for appropriate planning in areas with identified varying degrees of geologic, soil and seismic problems in order to minimize or avoid associated hazards resulting from development. Section V of the Element also includes a discussion of the importance of the Grading and Building Codes and the importance of obtaining a detailed geologic and soil investigation for sites under consideration for development.

Consistent. The Project would include mitigation measures to minimize geologic impacts and would comply with all grading and Building Code requirements. The facilities would be designed and built to Uniform Building Code Seismic Zone 4 standards.

With regard to fire hazards, Section VI of the Seismic Safety and Safety Element provides Control Measures designed to reduce fire hazards within the County and identifies that short of prohibiting all land development in areas of extreme fire hazard, the most reasonable solution is to require that all development proposals be accompanied by a plan showing the measures that will be taken to meet County regulations to minimize fire hazard and should address access to the site, water supply, buffer strips and firebreaks around structures, and a contingency plan covering human activities during periods of critical fire weather.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project would include measures to minimize fire risk, including onsite storage of water for firefighting, improving site access, requiring vegetation clearances, and complying with all Fire Department requirements such as the submittal of a fire protection plan, and participation in the Red Flag Warning program with local fire agencies and the National Weather Service.

Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME)

The ERME identifies environmental factors in areas mapped with slopes 30 percent and greater. Although steep slopes are not always hazardous in themselves, landslides, erosion and other geologic hazards are prevalent in these areas. Even if landslide and slope stability problems are solved by engineering design, other problems can ensue, resulting in damage to a project site itself, as well as to sites at lower elevations. In addition, scarring of the terrain due to grading is discussed. The ERME states that development on lands with “Slopes 20 to 30 Percent” should also be minimized because they are often subject to geologic problems, comprise portions of watersheds, or form the scenic backdrop of urban communities.

Consistent. Due to the nature of the Project and technical feasibility issues, some Project components would be located in steep areas. However, the Project would include mitigation measures to minimize geologic impacts and would comply with all Grading and Building Code requirements. The Project would also include measures to ensure adequate slope stabilization.

4.13.5.2 Santa Barbara County Coastal Land Use Plan *[New Analysis]*

The Project has been designed to avoid impacts to the Coastal Zone to the extent feasible, without causing excessive or incommensurate impacts in the inland zone. The only work within the Coastal Zone would involve grading to widen access roads and build short segments of new roads for transport of WTG blades and other large loads. The roads would be surfaced with gravel, not paved.

The grading would disturb approximately 6.6 acres, including areas of Critical Habitat and oak woodland. Part of this area would be only temporarily impacted. Following construction, the roads would remain the new width of 22-40 feet and the areas of cut and fill would be revegetated. No WTGs foundations or other structures would extend into the Coastal Zone, and no WTG blades would overhang the Coastal Zone Boundary. The roadwork would not be visible from public viewing areas.

Because Project construction within the Coastal Zone is limited to construction and widening of access roads, the following policy consistency analysis is limited to issues relevant to those roads.

Hillside and Watershed Protection

Policy 3-13. Plans for development shall minimize cut and fill operations. Plans requiring excessive cutting and filling may be denied if it is determined that the development could be carried out with less alteration of the natural terrain.

Consistent. The Project preliminary grading plans have been revised and refined to minimize grading and disturbance. The Applicant would be required to implement MM GEO-2 (Grading and Drainage Plan) to minimize grading impacts.

Policy 3-14. All development shall be designed to fit the site topography, soils, geology, hydrology, and any other existing conditions and be oriented so that grading and other site preparation is kept to an absolute minimum. Natural features, landforms, and native vegetation, such as trees, shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Areas of the site which are not suited for development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards shall remain in open space.

