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PREFACE

The Guadalupe Community Plan Background Report was prepared by the Cal Poly Team, comprised of 13 second-year graduate students and two professors in the City and Regional Planning Department at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. The report contains a summary of findings collected during the first phase of a two-phase planning project designed to perform the steps of a general plan update and prepare a community plan. The project was conducted over an eight-month period between September 2008 and April 2009.

The Cal Poly Team would like to express its appreciation to the many members of the community of Guadalupe, City Staff, and the City Officials for their invaluable input and support of this project. Sincere appreciation is extended to City Staff for their assistance in gathering the information needed to conduct the research. Special thanks are also due to City Officials for their support, input and participation. The Team would also like to extend their gratitude to the citizens of Guadalupe for participating in community meetings and focus groups. Without their participation this project would not have been possible.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** .......................................................................................................................... 1

**1.0 INTRODUCTION** ................................................................................................................................... 7

1.1 Setting ...................................................................................................................................................... 7

1.2 History ..................................................................................................................................................... 7

**2.0 PLANNING PROCESS** .......................................................................................................................... 11

2.1 Research Methods ................................................................................................................................... 11

2.2 Public Meetings ....................................................................................................................................... 13

2.3 Stakeholder Interviews .......................................................................................................................... 17

**3.0 DEMOGRAPHICS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** ........................................................................... 19

3.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................................. 19

3.2 Demographics ....................................................................................................................................... 19

3.3 Economics .............................................................................................................................................. 25

3.4 Emerging Directions ............................................................................................................................. 34

**4.0 LAND USE** ........................................................................................................................................... 35

4.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................................. 35

4.2 Guideline Requirements ....................................................................................................................... 36

4.3 Background .......................................................................................................................................... 37

4.4 Existing Conditions ............................................................................................................................... 38

4.5 Policies and Plan Documents ............................................................................................................. 51

4.6 Emerging Directions ............................................................................................................................. 61

**5.0 CIRCULATION** .................................................................................................................................... 63

5.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................................. 63

5.2 Evaluative Standards ............................................................................................................................. 63

5.3 Community Characteristics .................................................................................................................. 65

5.4 Thoroughfares and Transportation Routes .......................................................................................... 69

5.5 Public Transit Routes, Stops, and Terminals ....................................................................................... 73

5.6 Railroads and Railroad Depots ........................................................................................................... 77

5.7 Airports ................................................................................................................................................... 78

5.8 Bicycle and Pedestrian Routes and Facilities .................................................................................... 79

5.9 Parking Facilities .................................................................................................................................. 80

5.10 Emerging Directions ............................................................................................................................ 83

**6.0 HOUSING** ........................................................................................................................................... 85

6.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................................. 85

6.2 Existing Conditions ............................................................................................................................... 88

6.3 Opportunities and Emerging Directions ............................................................................................. 102

6.4 Emerging Directions ............................................................................................................................ 103

**7.0 PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES** .............................................................................................. 105

7.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................................. 105

7.2 Existing Conditions ............................................................................................................................... 105

7.3 Emerging Directions ............................................................................................................................ 115
# 8.0 CONSERVATION

- **8.1 Introduction** ................................................................. 117
- **8.2 Existing Conditions** ...................................................... 117
- **8.3 Emerging Directions** .................................................... 128

# 9.0 PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

- **9.1 Introduction** ................................................................. 132
- **9.2 Existing Conditions** ...................................................... 132
- **9.3 Emerging Directions** .................................................... 145

# 10.0 SAFETY

- **10.1 Introduction** ............................................................... 148
- **10.2 Emergency Response** ................................................. 149
- **10.3 Crime Reduction** ....................................................... 150
- **10.4 Compressible/Collapsible Soils** .................................... 150
- **10.5 Expansive Soils** .......................................................... 151
- **10.6 High Ground Water** .................................................... 152
- **10.7 Seismic Hazards** ......................................................... 154
- **10.8 Liquefication** .............................................................. 159
- **10.9 Slope Stability** ............................................................ 159
- **10.10 Soil Creep Potential** .................................................. 161
- **10.11 Tsunamis, Seiches** ..................................................... 161
- **10.12 Unreinforced Masonry** .............................................. 165
- **10.13 Flood** ..................................................................... 165
- **10.14 Wildfire** .................................................................. 168

# 11.0 NOISE

- **11.1 Introduction** ............................................................... 170
- **11.2 Standards** ................................................................. 170
- **11.3 Existing Conditions** .................................................... 172
- **11.4 Standards** ................................................................. 178
- **11.5 Emerging Directions** .................................................. 178

# 12.0 COMMUNITY DESIGN AND SENSE OF PLACE

- **12.1 Introduction** ............................................................... 180
- **12.2 Guidelines** ................................................................. 180
- **12.3 Standards** ................................................................. 181
- **12.4 Existing Conditions** .................................................... 182
- **12.5 Implications and Emerging Directions** ......................... 192

# 13.0 REFERENCES

APPENDIX

- **APPENDIX A: LAND USE CLASSIFICATION** ......................... 204
- **APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHICS & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** 205
- **APPENDIX C: HOUSING** ...................................................... 207
- **APPENDIX D: NOISE** ......................................................... 209
- **APPENDIX E: COMMUNITY DESIGN** .................................... 213
LIST OF TABLES

2.0 PLANNING PROCESS
Table 2-1. Land Uses and Acreage, 2008 ................................................................. 13

3.0 DEMOGRAPHICS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Table 3-1. Guadalupe Population, 1990 to 2008 ...................................................... 19
Table 3-2. Proportion of Population under age 18 ................................................... 20
Table 3-3. Proportion of Population age 65 and over ............................................. 22
Table 3-4. Guadalupe Population by Race, 2000 ..................................................... 22
Table 3-5. Hispanic or Latino Origin, 2000 ............................................................ 23
Table 3-6. Comparison of Hispanic/Latino Origin by Percentage, 2000 ................. 23
Table 3-7. Comparison of Race by Percentage, 2000 ............................................. 23
Table 3-8. Language and Linguistic Isolation ....................................................... 24
Table 3-9. Guadalupe Population Educational Attainment, 2000 ............................ 24
Table 3-10. Comparison of Incomes, 2000 (1999 dollars) ..................................... 25
Table 3-11. Comparison of Populations below Poverty Line, 1999 ......................... 26
Table 3-12. Households by Income Group, Guadalupe, CA, 2000 ....................... 26
Table 3-13. Guadalupe Unemployment, 2000-2007 .............................................. 26
Table 3-14. Labor Force and Employment, by Gender 2000 ................................ 27
Table 3-15. Comparison of Unemployment and Labor Force Participation Rates, 2000 28
Table 3-16. Industrial Sectors and Average Annual Salaries in California, 2002 ....... 29
Table 3-17. Local Economic Breakdown, 2002 .................................................... 31
Table 3-18. Guadalupe Projected Budget 2008 to 2009 ......................................... 31

4.0 LAND USE
Table 4-1. Typical Residential Densities .............................................................. 36
Table 4-2. Commercial/Industrial – Floor area ratio building intensity ................ 36
Table 4-3. Building Permits Over a Ten-Year Period .......................................... 37
Table 4-4. Commercial Land Uses .................................................................. 42
Table 4-5. Residential Land Uses by Housing Type ......................................... 45

5.0 CIRCULATION
Table 5-1. Level of Service (LOS) for Transit .................................................... 64
Table 5-2. Level of Service (LOS) Descriptions for Roads and Intersections ........ 64
Table 5-3. Commute Distributions for Guadalupe Residents, by Number of Workers .................................................. 67
Table 5-4. Average Annual Growth in Downtown Traffic Volume Between 1996 and 2004 ...................................................... 70
Table 5-5. Accident Data for SR 1 Between SR 166 and SB County Line ............. 70
Table 5-6. Accident Data for SR 166 Between Guadalupe and Santa Maria ......... 71
Table 5-7. Annual Average Daily Traffic for Vehicles and Trucks between ’98 and ’00 ........... 72
Table 5-8. Transit Usage in Guadalupe ............................................................. 76
Table 5-9. Transit Dependent Population Due to Age in 2000 .............................. 77
Table 5-10. Amtrak Schedule for Guadalupe .................................................... 78
Table 5-11. Amtrak Ridership for Guadalupe ................................................. 78
Table 5-12. Airport Traffic ........................................................................ 79
6.0 HOUSING
Table 6-1. 2008 Employed Population 16+ by Industry ................................................................. 88
Table 6-2. 2008 Employed Population 16+ by Occupation ........................................................... 88
Table 6-3. Percent Population in Poverty level 2000 .......................................................................... 89
Table 6-4. County of Santa Barbara Median Income distribution of Household Income groups 90
Table 6-5. 2000 Households by Income Group, City of Guadalupe .................................................. 90
Table 6-6. County of Santa Barbara Income Limits for 2008 .............................................................. 91
Table 6-7. Gross Rent as Percentage of Household Income, Guadalupe, California .................... 92
Table 6-8. Housing Unit Type by Jurisdiction, County of Santa Barbara .......................................... 94
Table 6-9. Housing Condition Survey Results .................................................................................... 95
Table 6-10. Persons per Household in Santa Barbara County 2008 ................................................ 96
Table 6-11. Tenure By Persons per Room City of Guadalupe, 2000 ................................................ 96
Table 6-12. Santa Barbara County Regional Housing Need Allocation 2007-2014 ....................... 97
Table 6-13. 2007-2014 Regional Housing Need Income Allocation ............................................ 98
Table 6-14. Percentage of Population over 65 and with Disabilities ............................................. 99
Table 6-15. Excerpt from City’s 2008 Parking Standards ............................................................... 101
Table 6-16. Fees that affect housing production ................................................................................. 102

8.0 CONSERVATION
Table 8-1. Soil Types and Characteristics of the Guadalupe Area .................................................. 120
Table 8-2. Common Air Pollutant Properties, Sources and Effects ............................................... 121
Table 8-3. Common Plant and Wildlife Species Present in the Guadalupe Quadrangle ............. 126

9.0 PARKS AND OPEN SPACE
Table 9-1. City Park Amenities ........................................................................................................ 134
Table 9-2. Application of Park Standards to City Parks ................................................................. 137
Table 9-3. Bikeway Design Standards .............................................................................................. 145
LIST OF FIGURES

1.0 INTRODUCTION
Figure 1-1. Regional Setting ........................................................................................................... 8
Figure 1-2. Jurisdictional Boundaries ........................................................................................... 9

2.0 PLANNING PROCESS
Figure 2-1. Land Uses in Guadalupe, 2008 ................................................................................. 13
Figure 2-2. Public Outreach Meeting, October 2008 .................................................................. 14
Figure 2-3. Participants at a Public Outreach Meeting, October 2008 ........................................ 15
Figure 2-4. Group Discussion at Public Outreach Meeting, October 2008 ................................. 16

3.0 DEMOGRAPHICS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Figure 3-1. Population by Sex and Age, 1990 ............................................................................. 21
Figure 3-2. Population by Sex and Age, 2000 ............................................................................. 21
Figure 3-3. Comparison of Unemployment Rates, 2000-2007 ..................................................... 27
Figure 3-4. Top Employing Industries for Guadalupe Residents, 2008 ........................................ 29
Figure 3-5. Commute Times for Guadalupe Residents, 2000 ........................................................ 30
Figure 3-6. 2008-2009 Guadalupe Total Revenues ..................................................................... 32
Figure 3-7. 2008-2009 Guadalupe Total Expenditures ................................................................. 33

4.0 LAND USE
Figure 4-1. General Plan Area for the City of Guadalupe ............................................................. 35
Figure 4-2. Land Uses in Guadalupe by acres and percentage ..................................................... 38
Figure 4-3. Land Use Map ............................................................................................................ 39
Figure 4-4. Industrial Land Use Categories .................................................................................. 40
Figure 4-5. Industrial Land Use Map ........................................................................................... 41
Figure 4-6. Commercial Land Use Map ....................................................................................... 44
Figure 4-7. Residential Land Use Map ........................................................................................ 47
Figure 4-8. Agriculture, Open Space, and Parks Acreage ............................................................. 48
Figure 4-9. Percentage of Vacant Land Acreage by Zones .......................................................... 49
Figure 4-10. Building Conditions in Guadalupe by Parcel ......................................................... 49
Figure 4-11. Vacant Land Map .................................................................................................... 50
Figure 4-12. Specific Plans Map .................................................................................................. 57

5.0 CIRCULATION
Figure 5-1. Vehicle Availability per Household in Guadalupe .................................................... 65
Figure 5-2. Means of Transportation to Work for Residents in Guadalupe ............................... 66
Figure 5-3. Travel Time to Work ................................................................................................. 66
Figure 5-4. City of Guadalupe Existing Circulation Map ............................................................. 68
Figure 5-5. Pavement Conditions ............................................................................................... 74
Figure 5-6. Transit Service in Guadalupe .................................................................................... 75
Figure 5-7. Guadalupe Pedestrian Infrastructure Map ................................................................. 81
Figure 5-8. Guadalupe On-Street Parking Map ........................................................................... 82
Figure 5-9. Guadalupe Parking Lots ........................................................................................... 83

6.0 HOUSING
Figure 6-1: Guadalupe Redevelopment Agency Boundaries .................................................... 87
Figure 12-7. Mural on Downtown Building ................................................................. 188
Figure 12-8. Image of Marine Life, Main St................................................................. 188
Figure 12-9. Image of Dunes in Downtown ................................................................. 188
Figure 12-10. Image of Dunes in City Hall .................................................................. 188
Figure 12-11. Latino Culture, Farm Workers, and Dunes ............................................ 188
Figure 12-12. Royal Theater (437 Guadalupe Street) .................................................. 189
Figure 12-13. Cultural Resource Center (1065 Guadalupe Street) ............................. 190
Figure 12-14. Historical Museum (1025 Guadalupe Street) ......................................... 190
Figure 12-15. Katayama Clock (in front of 945 Guadalupe Street) ............................. 191
Figure 12-16. Parking Dominated Plaza ................................................................. 192
Figure 12-18. Downtown Streetscape ........................................................................ 194
Figure 12-20. Lower Guadalupe Street, ................................................................... 194
Figure 12-21. Walls and Landscaping ...................................................................... 195
Figure 12-23. Potential Pedestrian Connections and Network ................................... 196
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Background Report is an integral part of the City of Guadalupe Community Plan. It summarizes of the existing (2009) conditions of Guadalupe, California and describes issues relevant to the update of the General Plan. Thus, it provides a starting point for the Community Plan and a context for examining the constraints and opportunities for meeting the community’s needs over the next twenty years. In this way, it serves as the informational basis on which the goals, policies, and programs of the Plan are based.

This information was gathered by students in the City and Regional Planning Department at California Polytechnic State University through an existing plan and policy audit, interviews with public officials and City residents, and community workshops. The report summarizes the planning process, and the status and trends of ten topics that are crucial to understanding the City as it exists today and how it may develop in the future. These topics include: demographics and economic development, land use, circulation, housing, public facilities and services, conservation, open space, safety, noise, and community design and sense of place.

The Community Plan will be completed by April 2009. It will be submitted to the City for its use as a resource to help citizens improve the town’s economy, housing, public facilities and services, and quality of life.

The following summary briefly describes existing conditions in January 2009, key findings, and “emerging directions” for the City.

Introduction and Planning Process

The City of Guadalupe, located in northern Santa Barbara County, is situated in the heart of California’s scenic Central Coast. The City consists of approximately 1.4 square miles and has a population of about 6,500 residents (California Department of Finance, 2008). All California cities and counties are required to adopt a general plan to guide long-term growth and development. The Guadalupe Community Plan, which performs the steps of a General Plan Update, shall provide a framework for the orderly growth and development for the next twenty years. This Background Report describes the issues relevant to the update of the General Plan.

The Planning Process for the Community Plan consists of three steps: 1) gathering information by researching the community, conducting site observations, and engaging the public through participation, and 2) analyzing the primary and secondary information in order to develop emerging directions for the City. Several strategies were used to gather information from the community, such as informal interviews, telephone conversations, and community meetings. In addition, to maximize citizen participation, two community meetings yielded valuable feedback. This will be used to develop emerging directions for Guadalupe.
Demographics and Economic Development

The Demographics and Economic Development chapter summarizes the population and employment trends in the City of Guadalupe and describes the local economy’s ability to provide quality employment for residents and revenue for City government programs. Current population trends reveal that Guadalupe has a diverse, young, and growing population. Much of the City’s labor force works outside of the City limits and has a lower per capita income than comparable communities, such as Nipomo and Grover Beach. These factors indicate that Guadalupe’s economy is in need of diversification and stability. Policies that attract businesses, promote tourism, and encourage local spending will help to improve existing conditions.

Land Use

The Land Use chapter describes the City’s existing conditions and emerging directions relative to land use. This information will be used to guide decisions regarding zoning, subdivision, and public works. It summarizes the findings of the Land Use Inventory that was conducted at the beginning of the process, which identified existing land uses, densities, and intensities. The inventory found that residential uses and the DJ Farms Specific Plan area each account for one third of the City’s planning area. Agriculture, open space, and park lands are also key land uses. Industrial uses are concentrated between Guadalupe Street and Obispo Street and the majority of the commercial uses are focused in the downtown area. Further analysis suggests that the City can maintain a compact urban form through infill development of the many vacant parcels. However, strategic development in the DJ Farms Specific Plan area is needed to create greater economic growth opportunities for the City.

Circulation

The Circulation chapter describes the existing conditions and emerging issues related to many aspects of transportation, including roads, highways, public transit, railways, parking, and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Guadalupe lies on State Route 1 (SR 1) and State Route 166 (SR 166), between San Luis Obispo and Lompoc. It shares its main street with traffic traveling through the City to other destinations. SR1 is a major north-south valley corridor with declining traffic volume over the past ten years; SR 166 is a main east-west route. These routes are operating at adequate levels of service. SR 166, however, has an accident rate higher than State levels and the community feels it is a safety hazard. Guadalupe also has a major rail line that parallels State Route 1 and splits the town. This poses a major problem for traffic, safety, and pedestrian connectivity. Guadalupe's streets, sidewalks, public transit stops, and street parking are in good condition. However, bike routes and traffic controls are deficient. Thus, emerging directions in Guadalupe include improvements to State Route 166, bicycle lanes, and sidewalks. Connectivity between the two sides of town and improved “wayfinding” signs should also be added.
Housing

The Housing chapter includes an analysis of existing conditions, including a condition of buildings inventory and documentation of construction trends. This information helps guide the City’s growth and sets the baseline for making projections about future housing trends. The majority of Guadalupe’s housing stock is single-family dwellings that were constructed before 1990, and well over one-half of the homes are thirty years old or older. When compared to the rest of Santa Barbara County, Guadalupe’s housing stock has the highest proportion of single-family detached units. Single-family homes tend to be more expensive, and as a result lower income households tend to live in smaller overcrowded dwellings. Most housing units in Guadalupe are in sound condition. Citizens would like to see more housing growth, for all income levels, that is designed to be walkable and compatible with existing architecture.

Public Facilities and Services

The Public Facilities and Services chapter describes the adequacy of seven types of public facilities and services in terms of existing capacity and demand. These facilities and services include water, wastewater management, solid waste management, fire protection, police protection, public schools, and library services. Based on Federal, State, and County standards, Guadalupe is adequately supplying the public with water, wastewater collection and treatment, solid waste collection, police protection, fire protection, and library services. The public schools, however, are overcrowded and the City is not meeting its 50 percent waste diversion requirement as mandated by the California Integrated Waste Management Board. Thus, emerging directions for public facilities and services include: expanding educational facilities to meet the community needs, improving the recycling program, and in general, expanding facilities and services as needed.

Conservation

The Conservation chapter identifies important natural resources within the City’s planning area and provides direction for how those resources can be preserved as development occurs. Major natural resource areas within the City’s planning area include the Santa Maria River floodplain and riparian corridor, the Ninth Street wetlands complex, and the prime agricultural land immediately surrounding the City limits. Emerging directions for conservation include: preservation of the Ninth Street wetlands, conservation of water resources, pursuit of city beautification activities, and promotion of sustainability through use of renewable energy and green building techniques.

Open Space

The Open Space chapter examines resources dedicated to parks and recreation, open space, agriculture, and local and statewide trail systems. There are 34 acres of parkland in Guadalupe.
Existing open space, including the Santa Maria River Floodplain and the Ninth Street wetland complex, provides Guadalupe with resource preservation and management, public health benefits, and aesthetic value. Additionally, Guadalupe is surrounded by agricultural land under Williamson Act Contracts which enhances the City’s feeling of open space; however, this also has implications for future growth and development. Further analysis of existing parks and open space reveals that park acreage expansion, park improvements, open space access, and agricultural resource protection are all needs for Guadalupe’s future.