Inconsistent. *[New Analysis]* The road work is designed to follow existing access roads, as much as possible, rather than building new roads. Hence, the roads would conform to site topography and minimize grading and disturbance. In addition to the *Grading and Drainage Plan*, additional mitigation measures would be required to minimize ground disturbance and hydrological and biological impacts (see Section 4.5.4 and 4.12.4.). However, as discussed above, the proposed Project is inconsistent with maximum feasible preservation of trees. This SEIR includes a Project alternative (*Modified Project Layout, Including Elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8*), which would substantially reduce the number of oak trees removed for access roads and WTG sites. Given that this alternative layout is considered feasible and would substantially reduce impacts to oak trees, the proposed Project (as described in the Project Description) cannot be found consistent with this policy.

Policy 3-15. For necessary grading operations on hillsides, the smallest practical area of land shall be exposed at any one time during development, and the length of exposure shall be kept to the shortest practicable amount of time. The clearing of land should be avoided during the winter rainy season and all measures for removing sediments and stabilizing slopes should be in place before the beginning of the rainy season.

Consistent. The Applicant would be required to implement MM GEO-2 (Grading and Drainage Plan), which would limit grading to the dry season to the extent practicable. If construction were to occur during the rainy season, MM GEO-2 requires the Applicant to coordinate this grading work with the County. All work would be conducted in accordance with the Erosion Control Plan and SWPPP.

Policy 3-17. Temporary vegetation, seeding, mulching, or other suitable stabilization method shall be used to protect soils subject to erosion that have been disturbed during grading or development. All

cut and fill slopes shall be stabilized immediately with planting of native grasses and shrubs, appropriate nonnative plants, or with accepted landscaping practices.

Consistent. The Applicant would minimize impacts to soils through implementation of MM GEO-2 (Grading and Drainage Plan) and an Erosion Control Plan. Areas of temporary disturbance would be revegetated to a natural state with an approved seed mix.

Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas

Policy 9-1. Prior to the issuance of a development permit, all projects on parcels shown on the land use plan and/or resource maps with a Habitat Area overlay designation or within 250 feet of such designation or projects affecting an environmentally sensitive habitat area shall be found to be in conformity with the applicable habitat protection policies of the land use plan. All development plans, grading plans, etc., shall show the precise location of the habitat(s) potentially affected by the proposed project. Projects which could adversely impact an environmentally sensitive habitat area may be subject to a site inspection by a qualified biologist to be selected jointly by the County and the applicant.

Consistent. Several biological resource surveys have been conducted at the Project site over a span of 15 years by qualified biologists. Final Project plans will show sensitive habitats. Pre-construction surveys and construction monitoring will minimize impacts to sensitive species and habitats. Potential impacts and associated mitigation measures are described in Section 4.5.4.2.

Policy 9-35. Oak trees, because they are particularly sensitive to environmental conditions, shall be protected. All land use activities, including cultivated agriculture and grazing, should be carried out in such a manner as to avoid damage to native oak trees. Regeneration of oak trees on grazing lands should be encouraged.

Inconsistent. *[New Analysis]* The preliminary grading plans for the Project have been revised and refined to minimize grading and, specifically, to minimize impacts to oak woodlands to the greatest extent feasible. However, an estimated 81 trees, including 24 coast live oak trees, would be lost in the Coastal Zone as a result of access road construction. Implementation of several required mitigation measures will help minimize losses (e.g., MMs BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-4a, BIO-4c, BIO-11c, BIO-11d). MM BIO-4b (Tree Replacement Plan) would ensure that the lost oak trees be replaced at a 6:1 replacement ratio. This SEIR includes a Project alternative (*Modified Project Layout, Including Elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8*), which would substantially reduce the number of oak trees removed for access roads and WTG sites. Given that this alternative layout is considered feasible and would substantially reduce impacts to oak trees, the proposed Project (as described in the Project Description) cannot be found consistent with this policy.

Policy 9-36. When sites are graded or developed, areas with significant amounts of native vegetation shall be preserved. All development shall be sited, designed, and constructed to minimize impacts of grading, paving, construction of roads or structures, runoff, and erosion on native vegetation. In particular, grading and paving shall not adversely affect root zone aeration and stability of native trees.

Consistent. See consistency discussion in the Coastal Land Use Plan's Policies 9-1 and 9-35, above.