Safety
The Safety chapter addresses the community’s safety from fire, flood, tsunami, seismic and geologic hazards, hazardous materials transport and use, crime prevention and emergency response, and other specific hazards in Guadalupe. The chapter includes mapping of known seismic, flooding, fire, and other geologic hazards. It also describes evacuation routes, minimum road widths and clearances around structures, crime prevention measures, and emergency response as they relate to identified fire, geologic, and other safety hazards. Although these maps and plans are extensive, the City needs to update its avoidance and recovery plans, especially for transportation safety, vandalism, and natural disasters. The development and implementation of safety and hazard mitigation plans, hazard education programs, safe construction practices, and floodplain management near Pioneer Street are additionally needed.

Noise
The Noise chapter examines existing and future noise sources in Guadalupe using noise data from the 2002 Guadalupe General Plan. The primary noise sources are roadway traffic, railroad traffic, and industrial plant operations. Growth in population and through traffic has the potential to increase the noise levels from these sources. Thus, emerging directions include implementing a variety of noise mitigation measures, such as strategically placed berms, vegetation, and other potential sound buffers.

Community Design and Sense of Place
The Community Design and Sense of Place chapter describes the aesthetic characteristics of the City’s built environment. It also focuses on Guadalupe’s unique and historic identity. Within the City, sense of place is created by cultural, historical, and architectural elements, such as murals, setbacks, fencing, architectural details, and storefronts. Key areas that define Guadalupe’s sense of place include the downtown commercial core, with its significant historical buildings, various residential neighborhoods, and the industrial park. To strengthen the City’s character, architectural guidelines can be created to address new construction, the downtown core,
pedestrian connections, park space, public art, and “gateways” to the community. Emphasis on creating public spaces, implementing sustainable design principles, and preserving landmarks, open space, and historical buildings can further enhance Guadalupe’s sense of place.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Guadalupe (“The City” or “Guadalupe”), located in northern Santa Barbara County, is situated in the heart of California’s scenic Central Coast. Guadalupe has many assets and opportunities for improvement, but also many challenges it must face in the years to come. Thus, this document, the Community Plan Background Report, sets the factual framework the City will need to address challenges and capitalize on opportunities. This Report describes existing conditions, emerging issues, and community visions to help decision-makers make informed and prudent planning decisions.

1.1 Setting

Guadalupe is a city of 6,541 residents, located approximately four miles inland from the Pacific Ocean along scenic State Highway 1 (Figure 1-1). The City consists of approximately 1.4 square miles in the heart of the fertile Santa Maria Valley, an important agricultural region. US Highway 101 (US 101), an interstate highway linking California’s coastal cities with Southern California and Washington State, is located 10 miles to the east. The City of Santa Barbara is located approximately 60 miles to the south and San Luis Obispo is located 25 miles to the north. Neighboring communities include the cities of Santa Maria, 10 miles to the west, and Pismo Beach, 15 miles to the north.

The Santa Maria River is located north of the City limits and flows westward to its outlet in the Pacific Ocean. The Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes State Preserve is located just south of the river’s mouth. The Preserve is located within the Mussel Rock Dunes and part of the 22,000-acre, 18-mile long Guadalupe-Nipomo dunes.

The City’s topography is mostly flat with an average elevation is 85 feet above mean sea level. The predominant land use surrounding Guadalupe is farming. Major crops include broccoli, cauliflower, celery, and artichokes. Guadalupe serves as an agricultural service center for the productive valley farms, providing processing and shipping of many of the Santa Maria Valley’s crops.

1.2 History

The City was founded in 1872 and incorporated in 1946, but its importance both locally and regionally is much older. In the early 1800s, much of the land around the City was used for grazing and cattle ranching by families who were probably descendants of the original Spanish land grantees. With arrival of the Southern Pacific Railroad in the late 1800s, Guadalupe became the focal point of a prosperous agricultural economy and a melting pot for farming and ranching families of many nationalities. Guadalupe remained the most important community in the Santa Maria Valley until the late 1920s, when the construction of US 101 enabled trucks to replace the railroad as the primary mode for transporting crops to surrounding markets, giving
“Central City” (later, “Santa Maria”) an economic advantage. Although still a regional farming center, Guadalupe has lost much of its historic prominence to the expanding City of Santa Maria, with a 2008 population of approximately 91,000.

Figure 1-1. Regional Setting

City Planning Area and Sphere of Influence
The area covered by the City’s General Plan (2002) is often referred to as the City’s “planning area” which includes the City’s corporate limits, and “...any land outside its boundaries which in the planning agency’s judgment bears a relation to its planning” (California Government Code Section 65300). As shown in Figure 1-2, the planning area extends outward from the City in a loosely defined circle that expands north across the Santa Maria River and east toward the City of Santa Maria. The “General Plan area” is the portion of the planning area governed by the policies, programs, and land uses of the Guadalupe General Plan. The Plan area is generally the shape of a rectangle defined by the Santa Maria River to the north, Simas Road to the east, and the property lines of agricultural lands to the south and west.
Figure 1-2 also shows the City’s “sphere of influence,” which coincides with the City limits. The Cortese-Knox Act defines a sphere of influence as a “...plan for the probable ultimate physical boundaries and service area of a local agency...” (California Government Code Section 56076). In practice, “ultimate” is often defined as a period of twenty years following adoption of the plan. Under Section 56080, a sphere of influence may include an urban service area which identifies portions of a city’s sphere of influence where urban services are provided, or where services are expected to be provided during the first five years of an adopted capital improvement program.

Spheres of influence and other changes to the organization of local governments are decided by the Local Agency Formation Commission Organization (LAFCO), which is comprised of representatives from member jurisdictions within the County. In addition to establishing and amending spheres of influence, LAFCO exercises jurisdiction over annexations (adding land to a city or special district), detachment from a city or district, and the incorporation of new cities, among others. Accordingly, LAFCO policies are key to identifying areas for future City expansion.

**Figure 1-2. Jurisdictional Boundaries**

Source: City of Guadalupe General Plan, 2002
**Long-Range Planning and the Guadalupe General Plan**

All California cities and counties must adopt long-range plans to guide their growth and development. The tool for long-range planning in California is the general plan. The general plan expresses the community’s development goals and embodies public policy on the type, location and distribution of future uses, both public and private. To provide a consistent framework to address these issues, State law requires that the general plan contain seven interrelated sections or elements, including land use, housing, circulation, conservation and open space, safety, and noise. Other elements may be added as needed to address specific issues. Elements can be addressed in individual chapters within a general plan, but can and are encouraged to be combined and streamlined, where appropriate, into a more unified and cohesive document.

Guadalupe’s existing General Plan was written in 1993 and revised in 2002. The Guadalupe Community Plan, which will be created by the Cal Poly graduate planning studio, updates the 2002 General Plan following the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s (OPR) recommendations on preparing a general plan. Through the seven mandated elements, plus three additional elements—Economic Development, Public Facilities and Services, and Community Design and Sense of Place—the Community Plan will provide a framework for the orderly growth and development for the City for the next twenty to twenty-five years from its adoption, or through the year 2034. By no later than 2032 (and probably sooner), the City must initiate changes or a general plan “update” to ensure the Plan stays useful and relevant to City conditions, needs, and opportunities.

The update process typically follows three steps:

1) Research and production of a background report to inform planners in preparation of the General Plan itself.

2) Preparation of the draft general plan, which includes goals, policies, and programs.

3) Study of the environmental impacts of proposed draft General Plan.

This Background Report provides the information base upon which the Community Plan will be developed. The Plan with be completed by April 2009, when it will be submitted to the City under the University’s service agreement with the City. Environmental review of the documents is not part of Cal Poly University’s approved work scope with the City.
2.0 Introduction

Research for the Guadalupe Background Report and Community Plan was completed through a three part process. First the planning team evaluated local, regional, state, and federal policies and guidelines that apply to the planning area. Second, the team also conducted a land use inventory to assess existing conditions regarding land uses and public improvements. Third, a total of five community outreach meetings were held between October 23, 2008 and March 12, 2009 to hear from residents’ about their likes, dislikes and preferences for change. Community input, combined with background research and growth projections, were critical components of the planning process. It helped the planning team identify issues and prepare goals, objectives, policies and programs, as well as the alternatives and preferred scenario described in the Plan.

2.1 Research Methods

Research for the Guadalupe Background Report was done several ways. First, the planning team evaluated local, regional, state, and federal policies and guidelines relevant to the planning area. Second, the team conducted a land use inventory to assess land use and public improvements. Third, the team led community outreach meetings on October 23, 2008 and March 12, 2008 to get more information from residents about their likes, dislikes and preferences for change.

Information Sources

Each general plan element is influenced by policies set at the local, regional, and state level. These policies guide the community’s decision-making process about when, where, and how to grow, as well as determining what infrastructure is needed to serve growth. The California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) identifies what needs to be addressed by the general plan for each of the seven required elements. Additional elements have been added to the Guadalupe Background Report and will be included in the Guadalupe Community Plan. Agencies with interests or responsibilities related to development and use of land in Santa Barbara County were consulted to identify current land uses (for the background report) and to identify agency policies on further development (for the community plan).

The following agencies were consulted to establish policies and best practices:

- California Coastal Commission
- California Department of Finance
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Transportation
- California Department of Water Resources
- California Office of Planning and Research, General Plan Guidelines
- California Resources Agency
These agencies either report activities at the local level (e.g., department of finance records current population and employment information) or guide local decision-making (e.g., the Local Agency Formation Commission determines if and when bordering areas can be annexed by the City). The agencies are referenced in chapters of the Background Report and Community Plan.

**Land Use Inventory**

The planning studio conducted an inventory in early October 2008 primarily to determine land uses and conditions of buildings inside city limits. The inventory included a visual assessment of each parcel in several different categories. A classification and coding system was adapted from Fairfax County, Virginia to categorize the land uses (Appendix 3, Land Use Classification). The intensity of development was assessed by determining the number of dwelling units and building stories on each parcel. The condition of roads, presence of public sidewalks and bicycle lanes, and the existence of unreinforced masonry (URM) buildings were also noted. Figure 2.1 and Table 2.1 show the breakdown of land uses in Guadalupe and the total acreages of the various land use categories. The land use inventory is discussed further in Chapter 4.0, Land Use of the Background Report.
Table 2-1. Land Uses and Acreage, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>239.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Open Space, Parks</td>
<td>138.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads, Rail, and Parking</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ Farms</td>
<td>212.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>773.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, October 2008

Figure 2-1. Land Uses in Guadalupe, 2008

Source: CalPoly, 2008

2.2 Public Meetings

Two public outreach meetings were held in Guadalupe, the first on October 23, 2008 and the second on November 20, 2008. Both evening meetings were held at the Guadalupe Community Center. A summary of the main points brought up during the meetings is given here. The compiled input lists from each meeting is in the Appendix to Chapter 2.
Public Outreach Meeting: October 23, 2008
During the first meeting, participants were provided an overview of the general plan and were asked three questions about Guadalupe. The questions were:

- What do you like about Guadalupe?
- What do you dislike about Guadalupe?
- What would you like to see changed in Guadalupe?

Twenty five community members attended the meeting. Participants discussed each of the questions in small focus groups. Participants were also asked to prioritize their favorite ideas for the future of Guadalupe. The information gathered during that meeting was incorporated into a presentation for the November 20, 2008 meeting.

Community members liked the small town feel, local markets, restaurants, and the dunes. They disliked homes too close to the train tracks and were concerned about the development at DJ Farms. To improve the City they feel that consistent facades and bulbouts on the sidewalks Downtown as well as more lighting on Guadalupe Street were important along with fixing 11th and N. Pioneer Street and the redevelopment of Leroy Park.
Figure 2-3. Participants at a Public Outreach Meeting, October 2008

Source: Cal Poly, 2008

Public Outreach Meeting: November 20, 2008
A slide presentation was created based on participant’s ideas presented at the October 23rd meeting, the Land Use Inventory and policy research. The purpose of the presentation was to show Guadalupe’s visual character, what policies guide its growth and development, and what changes could reasonably be expected, given community preferences and aspirations. The intent was also to make sure that what was being proposed in emerging directions adequately reflected the community’s interests.

The community felt more jobs were needed as well as a community center. Also, a path connecting the City to the Dunes should be planned. The downtown area should have more pedestrian crossings and shared parking for new developments. Historical buildings should be preserved. There should also be greater connectivity between the City and the parks.
Goals and Objectives Meeting: February 5\textsuperscript{th}, 2009

Information gathered from background research, community feedback, and stakeholder interviews was used to formulate goals and objectives for each element for the City's General Plan. Policies and programs for reaching the goals and objectives were also created. These goals and objectives were presented to the City during the third outreach meeting in an effort to ensure the proposed ideas adequately reflected community interests.

The community again stated the need for jobs for teens as well as a community center. They also asked for more crossings on Guadalupe Street as well as improved parks and playground design. Creating environmental awareness through volunteer clean ups or other activities were suggested in order to promote conservation in the community.

Alternative Scenarios Meeting: February 26, 2009

During this meeting, Cal Poly graduate students presented three growth scenarios to the City. The three scenarios were mild growth, moderate growth, and comprehensive (aggressive) growth. Details on the three scenarios can be found in Chapter 4.0, Alternatives. Each scenario had its own set of demographic projections and targets, including projected job growth and housing needs. Overall, preference was towards both a mix of moderate and comprehensive growth scenarios. Below is some feedback from those who attended the meeting.
Overall, the community preferred compact, mixed use development which is a hybrid of the moderate growth and comprehensive growth alternatives. They liked the idea of Downtown development and increasing the building heights to three or four stories as well as possibly providing a lookout to the Dunes.

Preferred Scenario Meeting: March 12, 2009

During this meeting, Cal Poly graduate students presented the Preferred Scenario. The Preferred Scenario was created based on feedback from participants at the previous meeting on February 26, 2009, and included elements from all three growth scenarios. Details on the Preferred Scenario can be found in Chapter 5.0, Preferred Scenario.

The presentation included jobs and housing targets, as well as population projections. Additionally, the presentation included three-dimensional renderings of what downtown Guadalupe could look like under the Preferred Scenario. Participants were given time to ask questions and discuss next steps in the community plan process.

2.3 Stakeholder Interviews

To help identify goals and objectives for the City, interviews were conducted with major stakeholders of the City. Interviews of Guadalupe’s stakeholders were held in Guadalupe, on January 13, 2009. Interviewees included the Mayor and the City Administrators, among others, and were asked the following questions:

- What do you feel are Guadalupe’s strengths?
- If you could change one thing about Guadalupe, what would it be?
- What do you think about its population growth rate?
- What are some things about Guadalupe that make it different from Santa Maria and other Central Coast towns?
- How would you characterize Guadalupe’s citizens?
- How do you think we can address some of the areas of improvement you identified in quantified goals and objectives?
- What types of programs are (have been) successful in Guadalupe?
- What are some long-term goals the City is still working towards?
- Are there any goals that Guadalupe is working towards that you feel need to be revised to become more attainable?
- How would you prioritize Guadalupe’s efforts?

Guadalupe’s strengths are its small, close knit community and atmosphere. It is close to the Dunes and Highway 1 runs through it. It has a Downtown core with historic architecture. It is also family friendly with low crime, traffic, and smog. It is different from other towns because it has many authentic Mexican restaurants and also has cheaper rents. The citizens are fairly
involved in the community through church and community events, though not as much as in the past. The City has successful programs such as façade improvement grant programs, downtown lighting, team sports, and URM retrofits.

They would like to see a slow growth rate and a reduction of overcrowding. The City needs a larger tax base and an increase in sales tax revenue. They would also like to take advantage of Highway 1 to create a beautiful tourist destination with amenities such as hotel. Additionally, street infrastructure, sidewalk, and circulation improvements are important, as well as sewer and water lines. The City has grant money that they need to take advantage of while the money is available.

To improve the community there needs to be more education for business owners and investment in the community. The City needs to encourage local spending and creating self-sufficiency.
3.0 DEMOGRAPHICS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Introduction
This chapter looks at the City of Guadalupe from two interrelated aspects: 1) demographics – the study of its citizens, and 2) economic development – the businesses and firms in the City. The purpose of this analysis is to gain a better understanding of the City’s population, employment trends, and overall economy, from which local strengths and weaknesses can be determined.

Data in this section compares Guadalupe to the County of Santa Barbara and the State of California. Additionally, the City of Nipomo is compared to Guadalupe because of its similar population size and composition. A variety of secondary sources were used to collect data, including the United States Decennial Census (US Census), United States Economic Census, California Department of Finance, Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), and the City of Guadalupe.

3.2 Demographics
Gaining an understanding of Guadalupe’s population is crucial to planning in the City. This section examines existing population characteristics and trends, specifically:

- Population size and change
- Age and gender
- Racial breakdown and Latino origin
- Primary Language and linguistic isolation
- Educational attainment

Population Size and Change
According to the California Department of Finance, the 2008 population for Guadalupe is 6,541 residents. This represents an increase of 882 people from the 2000 census population of 5,659. This 15 percent change is a substantial increase in the population growth rate when compared to the period from 1990 to 2000, when Guadalupe added 180 citizens, resulting in a population increase from 5,479 to 5,659, or a population growth rate of 3.2 percent (Table 3-1).

Table 3-1. Guadalupe Population, 1990 to 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Change in Population</th>
<th>% Change in Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6,541</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>15.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5,659</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5,479</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance 2008, Demographic Research Unit, Table E5
3.0 DEMOGRAPHICS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Gender and Age

The 1990 and 2000 populations of Guadalupe are broken down into five-year age and gender cohorts and shown in Figures 3-1 and 3-2.

In terms of gender, the populations were nearly identical in 1990 and 2000. In 1990, males accounted for about 52 percent of the population and females accounted for approximately 48 percent. Similarly, in 2000, males represented about 51 percent of the City’s total population and females represented about 49 percent.

In regards to population, the population pyramids shown in Figures 3-1 and 3-2 demonstrate a high concentration of citizens on the lower portion of the pyramid. In 1990, the largest cohort was also the youngest-- those citizens under five years of age. Overall, the citizens under the age of 25 accounted for 2,984 people, or 49 percent of the population. This young trend continued in 2000, when the largest cohort was the population five to nine years old. With 651 citizens, this age group represented 11 percent of the population. In addition, the next four largest cohorts were comprised of citizens under the age of 24. In order of size, they were 15 to 19, 10 to 14, five and under, and 20 to 24. In all, citizens under 25 represented 2,862 citizens and over 47 percent of the population. Further analysis revealed that 81 percent of the population was under the age of 50 (Appendix B).

Minors

To better understand this trend of a younger population it is helpful to place Guadalupe’s population in a larger context. As indicated in Table 3-2 that compares Guadalupe’s population under age 18 to the City of Nipomo, the County of Santa Barbara, and the State of California, Guadalupe’s percentage of minors was nearly five percent higher than Nipomo, ten percent higher than Santa Barbara County, and eight percent higher than the State of California. While these percentages reflect a slight downward trend from 1990 levels of the City, they still demonstrate a high concentration of minors among the population.

Another trend of note is that all three comparison populations experienced an increase in their percentage of minors. The State’s population rose 1.3 percent, while Santa Barbara County jumped 1.7 percent. Over the same 10-year period, the City of Nipomo gained 0.8 percent in its population, raising its proportion of minors to over 30 percent.

Table 3-2. Proportion of Population under age 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guadalupe</th>
<th>Nipomo</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County</th>
<th>State of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 1990, SF 1, Table QT-P1A; US Census Bureau, 2000, SF 1, Table P12
Senior Citizens

From 1990 to 2000 the proportion of senior citizens in Guadalupe increased. In 2000, the population aged 65 and over numbered 525 people, an increase of 64 people from 1990 (Table 3-3). This shift represented a one percent increase and was counter to the slower changes or decreases experienced in the State, County, and Nipomo.
Despite the upward trend, the total proportion of senior citizens in Guadalupe remained lower than that of the comparison populations. When compared with Nipomo, Guadalupe was 3.5 percent lower. Additionally, the County of Santa Barbara and the State of California had higher proportions of seniors in their population, representing a 4 percent and 2 percent increase respectively.

Table 3-3. Proportion of Population age 65 and over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guadalupe</th>
<th>Nipomo</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County</th>
<th>State of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 1990, SF 1, Table QT-P1A; US Census Bureau, 2000, SF 1, Table P12

Race and Latino Origin

In the 2000 census, 47 percent of the 5,659 residents in Guadalupe described themselves as “white”, an increase of nearly 16 percent from 1990 (Table 3-4). This was by far the greatest jump in population and made “white” the majority population in the City.

The next highest race category was the classification “some other race”, which indicates the portion of the population that does not fit into the general census groups. In 2000, there were 2,264 citizens representing 37.4 percent of the population that characterized themselves as some other race. This was down from 59 percent in 1990, a drop of nearly 22 percent.

Another racial group that experienced a decline from 1990 to 2000 was Filipino. Although at 3.8 percent they represent the fourth highest population percentage, their share of the population was down three percent over the ten-year period.

All other major race classifications experienced minor growth from 1990 to 2000. The Other Asian category, representing those who classified themselves as non-Filipino, grew slightly to 1.9 percent. The American Indian and Alaska Native category grew 1.3 percent to a total of 107, and the African American category grew 0.03 percent to 40 citizens, or 0.66 percent of the population. Although “two or more races” represents the third largest racial group, it was not an option in the 1990 census, so its growth or decline cannot be accurately measured.

Table 3-4. Guadalupe Population by Race, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>2000 Percent</th>
<th>1990 Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>47.22</td>
<td>31.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>37.34</td>
<td>58.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 2000, SF 1, Table QT-P3, and 1990, SF1, Table P007
When looking at race populations from census data it is important to note that Hispanic/Latino is considered an origin, not a racial identity. That is, people who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race (US Census Bureau, 2001). For example, an individual can be counted as racially white and also counted as being of Latino origin. In 2000, 83 percent of residents in Guadalupe were of Hispanic or Latino origin (Table 3-5).

Table 3-5. Hispanic or Latino Origin, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>5,009</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000, SF1, Table QT-P3

In comparison to surrounding populations, the percentage of Guadalupe’s population with Hispanic or Latino origin was more than double that of Nipomo, Santa Barbara County, and the State of California in 2000 (Table 3-6). This high proportion of citizens with a common ancestry has important implications for the community and any planning or development must recognize this population component.

Table 3-6. Comparison of Hispanic/Latino Origin by Percentage, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guadalupe</th>
<th>Nipomo</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County</th>
<th>State of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 2000, SF 1, Table QT-P3

Compared with Nipomo, Santa Barbara County, and the State of California, Guadalupe had an ethnically diverse population in 2000 (Table 3-7). Although White citizens were the majority in all four populations, Guadalupe had the lowest percentage overall. In addition to this, Guadalupe had the highest percentage of Some Other Race, American Indian/Alaska Natives, and Two or More Races in its population. The State of California had a higher percentage of Asians, and while Guadalupe had a slightly higher proportion of African Americans in its population than Nipomo, it was six percent lower than the State of California and 1.6 percent lower than the County of Santa Barbara.

Table 3-7. Comparison of Race by Percentage, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Guadalupe</th>
<th>Nipomo</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County</th>
<th>State of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 2000, SF 1, Table QT-P3
Primary Language and Linguistic Isolation

In 2000, 24.3 percent of Guadalupe households identified themselves as English speakers only, while 75.7 percent identified that they spoke additional languages (Table 3-8). The primary language spoken other than English was Spanish. Of the 75.7 percent, 23.6 indicated that they were linguistically isolated. Households are described as linguistically isolated when no one over the age of 14 can speak English without difficulty.

Compared with Nipomo, Santa Barbara County, and the State of California, Guadalupe had a high percentage of linguistic isolation within its population. While this number is much higher than surrounding populations, given that Guadalupe has such a high percentage of multi-lingual families, it is not unexpected.

Table 3-8. Language and Linguistic Isolation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Guadalupe</th>
<th>Nipomo</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County</th>
<th>State of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>136,769</td>
<td>11,512,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English speaking only</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks additional languages:</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistically isolated*</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000, SF3, Table P20
* Households are described as linguistically isolated when no one over the age of 14 can speak English without difficulty

Educational Attainment

Table 3-9 below displays the level of schooling attained by individuals over age 25 in 2000. Of the 2,966 residents older than 25, 42 percent had received less than a 9th grade education. An additional 36 percent of the population had either some high schooling, or had received their high school diploma. 16 percent had taken some college courses without receiving their degree, and the remaining 7 percent had an Associates, Bachelors, or Graduate/Professional degree.

Table 3-9. Guadalupe Population Educational Attainment, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th grade, no diploma</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000, SF3, Table P37
3.3 Economics

A city’s economy plays a critical role in its physical development and in the stability of the local tax base (Office of Planning Research [OPR], 2003, p. 109). Although economic development is an optional element for inclusion in the general plan, it plays an essential role by providing a glimpse into a city’s economic structure. Although cities use the economic element for different reasons, its general purpose is to maintain and enhance the economic character of the community, while providing for a stable annual budget (OPR, p. 109). To do this, an effective element will establish policies that provide direction to local government on how to:

- Retain and develop business
- Attract new industries
- Support the tax base
- Sustain the ability to provide public services for current and future residents

Income and Poverty

The local economy’s ability to provide a high quality of life for residents can be measured in several ways. Two measurements that are particularly helpful are household and per capita income, which communicate family and individual earnings for a given year (Table 3-10). In 2000, both median household income and per capita income were well below averages for comparison populations. With a median household income of $31,955, Guadalupe was 56 percent lower than Nipomo, 46 percent lower than Santa Barbara County, and 48 percent lower than the State of California. Per capita income was even lower than comparison population averages. At $11,431, Guadalupe was 64 percent below Nipomo, over 100 percent below Santa Barbara County, and 98 percent below the State of California.

Table 3-10. Comparison of Incomes, 2000 (1999 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guadalupe ($)</th>
<th>Nipomo ($)</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County ($)</th>
<th>State of California ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>31,955</td>
<td>49,852</td>
<td>46,677</td>
<td>47,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference compared to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+ 56.0%</td>
<td>+ 46.1%</td>
<td>+ 48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>11,431</td>
<td>18,824</td>
<td>23,059</td>
<td>22,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference compared to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+ 64.6%</td>
<td>+ 101.7%</td>
<td>+ 98.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 2000, SF 3, Tables P53, P82

In addition to having lower median incomes, Guadalupe’s population had a larger percentage of citizens living below the poverty line. The US Census determines threshold values for those living below the poverty line based on household size and income. For instance, in 1999 it was determined that a family of four needed to make $17,463 per year in order to live above the poverty line. The data reveals 25 percent of residents in Guadalupe earned less than this amount. This percentage was significantly higher than Nipomo, Santa Barbara County, and the State of California, who had 7 percent, 14.3 percent, and 14.2 percent respectively (Table 3-11).
Table 3-11. Comparison of Populations below Poverty Line, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guadalupe</th>
<th>Nipomo</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County</th>
<th>State of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Poverty Line</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>11,589</td>
<td>329,426</td>
<td>28,393,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>85.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty Line</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>55,086</td>
<td>4,706,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 2000, SF 3, Tables P87

Households are classified into income groups according to the percentage of an area’s median income earned. In 2000, household incomes revealed a trend similar to the poverty level data (Table 3-12). Of the 1,414 households in Guadalupe, 57 percent were classified in the very low or low income groups.

Table 3-12. Households by Income Group, Guadalupe, CA, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Income Threshold*</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>$23,338</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$23,338 to $37,341</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>$37,342 to $56,012</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td>Greater than $56,012</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 2000, SF3, Table P52
*SBCAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment, 2007

Unemployment and Labor Force Participation

Along with assessing quality of life, economic indicators are also useful for determining the economy’s ability to provide jobs for local residents. According to the California Department of Finance, in 2007 the unemployment rate in Guadalupe was 5.7 percent. Since 2000, unemployment has fluctuated up to a high of 6.7 percent in 2002, and a low of 5.3 percent in 2006 (Table 3-13).

Table 3-13. Guadalupe Unemployment, 2000-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance

Although changes in Guadalupe’s unemployment rate have coincided with changes across the state, over the past seven years the City has generally experienced higher levels of unemployment than comparison populations (Figure 3-3). Starting in 2000, Guadalupe had a higher unemployment rate than the State of California, Santa Barbara County and Nipomo. This
trend continued in 2001, and although 2002 saw unemployment rates rise for all four populations, Guadalupe and California had the highest unemployment rates at 6.7 percent. In 2003 and 2004, Guadalupe’s unemployment rate dropped slightly below the State of California. However, in 2005 and 2006 as unemployment rates dropped across the State, Guadalupe experienced a smaller overall decrease and again had the highest unemployment rate. As unemployment trends increased across comparison populations in 2007, Guadalupe was again the highest at 5.7 percent.

Figure 3-3. Comparison of Unemployment Rates, 2000-2007

Labor force participation is a measure of legally aged citizens who are working or looking for work. According to the 2000 census Guadalupe had a labor force participation rate of 54 percent (Table 3-14). Males had a higher participation rate than females, 63.8 percent compared to 44.4 percent.

Table 3-14. Labor Force and Employment, by Gender 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers age 16 and over</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>4,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>2,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force Participation Rate*</td>
<td>63.80%</td>
<td>44.40%</td>
<td>54.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**3.0 DEMOGRAPHICS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

* Population in labor force over population age 16 and over. Source: US Census Bureau 2000, SF 3, Table P43

Compared to surrounding areas and the State, Guadalupe had relatively low labor force participation in 2000 (Table 3-15). Guadalupe had 6.3 percent lower labor force participation than Nipomo, 8.8 percent lower than Santa Barbara County, and 8.1 percent lower than the State of California.

Table 3-15. Comparison of Unemployment and Labor Force Participation Rates, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guadalupe</th>
<th>Nipomo</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County</th>
<th>State of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$31,955</td>
<td>$49,852</td>
<td>$46,677</td>
<td>$47,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force Participation Rate</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 2000, SF 3, Table P43

Overall, the low labor force participation, the high unemployment rates, and the low median household income are indicators of a lagging local economy. Nearly half of the working age population is not working, and those that are working are being paid low wages. This data raises concerns about job quality, job quantity, job diversity, and the wages earned in the jobs that are available.

**Industries and Jobs Provided within Guadalupe**

Every five years the United States Census Bureau conducts an economic census of the Nation, states, counties, and cities. Although the latest economic census took place in 2007, the data will not be available until 2009. As a result, data used in this section, unless otherwise noted, reflects numbers from 2002.

A particularly important aspect of the US Economic Census is that it enables cities to compare their economic makeup to neighboring populations, as well as to larger economic regions of which they are a part. One approach to doing this is to determine the average annual salary for industries across the state, and based on these numbers identify whether a local economy has a diverse mix of “low”, “medium”, and “high” income jobs (Table 3-16). With these numbers a smaller economy, such as Guadalupe, can be more easily understood and classified for its relative strengths or weaknesses.
3.0 DEMOGRAPHICS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Table 3-16. Industrial Sectors and Average Annual Salaries in California, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Sector</th>
<th>Average Annual Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Salary Industrial Sectors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>$13,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>$23,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$24,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$24,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative &amp; support</td>
<td>$25,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Salary Industrial Sectors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>$33,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>$33,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>$34,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$36,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$37,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$41,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>$46,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$48,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Salary Industrial Sectors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>$53,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>$62,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$62,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$66,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Business</td>
<td>$72,638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Economic Census, 2002

Citizens in Guadalupe are predominantly employed in nine industries (Figure 3-4). In 2008, it is estimated that these nine industries provide 2,426 jobs, 76 percent of which are in industrial sectors characterized by “low” average salaries. Of the remaining jobs, 19 percent are in “medium” salary industries and approximately five percent are in “high” salary jobs.

Figure 3-4. Top Employing Industries for Guadalupe Residents, 2008

Source: ESRI, 2008
While understanding the type of industries that employ a city’s residents is important, it is equally important to identify where those industries are located. If large percentages are located outside of the city then it can be reasonably assumed that there is a lack of local job opportunities for a city’s population.

One method of determining the location of the top employing industries is to look at the average commute times for residents. For Guadalupe residents, a particularly useful threshold is to look at the proportion of the population with commute times over 15 minutes. Any commuter with less than 15 minutes of commute time can be expected to work either within the City limits, or in the agriculture fields immediately surrounding it. Beyond 15 minutes, a commuter may be traveling to Santa Maria, Nipomo, or another city.

With this in mind, and based on the information provided in Figure 3-5, it is reasonable to assume that the majority of the employed population in Guadalupe worked outside of the City and its surrounding areas in 2000. In total, 81 percent of commuters identified that they had a commute time of over 15 minutes. In general, this speaks to a lack of employment opportunities within the City.

Figure 3-5. Commute Times for Guadalupe Residents, 2000

![Commuter Times Diagram]

Source: US Census Bureau 2000, SF3, Table P31

This observation is confirmed with data from the 2002 Census Survey of Business Owners (Table 3-17). In 2002 Guadalupe had a total of 254 firms, 49 of which had paid employees. Total employees numbered 364 and had a payroll of $10.74 million. Compared to the 2,271 (2000) citizens employed, local establishments provided approximately 16 percent of the jobs held by residents. Further analysis reveals that 2002 per capita payroll was 16 percent of the 2000 per
capita income. This indicates that 84 percent of resident’s incomes were earned from outside the City and further demonstrates the size of the gap in local earning potential.

Table 3-17. Local Economic Breakdown, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Firms</th>
<th>254</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employer Firms</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Employer Firms</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Payroll</td>
<td>$10.74 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Economic Census, 2002

City Expenditures and Revenues

The anticipated 2008 to 2009 budget for Guadalupe is shown in Table 3-18. The projection is calculated by taking the remaining fund balance from the 2007 to 2008 fiscal year, subtracting estimated expenditures, and adding the estimated revenues and net transfers. Even though Guadalupe anticipates spending roughly $5.8 million dollars over expected revenues, the $7.7 million balance from the previous fiscal year results in the estimated balance of $1.9 million at the end of the 2008-2009 fiscal year.

Table 3-18. Guadalupe Projected Budget 2008 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6/30/08 Fund Balances</th>
<th>$7,797,200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Expenditures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Revenues</td>
<td>$12,748,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers in</td>
<td>$103,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30/09 Estimated Fund Balances</td>
<td>$1,958,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Guadalupe Budget, 2008

In order to gain a clearer perspective on the ability of Guadalupe’s economy to provide revenue for government programs it is helpful to further examine its revenue producing resources. The City has identified six areas as revenue sources for the 2008 to 2009 fiscal year. They are: 1) Taxes, 2) Licenses and Permits, 3) Fines and Penalties, 4) Revenue from other Agencies, 5) Charges for Current Services, and 6) Other Revenues. Figure 3-6 shows the share of these areas.

- Taxes consist of those funds generated through property taxes ($850,000), sales & use tax ($250,000), franchise fees ($175,000), real property transfer tax ($3,000), and utility user tax ($300,000). In total they are expected to account for 42 percent of the City’s revenues.
- Licenses and permits consist mostly of money generated through business licenses ($15,000) and construction building permits ($60,000). For the 2008 to 2009 fiscal year they are anticipated to make up two percent of total revenue.
- Fines and penalties consist of criminal fines and penalties, civil code fines, booking fees, and other miscellaneous fines and penalties. At one percent, this is the smallest portion of the City’s revenue.
• Revenue from other agencies was mostly made up of a $195,000 grant from FEMA for repairs to the pedestrian bridge and city hall. This is expected to account for seven percent of total revenue.
• Current services include parks and recreation fees, environmental review, grading permits, plan check fees, special fire service fees, and others. Overall this accounts for one percent of the City’s total revenue.
• Other revenues include interest from interfund loans ($1,507,400) and miscellaneous income ($120,000). As the largest source of revenue for the City it is expected to provide 47 percent of total revenue.

Figure 3-6. 2008-2009 Guadalupe Total Revenues

In addition to revenues, it is also important to understand the nature of expenditures within a city. In the City of Guadalupe, there are seven expenditure areas that will account for $18.6 million in the fiscal year 2008 to 2009 (Figure 3-7). These categories are 1) The General Fund, 2) The Enterprise Fund, 3) Public Safety Funds, 4) Special Grant and Public Works, 5) Special Road Funds, 6) Capital Project Funds, and 7) Redevelopment funds. Spending highlights for these seven categories are discussed below.

• The General Fund is the primary operating account for a city and consists of the money spent to finance various aspects of city operation. For Guadalupe’s adopted budget it consists of money for parks and recreation ($116,229), building and safety ($209,478), police ($1,625,658), building and maintenance ($404,443), finance and treasurer ($329,171), city attorney ($60,000), administration and community development ($504,752), and the city council ($20,000). With a total allotment of $3.7 million it represents 18 percent of the City’s total expenditures.
• The Enterprise Funds consist of the water operation fund ($1,439,152), wastewater operating fund ($803,763), solid waste fund ($456,200), and transit fund ($343,900). At a little more than $3 million, it accounts for 15 percent of total expenditures.
• Public Safety Funds consist of money for the fire and police public safety fund ($12,000), Supplemental Law Enforcement Service Fund ($172,286), Drug Task Force ($30,000), and an Alcohol and Drug Prevention Grant ($20,000). At one percent this represents the smallest amount of expenditures.
• Special Grant and Public Works generally consists of money for public works or other projects. Among those in the adopted 2008 to 2009 budget are several Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) projects, including $3,024,300 for the new water tower and $503,200 for the Department of Transportation to create safe routes to school. For the 2008-2009 fiscal year this accounts for 26 percent of expenditures.
• Special Road Funds are made up of money allotted for the gas tax fund ($664,678), as well as Measure D ($640,324), which allocates a portion of sales and transaction costs to road projects, and local transportation funds ($460,000). In total, Special Road Funds represent seven percent of expenditures for Guadalupe.
• Capital Projects Funds consist of money for the Water ($650,000) and Wastewater ($230,000) Capital Funds. For 2008 to 2009 this accounts for four percent of expenditures.
• Redevelopment Funds represent the money used to help support the Redevelopment Agency. For the new budget that consists of financing the Operating Fund ($1,201,881), Bond Refinance Projects ($3,228,000), Capital Projects Fund ($150,000), Commercial Rehab Fund ($100,000) and the Affordable Housing Fund ($1,050,000). At 28 percent this represents the largest portion of expenditures for the City.

Figure 3-7. 2008-2009 Guadalupe Total Expenditures

Source: City of Guadalupe Budget, 2008
3.4 Emerging Directions

Guadalupe’s population has realized steady growth since 1990. While this has been the normal trend, as discussed in later chapters, agriculture lands on the City’s boundary limit expansion opportunities. As a result, the City must look to build within its existing limits if it is to accommodate continued urban growth. Projects such as DJ Farms, which has been approved for construction, will help support any population growth in the short-run. However, looking into the future, if growth continues there will be a need for creative infill strategies to ensure that the City can continue to accommodate growth.

Along with the overall size of the population, there may also be changes to its makeup. With a high proportion of citizens under the age of 18, it may be assumed that the population will shift older. From 1990 to 2000, there was a slight decrease in minors, and this trend can be expected to continue. As teenagers become young adults, will they have the opportunity to remain in Guadalupe and become contributing citizens or will they be forced to move in search of jobs? Additionally, as younger children become teenagers, will there be adequate school and recreation facilities to meet their needs? Each of these questions has important implications for future growth in the City.

In terms of economics, community vision meetings held in Guadalupe indicate a desire for a stronger economic base within the community. The reliance on three industries to provide jobs is not representative of a diverse economic base and may help explain historically elevated unemployment rates and decreased labor force participation. Among the efforts required to accomplish economic stability, there is a call for the reestablishment of the Chamber of Commerce. Citizens believe this would help recruit businesses and establish jobs within the city. Among the jobs and industries the community hopes to see, of particular interest is a large supermarket, from which the city hopes to capture a greater amount of tax-revenue and create income for local residents.

An additional area where community members would like to see improvement is from the city promoting tourist and recreational amenities. Given Guadalupe’s proximity to the beach there is a belief that tourism could offer an economic opportunity for the city. Two areas that can encourage this are growth along Guadalupe Street and a more established connection to the beach.

To provide the facilities and services desired by residents and businesses, the City must find ways to expand its revenue. Although the 2008/2009 Budget is heavily funded from the previous year’s surplus, increased revenues and/or decreased expenses will be needed to ensure continued fiscal health. While state grants and inter-agency loans can help alleviate some of the fiscal pressure, the most common means of revenue growth is through retail sales tax, transient occupancy taxes, property taxes, and state subventions.
4.0 LAND USE

4.1 Introduction
The Land Use Element coordinates each of the required and optional elements of the General Plan into a unified plan to guide future development. It is one of the seven required Elements, each of which carries equal legal weight. The Land Use Element considers land use, physical, legal and environmental constraints, and the needs and wants of the community to create policies that guide land use, growth, and quality of life. Figure 4-1 shows the boundaries of the General Plan Area. This chapter discusses the following land uses:

- Industrial
- Commercial
- Residential
- Agriculture/Open Space
- Public Facilities/Parks

Figure 4-1. General Plan Area for the City of Guadalupe

Source: City of Guadalupe General Plan, 2002
4.2 Guideline Requirements

According to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) General Plan Guidelines (2003), the Land Use Element is a long range vision that guides decisions regarding zoning, subdivision, and public works. The Guidelines recommend that the Element address the distribution of housing, businesses, industry, open space, agriculture, mineral resources, and recreational facilities. It should identify locations of educational facilities, public buildings, and future solid and liquid waste disposal sites. The Land Use Element must also identify flood zones and Alquist-Priolo seismic safety zones. It also requires standards for determining population density, though local governments can decide if this standard applies to residential uses only, or other land uses as well. Also, intensity must be identified for each of the land uses, showing the range of land use intensity allowed on a site.