Archaeological and Historical Resources

Policy 10-2. When developments are proposed for parcels where archaeological or other cultural sites are located, project design shall be required which avoids impacts to such cultural sites if possible.

Consistent. SWEP cultural surveys identified three cultural resource sites within the Coastal Zone. Implementation of required MMs ~~CULT-1 to CULT-6~~ through CULT-10 would prevent any impacts to archaeological and historical resources resulting from access road construction.

Policy 10-3. When sufficient planning flexibility does not permit avoiding construction on archaeological or other types of cultural sites, adequate mitigation shall be required. Mitigation shall be designed in accord with guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State of California Native American Heritage Commission.

Consistent. If cultural sites were located near the construction zone, impacts would be mitigated by Avoidance, ~~Phase 2 Subsurface Testing~~ or Phase 3 Excavation, or Site Capping. (See MMs ~~CULT-1, CULT-6,~~ and CULT-9.)

Policy 10-4. Off-road vehicle use, unauthorized collecting of artifacts, and other activities other than development which could destroy or damage archaeological or cultural sites shall be prohibited.

Consistent. Presence of SWEP operational personnel onsite and Project security measures will reduce unauthorized activities. MMs ~~CULT-4, CULT-5, and CULT-6~~ through CULT-9 will deter authorized artifact collection.

Policy 10-5. Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted which impact significant archaeological or cultural sites.

Consistent. The NAHC and local Native American tribes have been consulted regarding this Project. MM ~~CULT-4~~ CULT-10 requires that all ground disturbances be monitored by a Native American monitor.

Air Quality

Policy 11-1. The provisions of the Air Quality Attainment Plan shall apply to the coastal zone.

Consistent. The Project would comply with Attainment Plan emission control measures, as discussed in SEIR Section 4.4.

4.13.5.3 Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code

Chapter 35.30.090- Height Measurement, Exception and Limitations

Describes height limits and exceptions to those limits. The section indicates that certain structures that are not used for human activity may be up to 50 feet in height. The section includes exemptions for specific structures and equipment and states that in the inland area, WTGs allowed in compliance with Chapter 35.57 may exceed applicable height limits where compliance would render operations technically infeasible.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Wind turbines in the inland area of the County allowed under Section 35.57 may exceed height limits if compliance is technically infeasible (Sec. 35.30.090.E.3.d). Refer also to the discussion under Chapter 35.57 below.

Chapter 35.57 Wind Energy Conversion Systems

35.57.050-Development Standards

Wind energy conversion systems shall be in compliance with the following standards:

A. Setbacks. Wind turbines shall comply with all setback requirements of the applicable zone.

Consistent. The Project complies with setback requirements for the AG-II-100 zone district for all portions of the WTG area adjacent to private property; for example, buildings would be set back at least 50 feet from the centerline and 20 feet from the right-of-way of any street. See also G. *Horizontal Access Wind Turbine Setbacks*, below.

B. Access Control. Towers shall be constructed to provide one of the following means of access control, or other appropriate method of access control:

- Tower-climbing apparatus located no closer than 12 feet from the ground.
- A locked anti-climb device installed on the tower.
- A locked, protective fence at least six feet in height that encloses the tower.

Consistent. Towers would be accessed for service via a door at the base of each tower. It is expected that the door would remain locked at all times. Due to the remote nature of this Project and the limited number of people present in the area, a locked door would be considered to meet these requirements.

C. Tower structures. Wind energy system tower structures shall be designed and constructed to be in compliance with pertinent provisions of the Uniform Building Code and National Electric Code.

Consistent. The tower structures would be designed and constructed in compliance with the pertinent provisions of these codes.

D. Over-speed controls. Wind energy systems shall be equipped with manual and automatic over-speed controls. The conformance of rotor and over-speed control design and fabrication with good engineering practices shall be certified by the manufacture.

Consistent. The wind energy systems would be equipped with the appropriate speed controls, certified by the manufacturer to comply with good engineering practices.

E. Height: Minimum height. To prevent harmful wind turbulence from existing structures, the minimum height of the lowest part of any horizontal axis wind turbine blade shall be at least 30 feet above the highest structure or tree within a 250-foot radius. Modification of this standard by the review authority may be allowed when the applicant demonstrates that a lower height will not jeopardize the safety of the wind turbine structure.

Consistent. All WTGs would be located away from structures or trees.

F. Guy wires. Anchor points for any guy wires for a system tower shall be located within the property that the system is located on and not on or across any above-ground electric transmission or distribution lines. The point of attachment for the guy wires shall be enclosed by a fence six feet high or sheathed in bright orange or yellow covering from three to eight feet above the ground.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Guy wires are not proposed for the WTGs. One meteorological tower with guy wires is proposed for the Project (Section 2.5.8). However, guyed

meteorological towers are prohibited under MM BIO-15b(c) due to potentially significant impacts to avian and bat collisions.

G. Horizontal axis wind turbines. Horizontal axis wind turbines shall be placed at a distance of at least two times the total tower height from any occupied structure. Additionally, the base of the tower shall be setback from all property lines a minimum distance equal to the height of the system, including the wind turbine, provided that it also complies with any applicable fire setback requirements in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 4290.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project complies with setback requirements for all portions of the WTG area adjacent to private property. The Applicant has requested variances to reduce the setback to 230 feet (slightly greater than one WTG blade length) along the VAFB property line and to remove the requirement for setbacks between Project-participant properties. If the variances are approved pursuant to LUDC Section 35.82.200, the decision to approve would ensure consistency with this development standard.

I. Electromagnetic interference. The system shall be operated so that no electromagnetic interference is caused. If it is demonstrated that a system is causing harmful interference, the system operator shall promptly mitigate the harmful interference or cease operation of the system.

Consistent. Proximity to VAFB communication facilities was addressed during Project development in consultation with VAFB. No electromagnetic interference is identified with Project design.

J. Color and non-reflective surfaces. The system's tower and blades shall be painted a non-reflective, unobtrusive color that blends the system and its components into the surrounding landscape to the greatest extent possible and incorporate non-reflective surfaces to minimize any visual disruption.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The standard color and finish of commercial WTGs, as established by FAA regulations, complies with this development standard.

K. Visual impact. The system shall be designed and located in such a manner to minimize adverse visual impacts from public viewing areas (e.g., public parks, roads, trails). To the greatest extent feasible, the wind energy system:

- Shall not project above the top of ridgelines.
- If visible from public viewing areas, shall use natural landforms and existing vegetation for screening.
- Shall not cause a significantly adverse visual impact to a scenic vista from a County or State designated scenic corridor.
- Shall be screened to the maximum extent feasible by natural vegetation or other means to minimize potentially significant adverse visual impacts on neighboring residential areas.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The relatively remote location of the Project site and intervening topography provide limited screening of the WTGs from many public viewing locations. The wind resource distribution along the coastal ridges at the Project site dictates the locations of WTGs, making it infeasible to use visual screening to mitigate the visual impacts. The WTGs in the westernmost array would create significant and unavoidable impacts to viewers at Jalama Beach County Park. However, the non-reflective, neutral gray finish of the WTGs would minimize contrast with the sky, and obstruction lighting would be

kept to the minimum required by the FAA. In addition, the Applicant will make a one-time \$100,000 payment to the County, to be used by the County Parks Department exclusively to preserve and enhance the natural beauty of Jalama Beach County Park (MM VIS-3).

L. Exterior lighting. Exterior lighting on any structure associated with the system shall not be allowed except that which is specifically required by the Federal Aviation Administration.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* As this standard applies to WTGs, lighting would be installed in conformance with FAA requirements. A landscape and lighting plan would be required for other project facilities, and would be reviewed and approved by the CBAR.