**Land Use Intensity - Standards**

- Population density is expressed as the number of people in a given area, not as dwelling units per acre (General Plan Guidelines, 2003).
- Residential density is expressed as maximum dwelling units per acre.
- Commercial and Industrial intensities of land use are expressed as Floor Area Ratios (FAR).

The following give examples of residential densities and commercial and industrial intensities of land use:

**Table 4-1. Typical Residential Densities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Gross Density du/acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>up to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero lot line, detached single-family</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-family, detached</td>
<td>8 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row houses</td>
<td>12 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>20 to 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkup apartments</td>
<td>30 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-story apartments</td>
<td>50 to 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighborhood Type**

- Mixed use 4.5
- Higher density TOD 20


**Table 4-2. Commercial/Industrial – Floor area ratio building intensity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Industrial Parks</th>
<th>Office Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Size</td>
<td>300 acres</td>
<td>40 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum recommended size</td>
<td>35 acres</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical FAR</td>
<td>0.1-0.5</td>
<td>avg. 0.25-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Employee Densities</td>
<td>10-30/acre</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical parking spaces per employee</td>
<td>0.8-1.0</td>
<td>avg. 4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Background

The City of Guadalupe is located within Santa Barbara County. It is surrounded by agricultural land and is situated in close proximity to the entrance of the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve.

Regional Context

El Rancho de Guadalupe originally was a land grant of 32,408 acres of northwestern Santa Barbara County from the Mexican Government to Teodoro Arrellanes and Diego Olivera in 1842 (Downtown Design Guidelines, 1999). Founded in 1872, the town of Guadalupe “evolved to be one of the oldest and most culturally diverse communities on the Central Coast. The architecture of the buildings in the downtown corridor is most reflective of the diverse spirit of the community. Preservation and protection of the culture and character of Guadalupe is of principal importance to residents and community leaders” (Downtown Design Guidelines, 1999, p.67).

The City of Guadalupe is under the jurisdiction of Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). SBCAG addresses issues of traffic, housing, air quality, and growth that cross many jurisdictional boundaries. The primary purpose is to solve public policy issues that are regional or multi-jurisdictional in nature. SBCAG also serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

Development Trends

Construction in Guadalupe is slow compared with other urban areas. According to the US Census, there were no building permits issued in Guadalupe in 1998, 1999, or 2000. As shown in table 4-3, in 2001, 47 single-family dwelling units were approved and built. In 2002, 48 units of single-family dwellings were constructed. In 2003, 51 single-family dwelling units were approved. The number of building permits spiked in 2004, with 16 single-family, 66 units of “three and four family,” and 53 units of “five or more family.” In 2005, construction slowed, with only six single-family units and 47 “five or more family” dwelling units. In 2006, building permits for 27 “five or more family” units were built, with a complete halt in construction in 2007 and 2008, which may be attributed to the slow real estate market and severe economic downturn in late 2008.

Table 4-3. Building Permits Over a Ten-Year Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three and four family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, Manufacturing, Mining, and Construction Statistics
4.4 Existing Conditions

This section addresses the land uses identified in the October 2008 land use inventory and how each land use is described in the 2002 General Plan. Figure 4-3 shows the land uses as defined in the inventory.

General Land Use Categories

The General Plan divides land uses in Guadalupe into several categories, which will be discussed in detail in the following section and subsequent chapters. The following land uses are discussed:

- Industrial
- Commercial
- Residential
- Agriculture/Open Space
- Public Facilities/Parks

The Policies and Plan Documents chapter addresses the Specific Plans. Figure 4-2 identifies the breakdown of the land uses in Guadalupe.

Figure 4-2. Land Uses in Guadalupe by acres and percentage

![Breakdown of Land Uses in Guadalupe - 2008](image)

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008
Figure 4-3. Land Use Map

City of Guadalupe Land Use Inventory
October 2008

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008
Industrial Land Uses

Industrial uses make up a large portion of the land in Guadalupe. These uses consist of warehousing for manufacturing, agricultural processing, distribution, and storage. There are three industrial land use designations in the 2002 General Plan: General Industrial, Light Industrial, and Planned Development Industrial.

There are 61.83 acres of industrial land in Guadalupe. The exact use at each site could not be determined from the visual survey, but the data represents an assessment of the land use. Figure 4-4 shows that 43 percent of industrial land is used for equipment storage, with 50 percent for warehousing. The largest portion of industrial uses is located to the east of Guadalupe Street and to the north of Main Street, as shown in Figure 4-5, along with other industrial use locations.

Figure 4-4. Industrial Land Use Categories

![Industrial Land Use Categories](image)

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008
Figure 4-5. Industrial Land Use Map

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008
General Plan Summary: Industrial Uses

The intent of the industrial land use category is to provide an opportunity for local employment and an improved tax base, serving both the local and regional area. The placement of industrial uses is critical in order to respect the relationship with surrounding land uses. There must be a healthy balance between protecting surrounding residents from the nuisances that industry can create, and the high monetary investment industry brings into the area. To ensure a pleasant environment for both the City and industry, there shall be planned industrial parks, the unification of architectural styles, as well as landscaping and buffer zones. The land adjacent to the railroad and Obispo Street is well-suited for industry.

- **Light Industrial**
  - Characterized by the absence of smoke, fumes, and other noxious effects.
- **General Industrial**
  - May have these effects if they cannot be fully avoided, however all industrial uses are subject to performance standards concerning noise, aesthetics, traffic, and air pollution.
- **Planned Development-Industrial**
  - This designation is listed but not further described in the General Plan (2002).

Commercial Land Uses

Commercial land uses include retail, personal services, and office uses (see Appendix A). The commercial land uses were divided into three major categories for the land use inventory: retail trade, which includes shopping centers, strip commercial, convenience stores, markets, auto sales, or restaurants; office uses, which include general office, business offices, or technology companies; and personal services such as banks, real estate agencies, laundry, or beauty parlors. There are 28.55 acres of commercial uses in Guadalupe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>PERCENT OF COMMERCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Market</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use Commercial</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>20.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Retail</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial with parking</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>9.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial without parking</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>12.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>17.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Office</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.81</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008

The Downtown Commercial District in Guadalupe is roughly defined as the area between 5th and Seventh Streets and Pioneer and Olivera Streets. Most of the commercial uses are focused
in this area. Table 4-4 shows that most of the commercial uses are mixed use or office buildings. Neighborhood markets and restaurants are the next largest categories. Outside of the downtown area, there is a strip mall shopping center on the corner of Guadalupe and Main Street with various services. There are few shops that serve individuals’ daily needs, otherwise known as personal or professional services. Also, Guadalupe notably lacks a grocery store. The locations of these uses are shown in Figure 4-6.

**General Plan Summary: Commercial Uses**

The intent of the commercial land use category is to maintain a healthy commercial base, which is important for revenue to the City and in terms of convenience offered to residents, being able to purchase a wide range of products and services locally. There are two commercial types established in the adopted 2002 General Plan.

- **Central Business District**
  - The existing CBD is approximately seven city blocks in size, including retail, commercial, restaurants, and some office space.

- **General Commercial**
  - This includes any strip commercial or commercial that is out of the defined CBD.
Figure 4-6. Commercial Land Use Map

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008
Residential Land Uses
The inventory identifies two major categories of residential land uses: single-family homes and multi-family homes. Single-family homes are intended for one family residing in one attached or detached building, or structure. Multi-family homes include duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, condominiums, apartments, and other settings where there are multiple attached units on one parcel. Table 4-5 shows the various land uses, acreages, number of dwelling units, and densities in Guadalupe. The densities are similar to those recommended for each housing type in the Standards section (Table 4-1).

Table 4-5. Residential Land Uses by Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Density (du/acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>187.8</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>181.56</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>52.24</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>11.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Development</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>19.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplex</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>19.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008

There are two locations in the City, as shown in Figure 4-7, with large quantities of single-family homes. One area is west of Guadalupe Street and south of Seventh Street. The other area is east of Obispo Street. The average density of the single-family home neighborhoods is 6.49 dwelling units per acre (du/acre). In the Northern portion of the City, there is a mix of single-family, multi-family, and various densities of dwelling units. The densities of multi-family homes are generally higher than the single-family homes with a maximum of 19.79 du/acre.

General Plan Summary: Residential Uses
The General Plan states that the residential category affects the character and quality of the City more than any other land use. The main distinction of the following subcategories is residential density.

- **Neighborhood/Low Density Residential.** One to six dwelling units per gross acre for detached single-family housing.

- **Medium Density Residential.** Six to 10 units per gross acre. Multi-family housing.
• **High Density Residential.** 10 to 20 units per gross acre. Should be located near the activity centers.

• **Residential Planned Development.** More flexibility and possible density bonuses.

**Agriculture, Open Space, and Park Land Uses**

Guadalupe contains approximately 60 acres of agricultural uses. The DJ Farms Specific Plan area is 212.5 acres of agricultural land, separately accounted for as it is a large portion of land designated for development under a specific plan. There are approximately 60 acres of open space and 20 acres of parks. Agriculture and open space uses are discussed further in Chapters 8.0, Conservation, and 9.0, Open Space.

**General Plan**

The agriculture, open space, and parks land use designations are concerned with resource management. The Agriculture designation applies to active agricultural uses. Open Space includes grazing activities, sensitive environmental habitats, and passive recreation. Parks, or recreational facilities, contribute to a healthful city and aesthetically pleasing environment. All of the agricultural land that surrounds Guadalupe is under Williamson Act contracts; however, none of the land within the city limits is under the Williamson Act. There is agricultural land within the city limits that the City wishes to acquire, but the owners have yet to agree to sell. The City also wishes to acquire the wetlands area, but the landowner is also uninterested in selling.

**Public Facilities**

Public Facilities include land uses such as government offices, fire stations, police stations, hospital and health facilities, community centers, schools, wastewater treatment plants, and libraries which are owned and operated by the City. There are no future solid waste disposal sites planned within the City limits. Solid waste is transported outside the City to the City of Santa Maria Landfill. Public Facilities are discussed further in Chapter 7.0.
Figure 4-7. Residential Land Use Map

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008
Figure 4-8. Agriculture, Open Space, and Parks Acreage

![Pie chart showing land use distribution](chart.png)

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008

**Vacant and Underutilized Land**

Vacant land contains two categories: land that is completely vacant, and underutilized land with unoccupied structures in disrepair. There are 25.36 acres of vacant developable land in Guadalupe; the locations of the parcels are shown in Figure 4-10. The vacant parcels are dispersed throughout the City in both residential areas and commercial/retail areas. The vacant land accounts for approximately 4 percent of the total acreage.

Figure 4-9 shows that 24 percent of the vacant land is zone R-1, single-family, low-density residential. Medium and High Density Residential is 25 percent of the vacant land, R-2 and R-3. General Commercial and General Industrial are each approximately one quarter of the vacant land.
**Building Conditions**

As depicted in Figure 4-10, the land use inventory showed that 83 percent of the buildings in Guadalupe are in good condition. Another 10 percent are in need of minor repairs or maintenance, such as exterior painting. Seven percent of the parcels were vacant. A total of nine parcels in the city had either buildings in need of major structural repairs or had remnants of a building structure.

**Figure 4-10. Building Conditions in Guadalupe by Parcel**
Figure 4-11. Vacant Land Map

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008
4.5 Policies and Plan Documents

The Land Use Element was adopted in December 1986, reformatted in April 2001, and revised in February 2002. In September 2008, the City commissioned Cal Poly to perform an update of the Background Report and develop a Community Plan.

City of Guadalupe General Plan – Review of Existing Land Use Element

The Land Use Element lays out specific goals, policies, and programs to help guide growth in Guadalupe. Emphasis is placed on the compatibility of land uses, historic preservation, environmental protection, sustainable economic development, infill development, affordable housing, and the prevention of sprawl. The following 2002 General Plan goals guide growth in Guadalupe in 2009:

Goals

1. To guide the City of Guadalupe by providing a planning approach which reduces public service costs, preserves community character, and enhances the environmental quality.

2. To manage development to reduce construction and maintenance costs, improve infrastructure efficiency, prevent urban sprawl, support community preferred lifestyles and maintain property values.

3. To separate incompatible land uses for functional efficiency, reduction of nuisance, and improvement of health and safety.

4. To stabilize and maintain the older portions of Guadalupe for more efficient use of services, protection of the housing supply, prevention of blight and maintenance of property and tax values.

5. To preserve and encourage residential neighborhoods to strengthen community identity, provide efficient service distribution, reduce transportation demands and protect the family.

6. To develop vacant and under-utilized land within existing urban and suburban areas for the maximum benefit of the entire community.

7. To provide long-term, high standard commercial growth of a stable and permanent nature that maintains and enhances the quality and well-being of the community.

8. To provide for quality residential development that will provide both attractive and economical dwellings for all segments of the population, yet protect and enlarge the overall community.

9. To provide for creative opportunities that will encourage development of economic housing and protect the environmental quality through the use of performance standards.
Policies

Policies in the 2002 General Plan encourage innovative land use techniques, residential clustering, environmental preservation, and community livability, and require case-by-case analysis of potential annexations, consistency of proposed County projects with the City’s General Plan, and sound and orderly growth.

Policies regarding the Agriculture land use category encourage urbanization of land within the planning area, the minimization of land use impacts on surrounding agriculture, and the continuation of agricultural uses in unincorporated areas. Specific policies require prime agricultural lands to be protected from urban development, but only “until such time it is established that conversion to urban uses is necessary” (p.56).

Central Business District policies encourage mixed residential and commercial uses and adaptive reuse of older buildings. The City is to work to strengthen its partnership with the private sector to protect and expand the economic viability of the downtown, primarily providing retail and service businesses to serve the community and its visitors.

General Commercial uses are to maintain a buffer between themselves and adjacent land uses, preferably developed in the form of commercial parks. Future commercial uses are to be designated only as the urban area expands; “isolated islands in advance of residential development” are not allowed. The City’s design and architectural standards must be met, and mixed-use (residential uses above office and retail) is encouraged.

Industrial uses require a buffer between themselves and adjacent land uses of lower intensity. Industrial development is to serve the local economy, not detract from the environment, and should be developed within designated industrial sites with a planned industrial park concept. Diversified, clean, labor-intensive light industrial uses are encouraged and the City will provide incentives for non-polluting industries when considering a location in the City. Areas indicated for industrial development shall be protected from encroachment of residential and/or other incompatible land uses, and traffic impacts must be mitigated.

Policies encourage well-designed and innovative residential development with a variety of housing types and densities. Incentives in the form of density bonuses are offered for providing a variety of amenities, as well as superior quality and design, and infill of vacant lots. Residential development shall only occur when water and sewer service is available or can be provided by the developer, and must be protected from higher intensity uses through buffer zones.

Programs

The City of Guadalupe has a number of programs, but many have yet to be implemented. The City shall work with the County to discourage “parcelization” of agricultural land. Regarding the Central Business District, the City shall provide incentives for new businesses to locate here, implement a program to enhance, conserve, and revitalize the historic character, develop fee
incentives for new mixed-use development, continue the efforts of the Redevelopment Agency, and develop and implement an urban design program that includes an overall master plan. The plan will include a design theme, prioritization of beautification projects, downtown parking improvements, and an appropriate lighting theme. The City shall appoint a committee of local downtown merchants, private enterprises, and local government, and establish procedures and methodology to improve the local tax base through the continued use of non-polluting commercial and industrial uses. The City shall cooperate with the local Chamber of Commerce, and create design criteria for the renovation and improvement of the downtown and entranceways of the City.

Downtown Design Guidelines

With the adoption of the Downtown Design Guidelines (1999), the Downtown Design Committee’s mission was “to create a master plan for the revitalization and physical development of Downtown Guadalupe. The master plan shall develop guidelines to preserve the historical and cultural character of Guadalupe, while blending the new with the old” (p.6). The overall goal of the guidelines is to “preserve and enhance the quality of design, which will promote an aesthetically pleasing downtown as well as stimulate economic and social vitality [...] it is highly encouraged that innovative design options and higher quality standards be pursued” (p.7).

Visual Preference Survey (1999) responses indicated that most participants preferred the removal of overhead power lines in the downtown corridor, building awnings that cover sidewalk entrances to buildings, pedestrian-oriented lighting and landscape enhancements such as street trees and cross-walk pavers. Respondents ascertained a need for future restaurants, Bed & Breakfast establishments, outdoor cafés, nightclubs, and some professional office space. Community members concluded that attention should be paid to the historic character of the downtown corridor, thus supporting development regulations that serve to protect and enhance the physical qualities of downtown.

The Downtown Concept Plan seeks to create a sense of destination, including primary improvements such as streetscape enhancements and the revitalization of under-utilized lots (Downtown Design Guidelines, 1999). Citizens also want accessible parking, slower traffic, and attractive pedestrian spaces. Great importance has been placed on the pedestrian experience.

New development shall adhere to the diverse character of the existing neighborhood and be integrated into the surrounding area. Policy A22 encourages innovative uses of public spaces to increase the livelihood of the downtown corridor.

The community requires effort to be made to retain existing historic buildings and, in terms of land use, Policy G2 requires that consideration should be given to the prevailing urban patterns such as intensity, massing, height, materials and scale. Policy G9 states that all buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no
historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged. Policy G13 encourages restoration and adaptive re-use of structures.

**Redevelopment Agency Five-Year Implementation Plan**

According to the Redevelopment Agency Five-Year Implementation Plan (February 2005), which is for 2005 to 2009, the Project Area consists of about 701 acres, or 70 percent of the land within the city limits. Since its establishment in 1985, the primary focus of the Agency has been:

> “to provide infrastructure improvements to enable the full and beneficial development of properties within the Project Area. In 1987, the Agency sold $1.7 million in bonds to finance the expansion of the City’s sewage treatment plant, and to make improvements to the City’s water system. Both improvements were essential to enabling continued development in accordance with the City’s General Plan. In addition, the Agency has acquired vacant industrial properties on the east side of the City and provided ‘off-site’ improvements and other incentives to encourage their development. The Agency has also acquired land for much-needed moderate income residential development (Point Sal Dunes), and has provided grants for commercial façade improvements in the downtown, and approved a program for housing rehabilitation loans. All of these efforts have helped to improve the economic conditions within the City, provide jobs and remove physical and economic blight” (2005, p.5-6).

The previous plan (August 2000) described a range of redevelopment activities and housing programs aimed at eliminating conditions of blight, both of physical and economic characteristics. These same problems persist and, as such, are included in the most recent plan.

- **Defective Design and Character of Physical Construction**
  - Prior to 1940 construction; noncompliant with modern building codes
  - Limited fire suppression facilities (i.e. fire sprinklers, emergency exists)
  - Unreinforced Masonry
- **Faulty Exterior Spacing**
  - Limits the amount of off-street parking available; serious shortage
  - Greatly restricts access for deliveries and storage, limiting the type of businesses that can occupy such buildings
- **Residential Overcrowding**
- **Age and Obsolescence/Dilapidation and Deterioration**
- **Mixed Character of Buildings**
  - Impacts related to noise, odors, fire safety, parking, other nuisances
  - Along Guadalupe Street, several residences on commercial lots adjacent to existing commercial, and sometimes industrial, land uses
- **Lots of Irregular Form and Shape for Proper Usefulness and Development**
- **Areas of Inadequate Public Improvements such as water and sewer systems**
- **Depreciated Values and Economic Maladjustment**
- **Depreciated or Stagnant Property Values**
Specific Plan

There are three Specific Plan areas established in the adopted 2002 General Plan, as shown in Figure 4-12.

- DJ Farms Specific Plan (Public Review Draft April 2006)
- River View Specific Plan (December 1998)
- Point Sal Dunes Specific Plan (March 1990)

DJ Farms Specific Plan

Intended to be consistent with the General Plan, the Specific Plan, revised in April 2006, outlines the development of 209 acres, in the southeastern section of the main incorporated portion of the City, south of West Main Street, or State Route 166. To be phased in over several years, the Plan is a revision of the original Specific Plan adopted in May 1995, now calling for 980 single-family lots in varying sizes, 18 acres of commercial land use, a new middle school site, and a public park for active recreation. More than 80 percent of the Specific Plan area is directly surrounded by County-zoned Agriculture (AG-II-40) – entirely to the east, west, and south, and partially to the north as well. As a result, the Plan requires an agricultural buffer around the perimeter of the plan area.

The Specific Plan is designed to mitigate potential conflicts with surrounding agricultural operations, and noise impacts from the railroad and major roads. A goal of the plan is to allow the development of new commercial businesses, without detriment to the downtown revitalization efforts, supported by a limit on Floor Area Ratios (FAR). The Plan seeks to provide a mix of land uses, to accommodate needed housing, expand retail opportunities, provide jobs, and include pedestrian and bicycle paths, and other amenities. The Plan also lays out the circulation system, standards for residential design and attractive development (consistent with the scale and character of the community), and capital improvements needed to accommodate the desired development, such as water, sewer, drainage, roads, fire, police, a school site, parks, and library services – much of which is to be paid for by the developer.

Riverview Specific Plan

Approved in December 1998 and recently built-out, the 26-acre Riverview Specific Plan area consists of Riverview Townhomes, 80 units in a permanently affordable rental community adjacent to Riverview Estates, a 50-home People’s Self-Help Housing (PSHH) owner-builder development, located in the southwestern portion of the City, and is entirely built-out. The site is bounded by West Main Street to the south, Jack O’Connell Park and the City of Guadalupe Sewer Plant to the west, the Santa Maria River floodplain to the north, and the Point Sal Dunes residential development to the east. In addition to the 130 residential units, the Riverview community includes a 5,000 square-foot community center with health clinic (providing tenants with medical screening services), a 5,000 square-foot learning center offering education assistance to children and adults, recreational facilities, and a secured gateway entrance.
According to the developer’s website (Peoples’ Self-Help Housing), this development received “major support from the Mayor and City Council of the City of Guadalupe, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the State Department of Housing & Community Development, the Rural Community Assistance Corp., Alliant Capital and Wells Fargo Bank.” The residential opportunities include a range of housing types, namely 50 single-family detached units on private lots, and 80 cluster townhome style units oriented around the common open space and park area. While the community is supposed to have access to a pathway running the length of the northern portion of the site along the Santa Maria River, an October 2008 site visit revealed the absence of a path. The Plan mentions a roadway connection with Point Sal Dunes, but in reality, a rod-iron fence currently prevents vehicle entry to Riverview.

*Point Sal Dunes Specific Plan*

Approved in March 1990, the 63-acre Point Sal Dunes Specific Plan area is located in the southwestern portion of the City, on the northern side of West Main Street, directly east of the Riverview Specific Plan area, and contiguous to the western edge of the Peacock Shores and Benita Homes Subdivisions. The project site, which was developed over five phases and has nine vacant parcels left as of October 2008, is bounded on the north by the Santa Maria River floodplain, the California Coastal Zone Boundary to the west. This Specific Plan area is characterized by approximately 250 single-family residential units of six different floor plans ranging from 1,505 to 2,093 square feet, on lots of between 6,000 and 11,200 square feet. The average lot is about 7,500 square feet. The entire northern edge of the Point Sal Dunes Specific Plan area is set aside for passive open space, buffering the Santa Maria River.
Figure 4-12. Specific Plans Map

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008
Santa Barbara County Land Use and Zoning Regulations

The City of Guadalupe is located within the Santa Maria Valley, an area defined as the agricultural trade center of the County. This intensive vegetable production region contains the largest area of prime agricultural lands in the County. The Agricultural Element (1991) of the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan has numerous goals and policies supporting the preservation of agricultural uses. Below are examples of the goals and policies which are applicable to the lands surrounding the City of Guadalupe.

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.

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.

Policy I.E. The County shall recognize that the generation of noise, smoke, odor, and dust is a natural consequence of the normal agricultural practices provided that agriculturalists exercise reasonable measures to minimize such effects.

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

Policy II.C. Santa Barbara County shall discourage the extension by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of urban spheres of influence into productive agricultural lands designated Agriculture II (A-II) or Commercial Agriculture (AC) under the Comprehensive Plan.

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.

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

Policy III.A. Expansion of urban development into active agricultural areas outside of urban limits is to be discouraged, as long as infill development is available.

Policy III.B. It is a County priority to retain blocks of productive agriculture within Urban Areas where reasonable, to continue to explore programs to support that use, and to recognize the importance of the objectives of the County’s Right to Farm Ordinance.
Surrounding County Land Use Designations

The following land use designations (as of September 25, 2008) surround the City of Guadalupe, under the jurisdiction of Santa Barbara County, but still within the City’s General Plan planning area: AC, A-II-40, and A-II-100.

Agriculture-Commercial (AC) (40 – 320 or more acre minimum parcel size)

This category is for commercially farmed, privately owned land located within either Rural, Inner-Rural, Existing Developed Rural Neighborhoods or Urban Areas which meets the following criteria:

1. The land is subject to a Williamson Act Contract, including contracts that have been non-renewed, or
2. Parcels forty (40) acres or greater, whether or not currently being used for agriculture but otherwise eligible for Williamson Act Contract, may be included if they meet requirements of Uniform Rule No. 6.

This category includes compatible land uses and land uses that are a necessary part of agricultural operations. All types of crops and livestock are included. Both “prime” and “non-prime” soils (as defined in the Williamson Act and the County’s Uniform Rule No. 6) and irrigated and non-irrigated lands are included.

Parcels which are smaller than forty (40) acres in size at the time of adoption of this Element may be eligible for the AC designation if they are “prime” or “super-prime” as defined by the County Uniform Rules and are eligible for agricultural preserve status.

Agriculture II (A-II) (40 or more acres minimum parcel size)

This designation applies to acreages of farm lands and agricultural uses located outside Urban, Inner Rural and Rural Neighborhood areas. General agriculture is permitted, including but not limited to livestock operations, grazing, and beef production as well as more intensive agriculture uses.

Surrounding County Zoning Designations

According to the County zoning map dated September 25, 2008, the surrounding County zoning designations include AG-II-40, AG-II-100, and AG-I-10 – as defined below.

AG-I (Agricultural I) zone

The AG-I zone is applied to areas appropriate for agricultural use within Urban, Inner Rural, Rural (Coastal Zone only), and Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood areas, as defined on the Comprehensive Plan maps. The intent is to provide standards that will support agriculture as a viable land use and encourage maximum agricultural productivity.
Within the Coastal Zone, the AG-I zone is intended to designate and protect lands appropriate for long term agricultural use within or adjacent to urbanized areas and to preserve prime agricultural soils.

**AG-II (Agricultural II) zone**

The AG-II zone is applied to areas appropriate for agricultural land uses on prime and non-prime agricultural lands located within the Rural Area as shown on the Comprehensive Plan maps. The intent is to preserve these lands for long-term agricultural use.

Within the Coastal Zone, the AG-II zone is intended to provide for agricultural land uses on large properties (a minimum of 40- to 320-acre lots) with prime and non-prime agricultural soils in the rural areas of the County, and to preserve prime and non-prime soils for long-term agricultural use.

**Coastal Commission**

The Coastal Commission has jurisdiction over the Coastal Zone boundary shown on the Land Use Map, covering the western portion of the City of Guadalupe including the waste water treatment plant, Jack O’Connell Park, several parcels within the Point Sal Dunes Specific Plan area, and the entire Riverview Specific Plan area (Figure 4-2). Although this area is largely built-out, should there be any additional building permits sought in alterations or additions, discretionary review shall fall under the purview of the Coastal Commission. The mission of the Coastal Commission is to “protect, conserve, restore, and enhance environmental and human-based resources of the California coast and ocean for environmentally sustainable and prudent use by current and future generations” (California Coastal Commission, 2008)

“This Coastal Commission, in partnership with coastal cities and counties, plans and regulates the use of land and water in the coastal zone. Development activities, which are broadly defined by the Coastal Act to include (among others) construction of buildings, divisions of land, and activities that change the intensity of use of land or public access to coastal waters, generally require a coastal permit from either the Coastal Commission or the local government.

The Coastal Act includes specific policies (see Division 20 of the Public Resources Code) that address issues such as shoreline public access and recreation, lower cost visitor accommodations, terrestrial and marine habitat protection, visual resources, landform alteration, agricultural lands, commercial fisheries, industrial uses, water quality, offshore oil and gas development, transportation, development design, power plants, ports, and public works. The policies of the Coastal Act constitute the statutory standards applied to planning and regulatory decisions made by the Commission and by local governments, pursuant to the Coastal Act” (California Coastal Commission, 2008).

**Hazards**

Hazards of concern in Guadalupe relate to flooding and earthquakes. Hazards are discussed further in Chapter 11.0, Safety.
Floodable Area. The City of Guadalupe has land within 100-year and 500-year flood zones, but none of these lands are currently developed or are considered for future development.

Other Hazards. As in most California cities, earthquakes are a concern for Guadalupe residents. For this reason, all of the unreinforced masonry buildings shall be retrofitted. Alluvial soils which create potential for more damage during earthquakes due to higher risks of liquefaction, are a concern for any development, but it is difficult to locate these soils until development begins.

4.6 Emerging Directions
The input gathered at community workshops and from interviews with City officials has helped Guadalupe residents formulate long-term goals for what they wish to preserve and what they wish to change. Historic restoration and preservation is seen as a priority to maintain the unique local character. The land use inventory reveals that there is room to grow and develop within the City Limits, reduce overcrowding in residential areas, and maintain the compact urban form as desired by the citizens, and as stated in the 2002 General Plan. To achieve such a goal, the City will need to work with local landowners to develop, or preserve, parcels of land for their optimal uses. Areas that can accommodate an appropriate mix of housing and commercial uses should be encouraged, and a space shall be provided for local community events. The Downtown Commercial area should accommodate more businesses in the Central Business District along Guadalupe Street, including a food center, to create a pedestrian-oriented environment and increase local tax revenue. This should also be an inviting environment that will have the appropriate facilities, such as a hotel, to attract and serve tourists. A shared parking policy between businesses may be beneficial for downtown development. Citizens also viewed the placement of the industrial zone near the railroad tracks as a good location for these land use types. The DJ Farms Specific Plan area can be analyzed for various strategic growth possibilities. Citywide land use and growth patterns, land use compatibility, and growth rates must all be considered when developing the Community Plan and making land use decisions.
5.0 CIRCULATION

5.1 Introduction
The circulation element is one of the seven mandatory elements required for a general plan according to California Government Code §65302. This element focuses on Guadalupe’s transportation system, which includes the infrastructure used to transport people and goods throughout the City and region. The circulation system is vital because it contributes to the health of the City’s physical, social, and economic environment. According to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines (2003), the circulation element must correlate directly to the land use element. It must also address:

- major thoroughfares
- transportation routes
- terminals
- other local public utilities and facilities.

This chapter covers these requirements and also addresses:

- community characteristics
- public transit routes, stops, and terminals
- railroads and railroad depots
- bicycle and pedestrian routes and facilities
- airports
- parking facilities

Each of these circulation components is provided with a definition, existing conditions, and emerging directions. These components are also evaluated to determine if it is adequate for the City’s population, and to determine what changes are needed to accommodate population growth.

5.2 Evaluative Standards
Transportation systems can be evaluated through level of service. Level of service (LOS) is a measure-of-effectiveness to determine the quality of service at, for example, intersections or sections of a street or highway. The LOS system uses the letters A through F, with A being no congestion and F being high congestion. There are different categories for Level of Service (LOS) depending on the mode type.

The Highway Capacity Manual (2000) provides a description of the LOS thresholds, which is presented in Table 5-1, Level of Service for Transit, and Table 5-2, Level of Service for Roads and Intersections. Santa Barbara County has adopted a standard of LOS C. However, the regional transportation planning authority, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG),
states that all regionally-significant transportation facilities must maintain a standard of LOS D or better. If service is below this level, a deficiency plan needs to be created to address congestion and air quality (Regional Transportation Plan, 2008).

Table 5-1. Level of Service (LOS) for Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Adjusted Service Frequency (Buses Per Hour)</th>
<th>Headway in Minutes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&gt;6.0</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Passengers don't need schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.01 to 6.0</td>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>Frequent service; passengers consult schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.0 to 4.0</td>
<td>15 to 20</td>
<td>Maximum desirable time to wait if bus is missed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.0 to 3.0</td>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>Service unattractive to choice riders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.0 to 2.0</td>
<td>31 to 60</td>
<td>Service available during hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>Service unattractive to all riders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5-2. Level of Service (LOS) Descriptions for Roads and Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Lane Highway</td>
<td>% Time Following</td>
<td>&lt;35</td>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>66-80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Speed (MPH)</td>
<td>&gt;55</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Descriptions</td>
<td>No Delays</td>
<td>Stable traffic flow. Speed becoming slightly restricted. Low restriction on maneuverability.</td>
<td>Minimal Delays</td>
<td>Stable traffic flow, but less freedom to select speed, change lanes or pass.</td>
<td>Minimal Delays</td>
<td>Traffic flow becoming unstable. Speeds subject to sudden change. Passing is difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsignalized Intersections (Four Way Stop)</td>
<td>Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds)</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>10--15</td>
<td>16--25</td>
<td>26--35</td>
<td>36--50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Descriptions</td>
<td>Very Short Delays</td>
<td>Short Delays</td>
<td>Minimal Delays</td>
<td>Minimal Delays</td>
<td>Significant Delays</td>
<td>Considerable Delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsignalized Intersection (Two Way Stop)</td>
<td>Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds)</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>11--15</td>
<td>16--25</td>
<td>26--35</td>
<td>36--50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Descriptions</td>
<td>Very Short Delays</td>
<td>Short Delays</td>
<td>Minimal Delays</td>
<td>Minimal Delays</td>
<td>Significant Delays</td>
<td>Considerable Delays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Community Characteristics

This section explains the modal split, travel times of residents, and the primary transportation corridors in Guadalupe. It provides an overview of the travel behaviors for Guadalupe residents.

Existing Conditions

Vehicle Availability

Figure 5-1 shows the vehicle availability per household for the City of Guadalupe according to the 2000 census. It indicates that automobiles are the key mode of transportation in Guadalupe as 91 percent of residents own at least one automobile and only nine percent are without an automobile.

Means of Transportation to Work

Figure 5-2 shows that according to the 2000 census, 90 percent of the population drove to work, four percent walked, three percent used other means of transportation, two percent worked at home, one percent used public transit, and zero percent biked to work. This mode split suggests that people are working outside of Guadalupe and must commute to work by car. It also shows that automobiles are the key means of transportation in Guadalupe. While data shows that transit use in 2000 was very low, more recent data shows that bus ridership has been increasing as discussed in section 5.5, Public Transit Routes Stops and Terminals.

Figure 5-1. Vehicle Availability per Household in Guadalupe

Source: US Census Bureau, SF3, H44,2000
Figure 5-2. Means of Transportation to Work for Residents in Guadalupe

Source: US Census Bureau, SF3, P30, 2000

Commute Time to Work

Figure 5-3 is a comparison of the City of Guadalupe residents’ commute times to those of Santa Barbara County residents as a whole. On average, City residents have longer commute times than County residents. This is due to the lack of jobs within the City of Guadalupe, which requires residents to commute to other cities for work. For example, Table 5-3 shows that Santa Maria employs 944 residents of Guadalupe while Guadalupe only employs 340 of its own residents.

Figure 5-3. Travel Time to Work

Source: US Census Bureau, SF3, P31, 2000
Table 5-3. Commute Distributions for Guadalupe Residents, by Number of Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Guadalupe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ynez Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc-Mission Hills-Vandenberg AFB</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria-Orcutt Area</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Santa Barbara Area</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unincorporated Areas in Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.L.O.</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Counties</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Persons Employed within</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: North County Regional Transit Plan, SBCAG, 2006.

Transportation Routes
As shown in Figure 5-4, the primary transportation corridors in Guadalupe are State Route 1 (SR 1), State Route 166 (SR 166), West Main Street, and the railroad running along SR 1. SR 1 and the bike route offer access to Grover Beach to the north, downtown Guadalupe, and Lompoc to the south. SR 166 allows access to Santa Maria to the east. West Main Street creates an entrance to the Guadalupe/Nipomo Dunes Reserve, and the railroad offers access to San Luis Obispo, the Bay Area, and Seattle to the north, and Los Angeles and San Diego to the South. Furthermore, the Guadalupe Flyer bus route offers hourly service to Santa Maria.

Implications
This section shows that Guadalupe is a very automobile oriented community. Most residents have commute times over 15 minutes, and leave Guadalupe for employment. Moreover, people are not walking to work often and not biking at all. Guadalupe is a compact city, which is partially due to the limited number of jobs within the city. The low levels of walking, cycling, and public transit use suggests these facilities may not be adequate to meet resident’s needs. Some problems may include disconnected bicycle and pedestrian routes as well as inadequate public transit service. These topics are covered in their respective sections.
Figure 5-4. City of Guadalupe Existing Circulation Map

Source: SBCAG for GIS and SMAT for Transit Route
5.4 Thoroughfares and Transportation Routes

This section covers the existing roadways in Guadalupe including State Highways, collector streets, local streets, and truck routes. It assesses current traffic conditions, capacities, traffic volumes, levels of service, adequacy of existing street and highway systems, traffic controls, automobile accidents, and road conditions.

Existing Conditions

The City of Guadalupe is intersected by two main thoroughfares, which include SR 1 which bisects the City from north to south and SR 166 which crosses the City from west to east. The downtown is designed in a traditional grid pattern, but the rest of the City is a mixture of loop and cul-de-sac streets.

Arterials

Arterial streets are primarily concerned with moving traffic safely and efficiently. There are two arterials in Guadalupe. These are SR 1 and SR 166.

State Route 1

State Route 1, also known as the Cabrillo Highway, passes through downtown Guadalupe, and is named Guadalupe Street through downtown. SR 1 is a two-lane highway with Class II bicycle lanes on both sides of the road. Class II bicycle lanes are lanes set aside specifically for bicycle usage. The highway connects to Grover Beach to the north and Lompoc to the south. It is the main arterial through the downtown, and provides access to many of the shops and restaurants downtown. The speed limit is reduced from 55 miles per hour to 25 miles per hour to accommodate the commercial land uses of downtown Guadalupe. The reduction in speed is also meant to accommodate pedestrians, but there are only three crosswalks on SR 1. This is an indicator of the multiple and sometimes conflicting needs that SR 1 must serve. The highway must serves as a statewide transportation route, but it must also serve as a pedestrian friendly local downtown street.

While SR 1 is the largest highway passing through Guadalupe, it is not the most traveled. Table 5-4 shows its usage has decreased from 1996 to 2004 by one percent. This may have to do with the growth of Santa Maria and the use of US Highway 101 (US 101). However, it does mean that there is a slight reduction in traffic flowing through the downtown of Guadalupe. The amount of traffic traveling on SR 1 allows the highway to operate at a LOS A through Guadalupe. There is also even traffic flow from north to south with a directional split of 55 percent (Caltrans, 2001). The directional split is the distribution of traffic flow on two lane highways.
Table 5-4. Average Annual Growth in Downtown Traffic Volume Between 1996 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Route 1N. Of Route 166</th>
<th>Route 166 E. of Route 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Control Station #</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT* for 1996</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT* for 1998</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>6900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT* for 2000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT* for 2002</td>
<td>5900</td>
<td>8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT* for 2004</td>
<td>5700</td>
<td>8100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Growth (1996-2004)</td>
<td>-1.00%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ADT = Average Daily Traffic
Source: SBCAG, 2007

The accident data in Table 5-5 for SR 1 shows that the collision rate is much lower on SR 1 between SR 166 and the Santa Barbara County line than similar roads statewide. Furthermore, there were no fatalities between 2000 and 2003, and the fatality and injury collision rate was approximately 10 percent of the rate for similar roads statewide. This demonstrates that this is a comparatively safe section of highway, and current safety measures may be adequate.

Table 5-5. Accident Data for SR 1 Between SR 166 and SB County Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Data</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>3-year period evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Collision Rate</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>Rates are incidents per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Collision Rate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>million vehicle miles from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality &amp; Injury Collision Rate</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>10/01/00 to 9/30/03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


State Route 166

State Route 166 runs from SR 1 at the south end of Guadalupe and connects to Santa Maria approximately seven miles to the East. If one travels west from SR 1, SR 166 turns into West Main Street. This road takes travelers to the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve, but West Main Street is not part of SR 166. SR 166 is the primary connection to Santa Maria and US 101. It is a two lane highway with 8 to 10 foot shoulders on each side and no median.

Traffic flow on SR 166, east of SR 1, has increased from an average daily traffic of 7,000 in 1996 to 8,100 in 2004 or by 1.8 percent. Average daily traffic on SR 166 was higher than SR 1 in the year 2004. This level of usage is most likely due to people commuting to Santa Maria for work and shopping or to access US 101. This is also shown with the majority of traffic flowing eastbound in the mornings and westbound in the evenings with a directional split of 60 percent. However, even with the increase in traffic, SR 166 still has a volume to capacity ratio of 0.34. The volume to capacity ratio is a measurement of actual traffic volume compared to the designed roadway capacity. This maintains a LOS C or better which is acceptable for both Santa
Barbara County and SBCAG. However, the Caltrans SR 166 Transportation Concept Report for 2001 proposes an increase to four lanes. According to this report, a widening would allow SR 166 to operate at a LOS A.