M. Underground electrical wires. Onsite electrical wires associated with the system shall be installed underground except for "tie-ins" to a public utility company and public utility company transmission poles, towers and lines. This standard may be modified by the review authority if the project terrain is determined to be unsuitable due to reasons of excessive grading, biological impacts, or similar factors.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* The Project proposes to underground all communication cables/internal power lines, except in those cases where placing the lines aboveground would minimize environmental impacts. The proposed 115-kV transmission line would be constructed aboveground, consistent with accepted industry standards, protective measures, and established industry guidelines. Undergrounding of portions of the transmission line was considered in possible project alternatives in the LWEF EIR, but was discarded as infeasible due to technical difficulties associated with steep slopes, as impacts to biological, geological, and cultural resources, and high costs.

N. Signage. At least one sign shall be posted on the tower at a height of five feet warning of electrical shock or high voltage and harm from revolving machinery. No brand names, logo or advertising shall be placed or painted on the tower, rotor, generator or tail vane where it would be visible from the ground, except that a system or tower's manufacturer's logo may be displayed on a system generator housing in an unobtrusive manner.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Safety signage would be posted where necessary around WTGs, transformers, and other high-voltage facilities, and along roads, in conformance with applicable State and Federal regulations. Commercial signage, if any, would be reviewed and approved by the CBAR.

O. Access roads. Construction of onsite access roadways shall be minimized. Temporary access roads utilized for initial installation shall be re-graded and re-vegetated to the pre-existing natural condition after completion of installation.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Access roads would follow existing roads to the extent feasible. Construction would involve widening existing roads, and construction of new roads would be minimized. Areas along the access roads disturbed by construction would be restored and revegetated. The access roads would be permanent, not temporary, and would not be narrowed to their original widths after construction. This would allow transport of cranes and large replacement parts (including WTG blades) during operations without disturbing newly renovated areas along access roads.

Chapter 35.62: Ridgeline and Hillside Development

35.62.040- Ridgeline and Hillside Development Guidelines

This section is intended to provide “visual protection of the County’s ridgelines and hillsides by requiring that the Board of Architectural Review evaluate each proposed structure within [certain] areas... in terms of the [development] guidelines” and “encourage architectural designs and landscaping that conforms to the natural topography on hillsides and ridgelines.” The guidelines apply to each structure proposed where there is a 16-foot drop in elevation within 100 feet in any direction from the proposed building footprint. The Board of Architectural Review may exempt a new structure or an alteration to an existing structure from review provided that in their review of the structure they find that one or more of the following situations applies to the proposed development:

b. In certain circumstances, allowing greater flexibility in the guidelines will better serve the interests of good design, without negatively affecting neighborhood compatibility or the surrounding viewshed.

Consistent. *[Revised Analysis]* Due to the nature of the Project and technical feasibility issues, some Project components would be located in steep areas and near ridgelines. The Project was sited strategically to minimize its visibility from the surrounding area. Scenic values would be protected to a great extent by the Project siting at the end of a relatively remote, dead-end country road. The site would be surrounded on two sides by undeveloped portions of VAFB, and views from the surrounding area would be screened by intervening topography. However, the WTGs would cause significant and unavoidable visual impacts as viewed from Jalama Beach and in the immediate Project vicinity. Placement of WTGs would be avoided on steeper slopes, where possible, to minimize grading. The Project would not include more access roads than necessary. The Project will implement a Site Restoration and Revegetation Plan and a Landscape and Lighting Plan, which would minimize the visual impacts from Project construction; native and drought-resistant plants that are compatible with the climate would be used. The Project would support continued use of the property for agriculture and reduce pressure for residential expansion into the area, which would help preserve the area’s rural character.

4.13.5.4 Santa Barbara County Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance *[New Analysis]*

This analysis is limited to the portion of the project proposed to be located within the Coastal Zone, which would involve grading to widen access roads and to build short segments of new roads for transport of WTG blades and other large loads (see the introduction to Section 4.13.5.2 *Santa Barbara County Coastal Land Use Plan*, above).

Section 35-65. Archaeology.

1. When developments are proposed for lots where archaeological or other cultural sites are located, project design shall be required which avoids impacts to such cultural sites if possible.
2. When sufficient planning flexibility does not permit avoiding construction on archaeological or other types of cultural sites, adequate mitigation shall be required. Mitigation shall be designed

in accord with guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State of California Native American Heritage Commission.

3. Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted which impact significant archaeological or cultural sites.

Consistent. See discussion above under Conservation Element Archaeological Sites Conclusions and Recommendations.

35-97. ESH - Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Overlay District.

The Coastal Land Use Plan designates Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) within the County's Coastal Zone, which are defined by Section 30107.5 of the Coastal Act as "any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments." The proposed Project does not fall within any mapped ESHA. However, according to Section 3.9.4 of the Coastal Land Use Plan, native plant communities are considered a county-wide ESHA that "are not designated on the land use maps because they occur in so many areas," and as such, "the policies will have to be applied on a case-by-case basis as projects are reviewed." Native plant communities include coastal sage scrub, chaparral, California native oak woodland and individual oak trees, and endangered, rare, or endemic plant species.

ESH-related sections of the Coastal Zoning Ordinance that are relevant to the Project are as follows:

Section 35-97.10 Development Standards for Native Grassland Habitats.

2. Development shall be sited and designed to protect native grassland areas.

Consistent. See discussion on Section 35-97.18(2), below.

Section 35-97.18 Development Standards for Native Plant Community Habitats.

Examples of such native plant communities are: coastal sage scrub, chaparral, coastal bluff, closed cone pine forest, California native oak woodland (also individual oak trees), endangered and rare plant species as designated by the California Native Plant Society, and other plants of special interest such as endemics.

1. Oak trees, because they are particularly sensitive to environmental conditions, shall be protected. All land use activities, including cultivated agriculture and grazing, should be carried out in such a manner as to avoid damage to native oak trees. Regeneration of oak trees on grazing lands should be encouraged.

Inconsistent. *[New Analysis]* The proposed project would result in removal of approximately 81 trees in the coastal zone, of which 24 would be coast live oaks and the rest would be tanbark oaks. Although the Applicant has submitted revised grading plans to substantially reduce loss of oak trees, while preserving the proposed overall layout of the wind farm, the impacts would still be significant and unavoidable. The impacts would be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible by implementation of several mitigation measures, including a Tree Protection Plan and a Tree Replacement Plan (see Section 4.5.4.2).

This SEIR includes a Project alternative (*Modified Project Layout, Including Elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8*), which would substantially reduce the number of oak trees removed for

access roads and WTG sites. Given that this alternative layout is considered feasible and would substantially reduce impacts to oak trees, the proposed Project (as described in the Project Description) cannot be found consistent with this policy.

2. When sites are graded or developed, areas with significant amounts of native vegetation shall be preserved. All development shall be sited, designed, and constructed to minimize impacts of grading, paving, construction of roads or structures, runoff, and erosion on native vegetation. In particular, grading and paving shall not adversely affect root zone aeration and stability of native trees.

Consistent. As presented in Section 4.5.4.2 and supported by detailed vegetation and habitat mapping, grading in the Coastal Zone would result in impacts to native plant communities, habitats, and special status species located within or adjacent to the areas of disturbance. The grading plans have been revised by the Applicant to reduce grading to the minimum required to construct the necessary roads. Implementation of prescribed MMs BIO-1 to BIO-14 would reduce impacts on native vegetation communities, habitats, and special status species to the greatest extent feasible. The measures comprise a range of strategies to minimize impacts, including worker education, preconstruction surveys, biological monitoring, minimizing ground disturbance, fencing, tree protection, site restoration and revegetation, and specific plans to protect sensitive species.

Section 35-140. Tree Removal.

Section 35-140.1 Purpose and Intent.

The purpose of this section is to regulate the removal of certain trees within the Coastal Zone. The intent is to preserve healthy trees that are important for the protection of habitat areas and the scenic and visual quality of the County.

Section 35-140.2 Applicability.

A Coastal Development Permit under Section 35-169 shall be required for the removal of any tree which is six inches or more in diameter measured four feet above the ground and six feet or more in height and which is 1) located in a County street right-of-way; or 2) located within 50 feet of any major or minor stream except when such trees are removed for agricultural purposes; or 3) oak trees; or 4) used as a habitat by the Monarch Butterflies.