The accident data in Table 5-6 for SR 166 between Guadalupe and Santa Maria shows that the total collision rate on SR 166 is higher than comparable roads statewide. The table also shows that the rate of fatal collisions on SR 166 is approximately one-half the statewide rate. However, when injury collisions are included, the overall rate of fatality and injury accidents is higher on SR 166 than other similar roadways in the State. This illustrates that SR 166 is a fairly unsafe section of highway compared to the rest of the state, underscoring residents’ concerns about safety and traffic on SR 166.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Data</th>
<th>Segment 1</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>3-Year Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Collision Rate</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Rates are incidents per million vehicle miles for the period 6/1/97-5/31/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Collision Rate</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality + Injury Collision Rate</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Collector Streets**

Collector streets are roadways used to transition between highways or arterials and local streets. While highways and arterials are prioritized to move traffic safely and efficiently, collector streets are more focused on guiding users to designated land uses. The following are collector streets in Guadalupe:

- West Main Street (West of SR 1) collects traffic from the Guadalupe/Nipomo Dunes Reserve and developments on the southwest side of Guadalupe and distributes the traffic to SR 1 and SR 166.
- Eleventh Street (East of SR 1) collects traffic from the north side of Guadalupe and distributes it to SR 1 or Simas Road. It also allows an alternate connection between SR 1 and SR 166.
- Simas Road (North of SR 166) collects traffic from the north side of Guadalupe and distributes it to SR 1 or Eleventh Street. It also allows an alternate connection between SR 1 and SR 166.
- Obispo Street (North of SR 166) collects traffic from the southeast side of Guadalupe and distributes it to SR 166.
- Pioneer Street (North of West Main Street) collects traffic from the southwest side of Guadalupe and distributes the traffic to West Main Street.

**Local Streets**

The remaining roads in Guadalupe are classified as local streets. The primary function of local streets is to allow users to access the desired land use. Local streets are not designed to move traffic quickly. They are designed for low speeds to maintain safe, quiet neighborhoods and to enable motorists to easily find their destinations.
5.0 CIRCULATION

Truck Routes
There are two Caltrans-designated truck routes: SR 1 and SR 166. These are “California Legal Routes”, and only trucks that are California legal can travel along these two routes. Furthermore, Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) trucks which are allowed on the National Network are not allowed to travel on these routes. Community members have expressed concern about trucks traveling off the designated routes of SR 1 and SR 166. Obispo Street and Eleventh Street are the two roads which residents noted to have problems with truck traffic.

The increase in average annual daily truck traffic along SR 1 at SR 166 has been consistent with the increase in average annual daily vehicle traffic. As shown in Table 5-7, this is an increase of about five percent from 1998 to 2000. These roads are operating at a LOS A and LOS C respectively, which means that these roads meet current standards for both vehicle and truck capacity.

Table 5-7. Annual Average Daily Traffic for Vehicles and Trucks between ’98 and ‘00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>SR 1</th>
<th>SR 166</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Jct Rt 166 E (Guadalupe)</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck AADT</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Truck</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck AADT</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Truck</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck AADT</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Truck</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck AADT</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Truck</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG, 2001 and 2007

Community members have expressed concern about trucks traveling off the designated routes of SR 1 and SR 166. Obispo Street and Eleventh Street are the two roads which residents noted to have problems with truck traffic.

Traffic Controls
Traffic controls in Guadalupe consist of all-way and two-way stops at intersections. Furthermore, the majority of traffic calming devices are speed limit signs. There are, however, a few bulb-outs to slow traffic on Guadalupe Street. There are also cross walks used to mark pedestrian rights of way, and there is a designated bike lane on SR 1. The most advanced traffic controls in Guadalupe are located at the SR 1 and SR 166 intersection, Pacheco Street and Eleventh Street intersection, and Pacheco and Tenth Street intersection. These intersections have at grade signalized rail crossings.
5.0 CIRCULATION

Road Conditions
Road surface conditions in the City of Guadalupe are judged to be good, as shown in Figure 5-5. Road conditions were measured by Cal Poly graduate students, and given a rating of good, fair, or poor. According to the land use survey, 78 percent of parcels have roads designated as good quality, 21 percent are designated fair quality, and only one percent are designated poor road quality. These road conditions allow for efficient bicycle and vehicle movement.

Implications
The existing roadways in Guadalupe are in good condition. The two primary arterials in Guadalupe, SR 1 and SR 166, are operating at a Level of Service A and C respectively. The accident rate for SR 1 is lower than similar roads statewide. However, the accident rate on SR 166 is higher than the statewide rate for similar roadways. SR 166 is also a road which the community noted as having safety and traffic problems.

5.5 Public Transit Routes, Stops, and Terminals
This section covers the trends in public transit use. It also illustrates the need of people who are dependent on transit, assesses the adequacy of existing routes and determines the existing levels-of-service for transit.

Existing Conditions
Types of Service
There are three types of public transit service in Guadalupe. These include the Guadalupe Flyer, the Guadalupe Shuttle, and the Guadalupe American Disabilities Act (ADA) service. These three services combine to offer local and regional transit to both able and disabled persons in Guadalupe.

Guadalupe Flyer
The Guadalupe Flyer is a local and regional bus service offering rides within Guadalupe and to Santa Maria. It is a bus that runs Monday through Friday from 6:15am to 6:06pm on the hour and Saturday from 8:15am to 5:06pm on the hour. The service starts in Santa Maria and travels through Guadalupe and back to Santa Maria. Thirteen of the eighteen stops are in Guadalupe and the rest are in Santa Maria. These thirteen stops provide service that is within a 1/4 mile of most residents as seen in Figure 5-6. While there is transit coverage for residents of Guadalupe, there is a very low frequency of service. The Guadalupe Flyer operates on the hour which is a Level of Service E. This is below the Santa Barbara Council of Governments standard of LOS D. The roundtrip service to Santa Maria takes approximately 50 minutes, and costs $1.00 to ride each way.

Guadalupe Shuttle
The Guadalupe Shuttle aids the Guadalupe Flyer and runs Monday through Friday from 10:00am to 4:00pm, and operates as a general demand response dial-a-ride. The driver generally picks up passengers within five minutes of their request, and the cost to ride is $0.25. The Guadalupe Shuttle only operates within the City of Guadalupe.

Figure 5-5. Pavement Conditions

Source: CalPoly, 2008
Figure 5-6. Transit Service in Guadalupe

Source: Land Use Inventory, October 2008
Guadalupe ADA Service

The Guadalupe ADA Service mirrors the Guadalupe Flyer service and runs within Guadalupe’s City limits and into Santa Maria. The Guadalupe ADA Service offers door-step to door-step transit, and operates during the same time as the Guadalupe Flyer. This service is important in Guadalupe because about 30 percent of transit-dependent residents are disabled.

Transit Use

Table 5-8 shows that transit use has increased steadily over the past six years from 74,838 users in fiscal year 2001 to 2002 to 110,939 users in fiscal year 2006 to 2007. This is a 48 percent increase in total transit service usage by residents of Guadalupe. The change is 28 percent higher than Santa Barbara County which had a 20 percent increase in transit usage during the same period. While public transit use is growing steadily, it must be noted that Table 5-2 suggests that only about one percent of Guadalupe residents use public transit to get to work according to Figure 5-2. Even with a 48 percent increase in ridership, public transit use would still account for less than two percent of trips to work.

Table 5-8. Transit Usage in Guadalupe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guadalupe Flyer</th>
<th>Guadalupe Shuttle</th>
<th>Guadalupe ADA</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 01-02</td>
<td>59,058</td>
<td>15,780</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,125,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 02-03</td>
<td>69,312</td>
<td>17,038</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,338,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 03-04</td>
<td>63,279</td>
<td>16,394</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,320,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 04-05</td>
<td>66,579</td>
<td>22,992</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,716,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 05-06</td>
<td>75,290</td>
<td>27,719</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,211,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 06-07</td>
<td>81,654</td>
<td>28,772</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>9,749,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 to 07</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Transit Dependent Population in Guadalupe

Transit dependency can be defined in numerous ways, but typically populations which are categorized as transit-dependent populations include: minors (who generally do not have drivers license), seniors (who may not be able to drive any longer), those with disabilities (who cannot drive due to their disability), and those without private vehicles. Table 5-9 shows that approximately 61 percent of the population in Guadalupe over the age of five is part of the transit dependent population, compared to approximately 51 percent for the County of Santa Barbara. These percentages underscore the need for more transit options in Guadalupe than the rest of the County.
Table 5-9. Transit Dependent Population Due to Age in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages 5-20</th>
<th>Guadalupe</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>98,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ Disability</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>6,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 21-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>217,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ Disability</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>39,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>49,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ Disability</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>18,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.30%</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population Over Five</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>187,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Dependent</td>
<td>5,154</td>
<td>365,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Implications

Guadalupe residents’ rate of dependency on public transit but relatively low usage rate indicate more or better public transit service is needed. The majority of residents have access to transit. However, there is not sufficient transit frequency. The Guadalupe Flyer is operating at a LOS E which is below the SBCAG standard. This may be a reason why transit use accounts for such a small percentage of trips to work. Public transit use in the future is likely to increase with more frequent transit service.

5.6 Railroads and Railroad Depots

This section locates rail lines and facilities. It also assesses current transportation schedules and volumes.

Existing Conditions

Passenger Rail

The Pacific Surfliner and Coast Starlight are the Amtrak services that stop in Guadalupe. The Pacific Surfliner runs northbound from Guadalupe to San Luis Obispo and southbound to Santa Barbara, Oxnard, Los Angeles, and San Diego. The Coast Starlight runs between Seattle and Los Angeles. There are three southbound trains that run through Guadalupe and three that run northbound as seen in Table 5-10. Access to the station by transit is available with the Guadalupe Flyer which has a stop at the Amtrak station. Table 5-11 shows that rail ridership increased by about 29 percent between fiscal years 2001/2002 and 2004/2005. This resulted in 6,981 passengers using Amtrak through the Guadalupe station in fiscal year 2004/2005. The increase mirrors the Pacific Surfliner as a whole, which has the second highest ridership in the
nation with 2.65 million riders in fiscal year 2006. The Pacific Surfliner also runs on time for 87 percent of trips. The Pacific Surfliner is doing much better than the Coast Starlight which has been on time for only two percent of its trips, and has seen ridership decrease by 26 percent between 1999 and 2005.

Table 5-10. Amtrak Schedule for Guadalupe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Operating</th>
<th>Train #</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>12:09PM</td>
<td>5:05PM*</td>
<td>7:21AM</td>
<td>7:38PM</td>
<td>2:36PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sa &amp; Su</td>
<td>Mo-Fr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Amtrak Website, 2008. *Only Drops Off Passengers

Table 5-11. Amtrak Ridership for Guadalupe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>FY 2001/02</th>
<th>FY 02/03</th>
<th>FY 03/04</th>
<th>FY 04/05</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Avg. Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>5408</td>
<td>6537</td>
<td>6362</td>
<td>6981</td>
<td>29.10%</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Travel Trends Report for Santa Barbara County, 2007

**Implications**

Passenger rail in Guadalupe is a viable form of transportation for regional trips into and out of Guadalupe. Amtrak service allows residents of Guadalupe to use public transportation for regional and interstate trips. Guadalupe’s passenger rail service is along one of the busiest rail corridors in the Nation, and gives Guadalupe access to major economic centers such as Los Angeles and San Diego. Passenger rail in Guadalupe proves to be a good transportation option for commuting purposes as well as for tourism.

**5.7 Airports**

This section describes existing airport facilities. It also explains current volumes and assesses the adequacy of ground access to airports.

**Existing Conditions**

Guadalupe is served by the Santa Maria Public Airport which is located about 23 minutes by car to the south east of Guadalupe. The airport can also be accessed by using the Guadalupe Flyer in combination with the SMAT route 8 or 62 or the Breeze main line. However, there is no direct transit service between the airport and Guadalupe. Table 5-12 shows that enplaned passengers for the Santa Maria Public Airport have decreased from 1996 to 2006.

The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is also accessible from Guadalupe. The airport is located approximately one and half hours from Guadalupe by car. Table 5-12 shows that enplaned passengers have increased from 1996 to 2006.
The San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport is also accessible from Guadalupe. The airport is located approximately forty minutes north of Guadalupe by car. Table 5-12 shows that enplaned passengers have increased from 1996 to 2002.

Table 5-12. Airport Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Santa Maria Public Airport</th>
<th>Santa Barbara Municipal Airport</th>
<th>San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>49,600</td>
<td>336,700</td>
<td>137,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>50,100</td>
<td>423,300</td>
<td>154,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>40,300</td>
<td>414,900</td>
<td>149,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>398,900</td>
<td>152,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>43,100</td>
<td>391,000</td>
<td>158,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>366,500</td>
<td>152,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>367,200</td>
<td>155,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>36,400</td>
<td>415,200</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>35,800</td>
<td>432,800</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>33,700</td>
<td>434,500</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG, 2007

Implications

While Guadalupe does have access to the Santa Maria Public Airport, Santa Maria Airport use has been decreasing over the past ten years. There is public transportation to the airport, and the location of the airport is fairly close. However, the decline in enplanements at the Santa Maria Airport may reflect a shift to the Santa Barbara Airport and San Luis Obispo County Airport, which have seen a rise in enplanements.

5.8 Bicycle and Pedestrian Routes and Facilities

This section assesses the adequacy of existing bicycle and pedestrian routes and facilities.

Existing Conditions

Guadalupe is compact, at approximately two square-miles, and level. These conditions make excellent bicycle and pedestrian conditions. However, little walking and bicycling occurs in Guadalupe.

There are few cyclists in Guadalupe, and as shown in Figure 5-2, no commuters used a bicycle to commute to work. This is surprising given the geography and road conditions in Guadalupe. The City is level and 78 percent of parcels have good quality roads as seen in Figure 5-5. However, there are only 3.5 miles of Class II bike lane in Guadalupe. This stretch of bike lane runs along SR 1 and has no bike path connections. This may be a reason for low bicycle usage.
Existing traffic volumes alone should not deter cyclists because traffic volumes are so low, and many of the roads in Guadalupe are local streets that do not need designated bike lanes.

Pedestrian travel accounts for only four percent of trips to work. However, 92 percent of the parcels, or 384 acres, in Guadalupe have sidewalks as seen in Figure 5-7. While pedestrians have ample sidewalks to travel on, they are not being used by residents. As seen in Table 5-3, the majority of Guadalupe residents work outside of Guadalupe. The location of residents’ employment may be the cause of low pedestrian travel instead of sidewalk unavailability.

**Implications**

Cycling and walking are not popular modes of transportation as shown by the low number of cyclists and pedestrians in Guadalupe. There is ample cycling and pedestrian infrastructure in Guadalupe, and the terrain is excellent for cycling and walking. Moreover, Guadalupe is a compact city. These factors suggest that other factors are the cause for low cycling and pedestrian travel. One factor may be that the majority of employment opportunities are outside of Guadalupe.

**5.9 Parking Facilities**

This section assesses the adequacy of existing on-street parking. It also assesses the adequacy of off-street parking.

**Existing Conditions**

There is ample parking within Guadalupe. As seen in Figure 5-8, 96 percent of parcels in Guadalupe have on-street parking. Furthermore, figure 5-9 shows that the majority of downtown is within a quarter mile of parking lots. The combination of on-street parking and parking lots provides Guadalupe with sufficient parking under normal conditions. However, there are no large parking facilities for major events which has been a concern for residents.

**Implications**

There is an adequate supply of parking in Guadalupe for both residents and business owners. The parking conditions allow businesses to run efficiently and offer residents convenient parking near their homes. However, there are no major parking facilities for large events. This discourages large events.
Figure 5-7. Guadalupe Pedestrian Infrastructure Map

Source: Land Use Survey, October 2008
Figure 5-8. Guadalupe On-Street Parking Map

Source: Land Use Survey, October 2008
5.10 Emerging Directions

Transportation data reveals Guadalupe is a very automobile oriented community. Many residents have commute times of longer than 15 minutes and work in Santa Maria. The main
5.0 CIRCULATION

A thoroughfare used is SR 166, which carries increasing traffic volumes, and has a relatively high rate of injury collisions when compared with other similar roadways in the State. Furthermore, SR 166 connects to West Main Street which is the entrance to the Guadalupe/Nipomo Dunes Reserve. This is the primary tourist attraction for the City of Guadalupe, but it has West Main Street as its entrance. This road is one of the poorest roads in Guadalupe, which could discourage tourist visits. The intersection of SR 166 and SR 1 will be a primary point of interest in the future. The intersection is the entrance to the dunes, the main access point to Santa Maria, and may have even more traffic in the future with the construction of DJ Farms.

Public transit in Guadalupe has a problem with service frequency and has resulted in very low percentages for mode choice to work. The amount and placement of bus stops is adequate for Guadalupe, but the Guadalupe Flyer is operating at LOS E. Transit use in the future may increase with the addition of more frequent service. This would help decrease congestion on SR 166 as well as offer residents more appealing transportation options.

Guadalupe’s passenger services include access to rail and an airport. The Amtrak Pacific Surfliner proves to be one of the busiest rail lines in the nation, and gives Guadalupe access to major economic centers such as Los Angeles and San Diego. However, the Santa Maria Public Airport’s popularity decreased over the past ten years. A decline in enplanements may be the result of plane users traveling to the Santa Barbara Airport and San Luis Obispo County Airport which have both seen a rise in enplanements. Guadalupe may want to capitalize on the Amtrak station because of its popularity and proximity to the dunes for tourists.

The low number of pedestrians and cyclists in Guadalupe shows that these facilities may be inadequate. Construction of bike and pedestrian paths may increase pedestrian and bicycle usage.

The final emerging direction in Guadalupe is the lack of major parking facilities. While there is ample parking supply for local businesses and residents, there is not a facility that can handle large volumes of parked automobiles during special events. This may prove to be a problem if Guadalupe wants to develop tourism.
6.0 HOUSING

6.1 Introduction

The housing element is one of the seven mandatory elements of a general plan required by the State of California. The Housing Element is required to be updated every five years and its content is subject to detailed statutory requirements. The Housing Element is the only Element that is subject to review and “certification” by the State of California.

The Housing Element gives a comprehensive analysis of a city’s existing and projected housing needs for all income groups and people. This includes the city’s share of the regional housing allocation given by the State to the local Council of Governments (COG). The Housing Element is required to identify and address the following:

- Quantification of projected housing needs
- A review and revision of previous housing Element
- Inventory of resources and constraints
- Governmental and non-governmental constraints on housing
- Programs
- Quantified objectives by income groups

The housing chapter of the Background Report provides the factual basis for updating the City of Guadalupe’s Housing Element. It evaluates the current Housing Element, State guidelines and standards for housing, existing conditions, and opportunities and emerging directions for the City’s housing supply.

Guadalupe adopted its most recent Housing Element on June 8, 2004, and the Element was then certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) as complying with State Housing law. State law requires that the City update its Housing Element by August 2009.

The main goals of the 2004 Housing Element for Guadalupe are to:

- Provide a continuing supply of affordable housing
- Preserve and rehabilitate current stock of affordable housing
- Preserve At-Risk Units
- Meet the housing needs of special groups
- Avoid significant homelessness
- Increase the efficiency of energy use in new and existing homes
- Assure equal access to sound, affordable housing for all persons
- Ensure participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of housing policy
Housing Element Process

The creation of a Housing Element starts with a review of the community’s demographic and economic factors. HCD data, based on Department of Finance (DOF) population projections and regional population forecasts, is used to distribute housing allocations to each regional COG, which provides each city and county within its jurisdiction a Fair Share Allocation of housing units for each income group. In this case, Guadalupe’s allocation comes from the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). The SBCAG receives a regional minimum baseline from the HCD and then distributes that amongst cities and unincorporated sub regions of Santa Barbara County. SBCAG then produces the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Report (RHNA) to allocate the amount and type of housing needed over a seven and a half year period to each city and unincorporated area. The City of Guadalupe is within the Santa Maria Housing Market Area.

The RHNA is required to promote the following objectives:

1) Increase the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner.

2) Promote infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and the encouragement of efficient development patterns.

3) Promote an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.

The current SBCAG RHNA was adopted in January 2007 and is valid until June 30, 2014. The purpose of the RHNA is to address “statewide population growth and housing needs of all economic segments of the community” (RHNA, 2007, p.1). SBCAG was given an allocation of 11,600 units for the entire County of Santa Barbara for the 2007-2014 planning period. Guadalupe’s allocation from the 11,600 units is 88 units. The 2004 Housing Element for Guadalupe accommodates a RHNA number slightly below that number, or 83 dwellings. RHNA allocations will be discussed further in the Housing Needs section of this report.

From these housing allocations, each local jurisdiction creates a housing element that shows how it will provide an adequate supply of housing for all income groups. The HCD explains that an effective housing element provides the necessary conditions for preserving and producing an adequate supply of affordable housing. If a housing element is consistent with State law it is certified by HCD. State certification makes a city or county eligible for state housing grants and provides the legal basis to support the city’s discretionary housing actions such as re-zonings or use permit approvals.

**Guadalupe Redevelopment Agency**

The Guadalupe Redevelopment Agency was established in 1985 to eliminate blight conditions within the City. The Redevelopment Agency defines the physical conditions of blight as:
defective design and character of physical construction; substandard infrastructure; faulty exterior spacing; and residential overcrowding. The redevelopment project area can be seen in Figure 6-1 and consists of about 70 percent of the land (701 acres) within the City limits. The Redevelopment Agency adopted a five-year Implementation Plan in 2005 which describes specific goals and objectives. This plan is good until 2010. The agency’s primary focus is to provide infrastructure improvements. The agency also focuses on repair and rehabilitation of housing through the approval of a housing rehabilitation loan program, as well as funds and assistance for commercial development.

The main goals of the Guadalupe Redevelopment Agency are:

- Revitalize the Central Business District
- Create conditions favorable to expanded eco-tourism, commercial and industrial development (increase number of jobs)
- Provide additional housing and rehabilitate existing sub-standard housing (increase supply of affordable housing)
- Increase supply of market rate housing

Figure 6-1: Guadalupe Redevelopment Agency Boundaries
6.2 Existing Conditions

This section covers:
- Affordability
- Affordable housing standards
- Housing and rental costs
- Housing stock and construction trends
- Overcrowding
- Housing needs
- Governmental and non-governmental constraints on housing

Affordability

Housing cost in the City of Guadalupe is considered affordable when compared to the rest of Santa Barbara County. However, the majority of Guadalupe’s work force is employed in blue collar jobs, and housing may not be affordable for these residents. Tables 6-1 and 6-2 show Guadalupe’s work force, separated by industry. They reveal Guadalupe is an agricultural community, and most of the workforce are in services and agriculture/mining industries.

Table 6-1. 2008 Employed Population 16+ by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employed</th>
<th>2,426</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Mining</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Utilities</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Insurance/Real Estate</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-2. 2008 Employed Population 16+ by Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employed</th>
<th>2,426</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Business/Financial</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming/Forestry/Fishing</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Extraction</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation/Maintenance/Repair</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Material Moving</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESRI, 2008
In 2000, Guadalupe’s median home price was $113,087, which doubled to $230,952 in 2008. Median household income for Guadalupe in 2000 was $31,632, while the County of Santa Barbara was $46,677. For 2008, median household income in Guadalupe was projected to be $41,461. Guadalupe has the lowest median household income of all the cities in Santa Barbara County. The median household income for Guadalupe does not support the purchase of a median-priced house there. Table 6-4 shows the income categories for the County, in which Guadalupe’s median household income falls under the “moderate income” category. The 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Santa Barbara County suggests Guadalupe had the highest poverty rate of the County, at 25 percent. Table 6-3 compares the poverty levels for all the cities in the County, as well as the County as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North County</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buelton</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc</td>
<td>5805</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>14823</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>11846</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>55086</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000

### Affordable Housing Standards

Affordable housing is defined by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as housing that is available at a cost no greater than 30 percent of a household’s monthly income. The State of California defines affordable housing as rental or purchase housing with a cost that does not exceed 25 percent of the resident’s gross monthly income.

Income categories are defined by HUD and income limits are adjusted for household and family size so that larger families have higher income limits. The income categories are:

- **Very Low income**: up to 50 percent of the area median income
- **Low-income**: between the very low-income limit and 80 percent of the area median income
- **Moderate income**: between the lower income limit and 120 percent of the area median income
- **Above moderate-income**: exceeding the moderate-income limit.
Table 6-4 shows the County of Santa Barbara’s income categories according to median income distribution. These income categories are used for all of the cities and unincorporated areas of the County when determining housing units needed for each income group.

Table 6-4. County of Santa Barbara Median Income distribution of Household Income groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Less than $23,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$23,338 to $37,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>$37,342 to $56,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
<td>More than $56,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment, 2007

Table 6-5 shows the number of Guadalupe households and percentage of households in each income category for 2000. The highest percentage, 36 percent, is in the ‘very low’ income group in Guadalupe. This means that Guadalupe will have to plan for a higher number of ‘very low’ income housing units in the future.

Table 6-5. 2000 Households by Income Group, City of Guadalupe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, Population and Housing Summary File 3 2000

Table 6-6 shows the income categories for different size households. This allows for a more accurate observation and analysis of households and their ability to afford certain housing types. The table shows the income spread between an extremely low-income, one-person household ($16,350) and a six-person household ($30,800) in the same income category.
Table 6-6. County of Santa Barbara Income Limits for 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons per household</th>
<th>Extremely Low</th>
<th>Very Low Income</th>
<th>Lower Income</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Moderate Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$16,350</td>
<td>$27,250</td>
<td>$43,600</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$56,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$18,700</td>
<td>$31,100</td>
<td>$49,800</td>
<td>$53,700</td>
<td>$64,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$56,050</td>
<td>$60,400</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$23,350</td>
<td>$38,900</td>
<td>$62,250</td>
<td>$67,100</td>
<td>$80,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$25,200</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$67,250</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$86,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$27,100</td>
<td>$45,100</td>
<td>$72,200</td>
<td>$77,800</td>
<td>$93,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$28,950</td>
<td>$48,250</td>
<td>$77,200</td>
<td>$83,200</td>
<td>$99,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
<td>$51,350</td>
<td>$82,150</td>
<td>$88,600</td>
<td>$106,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development, 2008

Purchase Housing Costs
The 2007 single family median sales prices are shown by market areas as follows:

- South Coast median $1,230,000
- Santa Maria valley median $400,000
- Lompoc valley median $366,000
- Santa Ynez valley median $800,000

Figure 6-2 compares the median household income to the median home value in Guadalupe. Between 2000 and 2008 home values increased exponentially while the median household income increased slightly, showing that household income has not kept pace with housing values.

Figure 6-2. Guadalupe Median Household Income vs. Median Home Value 2000-2013
Appendix C, Table C-1 provides information on what percentage of income is used for housing costs for owner-occupied units. The appendix shows that a little over 50 percent of people who earn less than $20,000 per year spend 35 percent or more on housing costs. For people making between $20,000 and $50,000, there are about 40 percent spending 30 percent or more of their income on housing costs. This shows that about 80 Guadalupe homeowners (or 10 percent) overpay for housing. As with most Central Coast communities, Guadalupe needs more affordable housing to match residents’ incomes.

**Rental Costs**

Table 6-7 shows the percentage of household income that Guadalupe residents spend on rent. The data shows that approximately 40 percent of Guadalupe residents are paying over 30 percent of their income on rent costs. Over one-half of Guadalupe’s renters pay 25 percent or more of their income for housing, suggesting that about 50 percent of the City’s rental housing is not affordable, according to the HCD’s definition.

**Table 6-7. Gross Rent as Percentage of Household Income, Guadalupe, California**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specified renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 percent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 percent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 percent</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 percent</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 percent</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 percent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 percent</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49 percent</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 percent or more</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not computed</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Summary File 3,

**Housing Stock**

**Unit Type**

The City of Guadalupe contains 1,836 housing units (Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, October 2008), which is a net increase of approximately 240 units since the year 2000. The percentage increase of housing stock (13 percent) aligns with total population growth (14 percent) during the same eight-year time span (US Census Bureau, 2000).
The majority of the housing stock consists of single-family dwellings (78.2 percent), and the remainder consists of duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes. Housing unit type is illustrated in Figure 6-3. There are limited numbers of mobile home parks and high-density apartment complexes. Given the City’s limited vacant parcels and continual pressure to allocate housing supply for all household income levels, as required by RHNA, this fact suggests that higher-density infill housing is needed. Further detail is discussed in the Housing Needs section of this chapter.

Table 6-8 compares housing types by jurisdiction within Santa Barbara County. When compared to the rest of the County, Guadalupe’s housing stock has the highest percentage of single-family detached units, the second highest percentage of single-family attached units, the second lowest percentage of multi-family units, and the lowest percentage of mobile homes. Guadalupe’s pattern of low density residential suggests the City will have difficulty absorbing its share of the RHNA housing allocation. Changes to General Plan policies to allow higher residential density may help meet regional housing needs.

Figure 6-3. Housing Unit Type

![Census 2000 Housing Units by Structure](image)

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000
Table 6-8. Housing Unit Type by Jurisdiction, County of Santa Barbara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mobile Homes</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Attached</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2-5+</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buellton</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>5,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>11,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc</td>
<td>7,499</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>14,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>17,269</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>16,974</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>37,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>17,098</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7,053</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>27,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2,347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Housing Tenure**

Housing tenure refers to whether housing is owner-occupied or rental housing. An estimated 1,157 units (68.6 percent) in Guadalupe are owner-occupied, 649 (38.6 percent) are rentals, and 48 (2.9 percent) are vacant (ESRI Forecast, 2008). In urban areas, a fifty-fifty split between owner-occupied and rental units is not uncommon, and in rural areas the ratio is generally skewed towards owner-occupancy. Ownership rates in Guadalupe have been increasing slowly over the last 28 years; 46 percent of the housing stock was owner-occupied in 1980, 57 percent in 1990, 55 percent in 2000 and an estimated 69 percent in 2008.

**Condition of Buildings**

A survey of the housing stock in Guadalupe was conducted for this report. It was found that the majority of housing stock is in sound condition. Houses in poor condition were evaluated as either deteriorating or dilapidated. The majority of these houses were found to be deteriorating instead of dilapidated, which suggests programs should be focused on rehabilitation and retention instead of demolition.

When compared with previous inventories of Guadalupe, the general trend seems to be that houses are increasing in quality. This could be largely due to rehabilitation grant programs funded by the Guadalupe Redevelopment Agency. Also, the overall percentage of sound buildings documented could be a result of new housing recently constructed.
Table 6-9. Housing Condition Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Rehabilitation</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Trends**

Guadalupe experienced a 39 percent increase in the total number of housing units from 1980 to 2003 (US Census Bureau, 1980, 1990, 2000), yet from 1990 to 2000 Guadalupe’s housing stock increased a mere five percent. Since 2000, Guadalupe has experienced a small housing boom of an approximate increase of 14 percent in the City’s housing stock. The City issued 111 new residential building permits from 1999 to 2003 (Housing Element, 2004). People in search of more competitive housing costs on the Central Coast are finding Guadalupe as an attractive alternative, which could lead to increased housing demand and higher housing costs as Guadalupe draws more homebuyers seeking a small “bedroom” community.

The majority of Guadalupe’s housing stock was constructed before 1990, and well over one-half of the homes are thirty years old or older (US Census Bureau, 2000). Most housing units in Guadalupe have three to five rooms plus a kitchen and a bathroom. In 2008, the median home value was $230,900 (ESRI, 2008). Larger homes tend are usually more expensive, and consequently, lower income households tend to live in small, overcrowded dwellings, regardless of household size.

**Overcrowding**

Overcrowding is a problem in Guadalupe. The US Census defines overcrowding as occupancy that exceeds more than one person per room. The State of California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) guidelines (2003) state that households with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded.

The Guadalupe Redevelopment Agency’s Implementation Plan (2005) states that almost one-half of Guadalupe’s renters’ and one-third of owner-occupants live in overcrowded conditions. According to the Redevelopment Agency’s Plan (2005), the City of Guadalupe has a very high incidence of overcrowding; 28 percent of all renter-occupied housing units are highly overcrowded (p.9). Another 17.5 percent of renter occupied housing also meets the simple definition of overcrowded, for a total of about 47 percent overcrowded rental units. Approximately 34 percent of owner-occupied housing is overcrowded. The average five room home (kitchen, living room, and three bedrooms) in Guadalupe is housing eight people. The
Guadalupe Planning Department regularly receives complaints of overcrowded rental units where a three-bedroom home has as many as 18 people per unit (p.9).

Table 6-10 shows persons per household by City in Santa Barbara County. Guadalupe has the highest number of persons per household in the County. The persons per household numbers collected by the US Census and the Department of Finance (DOF) may not reflect the real situation of overcrowding in Guadalupe.

Table 6-10. Persons per Household in Santa Barbara County 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY/CITY</th>
<th>PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buellton</td>
<td>2.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria</td>
<td>2.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta</td>
<td>2.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guadalupe</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.959</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc</td>
<td>2.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>2.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>3.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang</td>
<td>2.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Barbara County</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.776</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Department of Finance, 2008

Table 6-11 shows the number of persons per room and percentage in owner-occupied and renter occupied units. Renter occupied units have a higher rate of over crowding. Approximately 30 percent of units have more than 1.5 persons per room while approximately 17 percent of owner-occupied units have more than 1.5 persons per room. This suggests that there may be a lack of housing that is affordable for the residents of Guadalupe.

Table 6-11. Tenure By Persons per Room City of Guadalupe, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons per Room</th>
<th>Owner Occupied Units</th>
<th>Renter Occupied Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 or less occupants per room</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51 to 1.00 occupants per room</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 to 1.51 occupants per room</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 or more occupants per room</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units</strong></td>
<td>803</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, Summary File 1, 2000

**Housing Needs**

The Housing Element is required to include quantified objectives. “Quantified housing needs” are defined by the HCD as the city or county's share of the regional housing need, as
established in the RHNA, for various housing types and income levels. The allocation establishes the number of new units needed, by income category, to accommodate expected population growth over the planning period of the Housing Element.

Table 6-12 shows the allocation from HCD and SBCAG for all of the Cities and unincorporated areas of the County, as well as each area’s percentage of the County total allocation. Guadalupe the smallest percentage of the County’s allocation. This corresponds with population and job growth in the area, showing that Guadalupe holds a small proportion of the County’s employment and projected population growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Market Area/ Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Draft Allocation</th>
<th>Percent of County Total Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South County Market Area</td>
<td>6,624</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria City</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara City</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorp South County</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta City</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ynez Market Area</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang City</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buellton City</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorp Santa Ynez Valley</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc Market Area</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc City</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorp Lompoc/VAFB</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria Market Area</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria City</td>
<td>3,199</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe City</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorp Santa Maria Valley</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Total</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Total</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG RHNA 2007-2014

The distribution by income categories for Guadalupe, Santa Maria and the County as a whole can be seen in Table 6-13. When compared to the City of Santa Maria and the whole County, the percentages of ‘very low’ and ‘low’ income housing needed are exactly the same. For ‘moderate’ and ‘above moderate’ income levels, Guadalupe has almost the same percentage allocation as Santa Maria. This data shows that housing needs in Guadalupe are very similar to those of the neighboring City of Santa Maria.
### Table 6-13. 2007-2014 Regional Housing Need Income Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Market Area/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Allocation</th>
<th>Very Low Units</th>
<th>Low Units</th>
<th>Moderate Units</th>
<th>Above Moderate Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria Market Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria City</td>
<td>3,199</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe City</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Santa Maria Valley</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Total</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,756</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG RHNA 2007-2014

### Special Housing Needs Populations

According to OPR, special housing needs include the elderly, persons with disabilities, large families, farm workers, families with female heads of households, and homeless families and individuals. US Census data (2000) suggests that residents with special housing needs in Guadalupe include mostly farm workers, persons with disabilities and large families.

Large families in Guadalupe are a possible cause of the City’s problem with overcrowding. When housing is not affordable, large families often live in housing units that are too small to accommodate the number of people in their household, causing them to exceed the 1.5 persons per room threshold. Tables 6-10 and 6-11 in the overcrowding section of this chapter show the persons per household and tenure persons per room.

Table C-2 in Appendix C reveals that the largest percent of working residents are employed in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations. This number may not include seasonal farm workers, which constitute a population in need of affordable housing for very low income categories. Addressing seasonal farm worker housing needs is an important step to take to avoid homelessness in Guadalupe.

Table 6-14 indicates that 23.4 percent of Santa Barbara County’s disabled population and 8.5 percent of Santa Barbara’s elderly population lives in Guadalupe. This has implications in planning for housing needs.
Table 6-14. Percentage of Population over 65 and with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent of Population</th>
<th>Percent of County Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County</td>
<td>26255</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buelton</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc</td>
<td>3856</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>8776</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td>17511</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15493</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>50765</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>64541</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Summary File 3

Constraints to Housing
As part of the General Plan update, the City must identify constraints to meeting its quantified housing objectives allocated by RHNA; 88 units before 2014. Housing constraints are divided into two categories: non-governmental and governmental constraints.

Non-Governmental Constraints
Availability of Land
Availability of properly zoned land can be a major constraint on housing development. In 2003, land available for residential use within the city limits had the potential to generate up to 1,486 units. 980 of these potential units are included in the 110 acre DJ Farms specific plan area that was recently annexed to the southern portion of the city (DJ Farms Specific Plan, 2006). Miscellaneous acreage accounts for approximately 20 acres of potential infill development within the city limits (Housing Element, 2004)

From a County perspective, Guadalupe is a part of the Santa Maria Region, which has a significant amount of land available, as illustrated in Figure 6-4. Guadalupe, Santa Maria and the surrounding areas hold 45 percent of available residential capacity in the County (SBCAG, 2007). This could help offset development pressure within the city limits, however it will be important for Guadalupe to implement policies in the Conservation and Open Space Element to continue the balance meeting housing needs and conserving environmental features that benefit the community at large.
Figure 6-4. Regional Perspective of Available Land

Distribution of Available Residential Capacity

South Coast Region, 30%
Santa Maria Region, 45%
Santa Ynez, 9%
Lompoc Region, 16%

Source: SBCAG, 2007

Land Costs
Land is the second largest component in the cost of new housing, accounting for over 20 percent of development costs. Land costs vary according to a number of factors, and can influence the type of project built. The main determinants to land value are location, zoning and parcel size. As land becomes more scarce, its price increases. In Guadalupe, land located downtown costs more than remote agricultural land.

Development Costs
When deciding whether to build housing, developers must consider a variety of costs including price of land, site and subdivision improvements, engineering and other technical assistance costs, construction costs, development fees (which may include offsite improvements), financing charges, sales and marketing, taxes, and profit margins. Affordable housing projects are not a top priority for developers, as potential profits are lower than for market-rate housing, and the process for developing affordable housing, and the costs associated with doing so, often prove daunting. Developers must work within the regulations, such as parking requirements and zoning codes, while simultaneously making money from their projects.

Citizen Behavior
Housing preferences have changed in the last fifty years, as consumers tend to prefer larger detached houses. These expectations are often unrealistic given the high cost of living in
California. Bias towards single-family residences can result in neighbors opposing more dense and/or affordable housing.

New housing also means increased traffic and noise. These perceptions can result in community disdain with all types of development, including housing, commercial and industrial uses. Community opposition can frustrate a city’s ability to meet its housing and economic goals.

**Governmental Constraints**

Governmental constraints are the policies, standards, requirements, actions or fees imposed by local, State or Federal governments to guide land use and development.

**Zoning Code**

Local building and zoning regulations are the primary governmental tools used in Guadalupe. Property development standards, maximum densities (measured in dwelling units per acre), parking standards and other regulations constrain the site layout, scale, massing and types of housing developed in the City. Parking standards are demonstrated below in Table 6-15.

Table 6-15. Excerpt from City’s 2008 Parking Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Use</th>
<th>Required Spaces</th>
<th>Type of Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single dwelling unit</td>
<td>One per 800 sq. ft., not to exceed two spaces</td>
<td>Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple dwelling unit</td>
<td>One per unit</td>
<td>Carport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Guadalupe Zoning Code, 2008

**Permit Fees**

Residential development fees in Guadalupe are not excessive and do not present significant obstacles to the production of affordable housing. Fees in Guadalupe are low when compared with other jurisdictions in the County. The 2001 development fee schedule is displayed in Table 6-16.

**Processing Time**

There are various levels of review and processing of residential development applications, depending on the size and complexity of the development. The Planning Commission and City Council are involved in making decisions about all large development projects. The major constraint associated with development review is the time it takes to get through the entitlement and permitting process. However, permit processing in Guadalupe is remarkably fast.
Table 6-16. Fees that affect housing production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development Department Fee Schedule, 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Fee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Permit (CUP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP Time Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Demolition/Moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Tract Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Parcel Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Tract Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Parcel Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encroachment Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Line Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility and Traffic Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Guadalupe Zoning Code, 2001

Regional Constraints

Regional constraints result, in part, from decisions made by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), a supra-local planning agency which ensures the logical and orderly growth of cities. Based on past LAFCO decisions, Guadalupe’s sphere of influence—the City’s ultimate anticipated growth boundary—is congruent with the city limits in 2008, thus precluding outward expansion to meet housing needs. The City has attempted to expand the sphere but is unable to get LAFCO approval. This is the largest single governmental constraint to meeting the City’s housing needs. Lack of expansion areas will create pressure to develop areas on the City’s fringe, including natural resource lands and agricultural parcels.