Section 35-140.3 Processing.

In addition to the requirements for the issuance of a Coastal Development Permit set forth in Section 35-169, a Coastal Development Permit for the removal of trees shall not be issued unless the Coastal Planner makes one of the following findings:

1. The trees are dead.
2. The trees prevent the construction of a project for which a Coastal Development Permit has been issued and project redesign is not feasible.
3. The trees are diseased and pose a danger to healthy trees in the immediate vicinity, providing a certificate attesting to such fact is filed with the Planning and Development Department by a licensed tree surgeon.

4. The trees are so weakened by age, disease, storm, fire, excavation, removal of adjacent trees, or any injury so as to cause imminent danger to persons or property.

Inconsistent. *[New Analysis]* The proposed Project would result in removal of approximately 81 trees in the Coastal Zone, of which 24 would be coast live oaks. See discussion under Sec. 35-97.18 Development Standards for Native Plant Community Habitats (1), above.

4.13.6 Cumulative Effects

Geographic Extent/Context

The geographic context for land use considers the extent to which the Project's adverse effects to quality of life for the surrounding community (specifically noise, traffic, and neighborhood incompatibility) would combine with the impacts from other projects to create an effect that is cumulatively considerable. The geographic extent of cumulative land use impacts includes residences near the switchyard, residences along San Miguelito Road, participating residences within the Project area, and nonparticipating residences surrounding the Project area. The LWEP Final EIR concluded that cumulative quality of life impacts that may occur during Project construction or operation from noise and traffic would not be cumulatively considerable. SWEP Table 3-1 identifies the most recent list of cumulative projects applicable to this SEIR.

Cumulative Effects

County Plans, Policies, and Development Standards. The Project would be consistent with all applicable County plans, policies, and development standards through the siting and design process, through ongoing coordination with the County, and through required mitigation measures. None of the Project impacts could combine with the effects of another project listed in Section 3.3, Table 3-1, to create an inconsistency with a County plan or development standard.

FAA Air Navigation Requirements. The Project would comply with FAA requirements and would obtain FAA approval prior to construction. None of the cumulative projects listed in Section 3.3, Table 3-1, could combine with the Project to create a substantial air navigation hazard. The Project would not contribute to a cumulative impact to air navigation.

Compatibility with VAFB Operations. The Project has been designed to comply with military requirements and to minimize interference with telemetry equipment. None of the cumulative projects listed in Section 3.3, Table 3-1, could combine with the Project to create a substantial impact to VAFB operations. Given ongoing consultation and an executed agreement with the Airforce, the Project would not contribute a cumulative impact to VAFB.

Quality of Life - Traffic. Cumulatively adverse traffic impacts could occur if nearby projects were to be constructed concurrently with the proposed Project. None of the projects listed in Section 3.3, Table 3-1, are located within three miles of the SWEP site. Because of variable construction schedules, the potential for the combined effects of construction traffic to result in substantial cumulative impacts is unlikely. Furthermore, traffic impacts from the proposed Project would be short term, lasting approximately ten months. Cumulative quality of life impacts associated with increased traffic are not anticipated.

Quality of Life - Noise. Cumulatively adverse noise impacts could occur if nearby projects were to be constructed concurrently with the proposed Project, or if the noise from these cumulative projects

were to affect participating residences within the Project area and nonparticipating residences surrounding the Project area. None of the projects listed in Section 3.3 are located within three miles of the SWEP site, although the switchyard would be less than one mile from cumulative projects within the City of Lompoc. However, because of variable construction schedules, the potential for the combined effects of construction to result in excessive cumulative construction noise is unlikely. Furthermore, given the three-mile distance of these projects from the proposed WTGs, the operational noise of these projects would not combine with the operational noise of the SWEP to create a cumulative noise impact affecting quality of life for the nearby residences. Cumulative quality of life impacts associated with noise are not anticipated.

4.13.7 Residual Impacts

As summarized in Section 4.13.4, Impacts LU-1a, LU-2, and LU-3 would be less than significant. With implementation of proposed mitigation measures, residual effects from Impact LU-4 (construction), LU-5a, LU-5b, LU-6, and LU-7 would not be significant. Residual effects from Impact LU-1b would remain significant.

4.13.8 Impact and Mitigation Summary

Table 4.13-3 below provides a summary of the SWEP’s impacts related to land use and planning. The table also indicates the mitigation measures proposed to reduce each significant impact.

Table 4.13-3. SWEP Impact and Mitigation Summary – Land Use and Planning

Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Conclusion
LU-1a	LU-1a LUDC Visual Impact Development Standards. The Project poses potential inconsistency with County Plans, Policies, and Development Standards concerning visual impacts.	None required	Class III
LU-1b	LU-1b Tree Protection. The proposed Project is inconsistent with County Plans, Policies, and Development Standards concerning tree removal.	MM BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program MM BIO-2: Ground Disturbance MM BIO-4a: Tree Protection Plan MM BIO-4b: Tree Replacement Plan MM BIO-4c: Invasive Plant Pathogen Abatement (SOD Prevention) MM BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring MM BIO-11d: Monitoring Report	Class I
LU-2	LU-2 FAA Air Navigation Requirements. Potential conflict with FAA air navigation requirements from installation of WTGs and meteorological towers, and possible use of helicopters during construction.	None required.	Class III
LU-3	LU-3 Compatibility with VAFB Operations. Potential incompatibility with VAFB operations, such as radar, telemetry antennas, and microwave links.	None required.	Class III
LU-4	LU-4 Quality of Life – Traffic. Construction activities would result in increased traffic in relatively quiet neighborhoods.	TC-1: Traffic Management Plan (construction)	Class II

Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Conclusion
LU-5a	Quality of Life – Noise. Noise from Project construction could cause temporary impacts to quality of life of residences within and surrounding the Project area.	NOI-2: Construction Hours NOI-3: Telephone Number for Noise Complaints NOI-4: Noise Complaint Resolution Plan. NOI-5: Maintenance of Construction Equipment NOI-6: Resident Notification	Class II
LU-5b	Quality of Life – Noise. Noise from WTG operation could potentially impact quality of life of nearby residences.	NOI-1: WTG Maintenance NOI-3: Telephone Number for Noise Complaints NOI-4: Noise Complaint Resolution Plan NOI-7: Acoustical Analysis NOI-8: Noise Monitoring and Control Plan NOI-9: Maintenance Hours	Class II
LU-6	Coastal Resources. Possible unpermitted encroachment into the Coastal Zone, impacting coastal resources.	LU-1: Staking of Coastal Zone.	Class II
LU-7	Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan. Long-term impacts to land use following end of Project.	LU-2: Decommissioning & Reclamation Plan LU-3: Financial Assurance for Decommissioning and Reclamation	Class II

Class I. Significant unavoidable adverse impact.

Class II. Significant environmental impacts that can be feasibly mitigated or avoided.

Class III. Adverse impacts found not to be significant.

Class IV. Impacts beneficial to the environment.

4.13.9 References

CCC (California Coastal Commission). 2017. Summary of LCP Program Activity in FY 16-17. July 24.

King, Bradley G. (Chief of Comprehensive Planning & Program Development, Vandenberg Air Force Base). Personal communication via email with Daniel Duke, BayWa r.e. Wind, LLC. February 28, 2018.

Santa Barbara County. 2018a. Santa Barbara County Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance. Published January 2015. Updated November 2018.

_____. 2018b. Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code. Published December 2011. Updated September 2018.

_____. 2018c. Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. Published March.

_____. 2016. Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan. Updated through November 2016.

_____. 2014a. Santa Barbara County Coastal Land Use Plan. Adopted 1982. Republished May 2014. Partially Certified by the State Coastal Commission March 1981.

_____. 2014b. Santa Barbara County Uniform Rules for Agricultural Preserves and Farmland Security Zones. September.

This page intentionally left blank.