6.3 Opportunities and Emerging Directions

Opportunities

Financing for infrastructure and housing improvements is available through the Guadalupe Redevelopment Agency. The Agency has also acquired land in the past to support development of medium- to high-density residential housing. The Agency continues to provide incentives for...
the development of affordable housing within the Project Area, shown in Figure 6. Incentives include subsidies for land costs, grants and low-cost loans for housing rehabilitation.

Opportunities to plan for housing include a variety of local, state, and federal government programs that fund affordable housing projects including those listed below.

- Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
- Home Investment Partnership (HOME)
- Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG) funds directly from HUD
- Cal Home grants and the Supportive Housing Program (SHP)

These grant funds have assisted very low, low and moderate income persons/households by providing services, housing and facilities throughout Santa Barbara County.

6.4 Emerging Directions

The planning team held a focus group community meeting in Guadalupe on October 23rd to gather citizen input on the proposed community plan. Twenty-five residents attended the meeting and formed discussion groups to talk about what they liked, disliked and wanted to change in Guadalupe. Specific comments about housing were focused on growth, affordability, and design. Community members were interested in targeting growth along Guadalupe Street, which they felt would help increase the tax base for the city. Emphasis was placed on creating consistent facades downtown and incorporating more landscaping. Guadalupe has some historic homes, and many participants felt these houses should be retained and restored, especially in the downtown core. These comments indicate that a historic preservation program might be a sound policy direction for the Guadalupe community plan.

Community members also saw value in mixed-use development projects, including both affordable housing and commercial development. This type of housing, with retail on the first floor and housing above, would most likely be located in the downtown area and promote walking over automobile use. Walkability was identified as a community goal in the focus group meeting. However, this objective may conflict with other identified goals for retention of the “small-town” atmosphere due to the larger building sizes required to suit this type of use. Priorities for mixed-use development will increase density in Guadalupe and alter its small-town character.

Community feedback pointed to a demand for housing stock that meets the needs of low- and very-low income households. Citizens identified a recent People’s Self-Help Housing Corporation project as an example of successful affordable housing development. The City of Guadalupe should use this project as an example for future housing and invest resources into the existing housing stock to rehabilitate dilapidated homes identified by the Land Use Inventory.
This chapter of the background report identified the existing conditions and emerging directions for housing in the City of Guadalupe. Information contained within this chapter will be used in the Guadalupe Community Plan 2030.
7.0 PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

7.1 Introduction
The backbone of a community is its public facilities and services. Their availability and location not only affect a city's development patterns and economic opportunity, but also its citizens' safety and quality of life. Although a "public facilities element" is not mandated under state law, planning for quality public facilities and services is vital to Guadalupe's future. A public facilities element helps ensure that essential public facilities and services will be available to meet community needs.

The California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) General Plan Guidelines (2003) suggest that a public facilities and services element offer generalized long-term policies grounded in realistic analyses of service capacities and demands, both existing and future. In addition, it should provide the policy basis to guide shorter-term documents, such as the City's capita improvements program and annual budget. Thus, the element should describe the general distribution, location, and extent of existing and proposed facilities and services. Additionally, the Guidelines recommend that the need for additional facilities be based on existing need for additional services, and on projected increases in land use intensity and population. Other recommendations include consulting with other service providers, planning for the equitable distribution of new facilities, scheduling a timetable for improvements, expansion and replacement of facilities, and identifying sources of funding. Furthermore, the Guidelines suggest that community design principles be incorporated into the element for public facilities to create community focal points, foster neighborhood integrity, and help preserve or establish community identity. This aspect of public facilities is discussed in greater detail in chapter 12.0, Community Design and Sense of Place.

This chapter addresses seven types of public facilities and services most directly related to the physical development of the City of Guadalupe. These are water, wastewater management, solid waste management, fire protection, police protection, public schools, and library services. The chapter examines existing conditions in terms of capacity and demand, and identifies emerging directions. Basic standards are applied to these facilities and service systems to determine if they are adequate for the City's population. In terms of capacity and demand, and what changes need to be made to allow for population growth.

7.2 Existing Conditions
This section describes the status of the public facilities and services in terms of service capacity and demand, and is broken into seven sections, corresponding to each of the public facilities and services. A map of the public facilities is shown in Figure 7-1.
Figure 7-1. Existing Public Facilities

Source: Cal Poly, 2008
Water
The City of Guadalupe has two primary water supply sources: the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin and the State Water Project.

Santa Maria Groundwater Basin
The Santa Maria Basin underlies much of northern Santa Barbara County and southern San Luis Obispo County. The Basin covers about 700 square miles and is approximately 28 miles long by 12 miles wide. Storage capacity estimates for the Basin range between 1.5 million acre-feet and 2.5 million acre-feet, and average rainfall in the Basin watershed is 24 to 26 inches per year. Water from the Basin is shared with agricultural operations, the oil industry, and other domestic users throughout the Santa Maria Valley, including the City of Santa Maria. The safe annual yield of the Basin is estimated at 25,000 acre-feet per year.\(^1\) (Santa Barbara County, 2005)

Surface drainage is primarily from the Sisquoc and Santa Maria Rivers that traverse the north side of the Basin from east to west. Orcutt Creek, Bradley Canyon, Cat Canyon, and Foxen Canyon are the primary drainages on the south side of the Basin. Natural recharge to the basin can be attributed to seepage from the major streams, percolation of rainfall, and subsurface flow. (Department of Water Resources [DWR], 2003). Flow and associated percolation in the Santa Maria River is controlled by releases from Twitchell Dam which provide optimal recharge for the Santa Maria Valley area of the basin. Other recharge occurs from deep percolation of urban and agricultural return water as well as land application of treated wastewater (DWR, 2003).

Guadalupe is located on the south bank of the Santa Maria River and portions of the City are located within the 100-year floodplain as designated and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Areas of shallow groundwater are also present within the City east of Obispo Street and south of Eleventh Street near the Ninth Street wetlands complex (Guadalupe General Plan, 2001). Implications associated with flooding and shallow groundwater will be further described in Chapter 10, Safety.

In 1997, the Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District filed a lawsuit to adjudicate water rights in the Basin (Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District vs. City of Santa Maria CV 770214, January 11, 2005). The case went to trial in January 2001 and the first phase focused on the issue of overdraft. The arbitrator ruled that the Basin is not presently in a state of overdraft. In June 2006, the Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District negotiated a Settlement Agreement that set forth terms and conditions for a solution concerning the overall management of the Basin’s water resources, including rights to groundwater use. According to this agreement, Santa Maria, the Golden State Water Company, and the City of Guadalupe have preferential appropriative rights to surplus native groundwater. Therefore, these parties may pump groundwater without limitation unless a severe water shortage condition exists.\(^1\) One acre-foot refers to the amount, or volume, of water it takes to cover one acre to a depth of one foot. One acre foot equals 7,758 barrels, 325,829 gallons or 43,560 cubic feet.
event that a severe water shortage exists, the Court may require these parties to limit their pumping to their respective shares and assigned rights. The Court granted the City of Guadalupe 1,300 AFY of prescriptive rights in the Basin during drought conditions (Santa Maria Valley Water Management Agreement, 2005). Overall, the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin is a reliable source of water for the City of Santa Maria (2007). This reliability is based on the City’s water rights in the Basin, in addition to the Basin’s large volume of groundwater storage to buffer drought conditions.

Currently, the City of Guadalupe uses approximately 767 acre-feet per year (AFY) from two wells in the City: the Obispo Well and the Fifth Street Well. The Obispo Well was opened in 2008 and the Fifth Street Well was constructed in 1978. These wells run 12 hours per day, pumping 950 gallons per minute (Jose Vidales, City of Guadalupe, Personal Communication, October 30, 2008). Guadalupe also has a backup well, the Tognazzini Well, which is used periodically when the main wells are taken off line. The City has two other wells on Ninth Street and Obispo Street that are currently inoperable due to mechanical problems. According to the Water Master Plan (2001), the City’s well water is of marginal quality and therefore must be blended with State water at a ratio of one part State water to three parts groundwater prior to delivery.

State Water Project
State water is delivered to the City via a line extending off the State’s Coastal Branch facility (fed by the Central Valley Aqueduct), which is located eleven miles east of Guadalupe. In 1998, the City began receiving a 550 AFY allocation of State water, plus a drought buffer of 55 AFY, to augment the City’s groundwater supplies (Santa Barbara County, 2005). The importation of this water has reduced the stress on the Basin through a reduction in pumping by a number of parties, including Guadalupe. This water is generally higher in quality and is blended with the groundwater. Although the City is allocated 550 AFY of State water, average and historic use has totaled approximately 200 AFY because the supply of State water is not guaranteed on an annual basis. Cutbacks can occur depending on rainfall and snowpack in Northern California, which is the source of this supplemental water, and agricultural uses receive higher priority than water allocations than urban uses.

Water Demand
The City supplies a total of blended groundwater and State water of about 1,287 AFY for domestic uses (Jose Vidales, City of Guadalupe, Personal Communication, October 30, 2008). This amount has increased over the past ten years. According to the Santa Barbara County Groundwater Report (2005), the City’s average use of State water has been 405 AFY, however, in 2007 it increased to approximately 520 AFY. In addition, the City has on average pumped 529 AFY since 2000. Although water demand has increased over the years, the City may pump groundwater without limitation unless a severe water shortage condition exists. However, the unlimited pumping and the State Water Project do not mean the City has a “secure” source of water. In the event of extended drought, the State Water Supply will be turned off, and groundwater supplies will be affected. The City would have a safe annual yield of 1,300 AFY from groundwater.
Drinking Water Supply and Quality

The City of Guadalupe receives its water supply from two sources: local groundwater and the State Water Project via the Coastal Branch pipeline of the Central Valley Aqueduct. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Department of Health Services are the entities responsible for establishing drinking water standards which must be met by the City of Guadalupe municipal water services. These agencies establish two types of standards for drinking water:

- **Primary standards** which affect the health of the community and include constituents such as fecal coliform bacteria, asbestos, arsenic, nitrate, etc.
- **Secondary standards** which are aesthetic in nature and include traits such as taste, odor, color and minerals.

Groundwater quality in the Guadalupe area is considered marginal with respect to secondary aesthetic standards. Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) concentrations vary throughout the basin, but tend to increase from east to west and increase toward the center of the basin beneath the cities of Santa Maria and Guadalupe in Santa Barbara County (DWR, 2003). Historically, the Santa Maria Valley Groundwater Basin has been subject to high nitrate concentrations, particularly in the vicinity of the City of Santa Maria and in Guadalupe (DWR, 2003). Sources of nitrogen-bearing salts within the aquifer may include septic systems and agricultural fertilizer applications. Water quality within the Basin has been positively affected by the operation of the Twitchell Reservoir, releases from which have served to reduce sulfate, nitrate and salt loading.

To enhance the potability of the City’s groundwater supply, which tends to be high in sulfates and total dissolved solids, well water is normally blended with water from the State Water Project at a ratio of one part State water to three parts well water (Guadalupe Water Master Plan, 2002). Due to close proximity to the Pacific Ocean and given the high level of groundwater demand for agricultural and urban use, the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin is actively monitored for saltwater intrusion. Coastal monitoring wells are measured biannually for any indication of seawater intrusion, and to date there has been no evidence of intrusion (DWR, 2003).

Stormwater Runoff

The City of Guadalupe is located within the Santa Maria River watershed which is roughly 468,000 acres in size. The Sisquoc and Cuyama Rivers form the major tributaries of the Santa Maria River, which outfalls to the Pacific Ocean west of Guadalupe. In 2005, the City received a Community Development Block Grant to analyze stormdrain infrastructure and prioritize drainage improvement projects within the City. This grant resulted in the completion of a Storm Drain Master Plan (2007). The City currently owns and operates a municipal storm drain system to service residents and businesses within its jurisdiction. Stormwater refers to runoff resulting from rainfall events which is conveyed, detained or retained through a series of gutters, ditches, pipes and basins.
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Stormwater management is important for several reasons including flood management, public health and water quality. The City’s stormwater management goals include:

- Water Quality
- Streambank Channel Protection
- Habitat Protection
- Groundwater Recharge

Within the City, most off-site stormwater flow originates from agricultural fields to the east and south, draining in a west-northwesterly fashion toward Highway 166, the Ninth street wetlands and the Santa Maria River. Pesticides, fertilizers and sediment negatively impact off-site stormwater quality. The majority of runoff originating within the City stems from impervious surfaces including roofs and roads. Stormwater quality impairments associated with urban runoff include petroleum hydrocarbons and sediment. Soils within the Guadalupe area tend to be well drained with the exception of some shallow groundwater conditions located in the northern half of the City limits.

The 2007 Stormdrain Master Plan study found four major stormwater management priorities within the City:

- Protect existing development inside the Santa Maria River Floodplain that is vulnerable to flood damage;
- Restore the Ninth Street wetlands complex;
- Improve drainage conveyance along Highway 166 at Jack O’Connell Park; and
- Implement small scale Capital Improvement Projects to address minor and routine work including construction of additional inlets and piping.

The Ninth Street wetlands complex represents a roughly 70 acre remnant slough in the heart of Guadalupe. This environmentally sensitive area conveys and detains both agricultural and urban stormwater runoff. Wetland vegetation serves to slow the speed of floodwaters, thereby reducing erosion, facilitating groundwater recharge, and filtering and improving water quality. Wetlands within an urban context serve to counteract increased runoff volume caused by impervious surfaces and provide valuable wildlife habitat. The Stormdrain Master Plan recommends reducing the amount of storm runoff into the wetlands, and improving runoff flow through the system. The goal is to reduce the amount of pollutants entering the system and relieve the volume influx so that the area is less prone to flooding. Wetland hydrology is very complex and changes to the system should be considered carefully.

The City of Guadalupe discharges stormwater directly to the Santa Maria River in several locations. The Santa Maria River is currently listed as an impaired water body by the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA 303d list). Stormwater infrastructure and policy must comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regarding implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to address source controls (volume of...
runoff) and treatment controls to address quality of stormwater runoff. In 2009, the City does not have specific requirements for stormwater controls. Additionally, the City does not have an MS4 permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board for operation of a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System.

Wastewater
The City owns and operates a wastewater treatment plant located west of the developed portion of the City and north of Highway 166. Updated in 2004, the plant uses an advanced integrated pond system that incorporates both anaerobic bacteria and aerobic algae in two, 12-foot-deep ponds to remove waste products from the water. These ponds were enlarged, deepened, and reconfigured to treat raw sewage more efficiently. Water is subsequently transferred to additional ponds where the process is continued before it is finally irrigated by sprinklers on fields to the north, across the Santa Maria River.

Currently, the plant has an influent capacity of 1.0 mgd (million gallons per day) that can serve a population of about 2,500; however, total treatment and effluent disposal capacity is limited by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to 0.966 mgd, which could sustain approximately 2,000 people. Over the last eight years, influent wastewater flow has averaged 0.50 mgd. This is based on an average 80 gallons per capita per day (GPCD) wastewater usage rate (Wastewater Treatment Plant Study, 2007). Currently, the influent wastewater flow averages 0.53 mgd (Reuben Moreno, Personal Communications, October 22, 2008). Thus, with the 2009 population of 6,541, the City’s wastewater treatment plant is operating at just under one-half of its capacity. It could accommodate a growth in population of approximately 5,500 individuals.

The City of Guadalupe and the County of Santa Barbara do not have thresholds for wastewater impacts. However, on a cumulative basis, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the RWQCB have a threshold for overall facilities capacity. Securing agreements and permits, and designing and constructing plant improvements is time-consuming and subject to a number of uncertainties; therefore, the EPA and the RWQCB recommend a 75 percent capacity "check-point" threshold.

However, reaching this threshold would require the City to establish a schedule for necessary treatment plant upgrades and to submit this schedule to both the EPA and the RWQCB at such a time as the average daily flow exceeds 75 percent of the design capacity of the existing facilities. Although Guadalupe is only at 53 percent of the design capacity, the City has already completed a Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Study in June 2007 which presents alternatives for expanding the facility to have an influent capacity of 1.5 to 2.0 mgd. Increasing the influent capacity to 1.5 mgd would support 18,750 residents, which represents a triple in population.
Solid Waste

Solid waste collection service in Guadalupe is provided to businesses and residences by Health Sanitation Services (HSS), a private collection service. HSS furnishes automated trash containers with wheels and an attached lid. Trash is collected weekly and recyclables and organic waste are collected on alternate weeks. HSS hauls solid waste to the City of Santa Maria Landfill and recyclable materials to the Santa Maria Area Recycling Terminal located in the City of Santa Maria. There is no restriction as to the amount of trash a household or business can generate as each individual unit is charged by trash bin size; 90-gallon recycling and green waste bins are provided free of charge. In 2006 (most recent date available), Guadalupe generated approximately 7,186 tons of trash (California Integrated Waste Management Board [CIWMB], 2008).

The City of Santa Maria Landfill is anticipated to reach capacity and close in 2018, assuming the City expands the current facility. Without such an expansion, the landfill will reach capacity in the year 2012 (CIWMB, 2008). Thus, the development of new disposal sites or expansion of the current facility is necessary within the near future, but is not under Guadalupe’s jurisdiction.

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (State Assembly Bill 939) requires cities to have a source reduction element to provide strategies for diverting at least 50 percent of all solid waste from County landfills by the year 2000. This act also requires the adoption of measures to implement the mandated waste stream diversion rate. Guadalupe was unable to meet the mandated 50 percent solid waste diversion requirement in 2000, achieving 38 percent citywide participation. The City has since expanded its recycling program, which now includes programs for both commercial on-site collection and residential curbside collection of recyclables and green waste. It also has a number of diversion programs which include source reduction, facility recovery, composting, policy incentives, and public education. The most recent waste diversion report, however, shows a diversion rate of 31 percent in 2006 (CIWMB, 2008), compared with the Countywide average rate of 69 percent. Thus, new policies, programs, or incentives may be necessary to increase waste diversion in Guadalupe.

Police Protection

The Guadalupe Police Department, located at 4490 Tenth Street, provides law enforcement services to the residents of Guadalupe. The Police Department employs ten full-time, sworn officers, two reserve officers, three administrative assistants, one evidence technician, one police volunteer, and the Chief of Police (George Mitchell, Guadalupe Police Department, Person to Person Communications, October 22, 2008). Ten sworn officers for a current (2008) population of 5,541 results in 1.85 sworn officers per 1,000 residents, or 1.63 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. This level of staffing is slightly higher than other cities of comparable population and is higher than the generally accepted average of one officer per 1,000 residents (County of Santa Barbara Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, 2006). In addition, response times are typically within three minutes to anywhere in the city due to its small
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As such, the Guadalupe Police Department’s response times are much lower than the five minute response time standards set in the County of Santa Barbara Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (2006).

The Guadalupe Police Department has mutual aid agreements with the California Highway Patrol, Santa Maria Police Department, and Santa Barbara County Sheriff’s Department, providing for back-up assistance if needed.

Fire Protection

The Guadalupe Fire Department provides fire protection for the City. The Department operates out of a single fire house adjacent to City Hall at 918 Obispo Street and employs one interim fire chief, four full time fire fighters, and 24 volunteers. Nine of the volunteers have emergency medical training certification. The Fire Department currently utilizes two fire engines, a rescue unit and one command vehicle (Patrick Schmitz, Guadalupe Fire Department, Personal Communications, October 6, 2008). The Department provides the following services:

- Fire Suppression: The fire department responds to structure fires, vehicle fires, wildland or grass fires, dumpster fire, and fire alarm activations.
- Rescue Services: The fire department responds to all motor vehicle crashes where injuries are reported.
- Hazardous Material Response: Fire personnel are trained to respond to many hazardous material releases and take defensive actions at a hazardous material incident scene.
- Fire Prevention Education: Besides completing fire prevention inspections, Guadalupe Fire Department Personnel also provide different forms of fire prevention education including, but not limited to, school and classroom visits, fire station tours, fire extinguisher training, and education in the Guadalupe Fire Department Fire Safety House.

In addition, the Guadalupe Fire Department has a mutual aid agreement with neighboring agencies, such as the Santa Maria Fire Department and the Santa Barbara County Fire Department in the event that it needs backup assistance.

Standards for fire protection are generally stated in terms of the minimum amount of time necessary to respond to calls for assistance. The standards of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) guidelines require five-minute response times from the fire station to the location of the emergency, as well as a minimum of four firefighters on each engine company (NFPA, §5.2.3.1.1). The Guadalupe Fire Department response times are typically within three minutes to the entire city, due to the relatively compact geographic area and the central location of the fire station. In addition, the City has four firefighters on their engine company at all times. Thus, the Department is currently meeting the NFPA standards.

Guadalupe is not located in a “high fire hazard” area; however, they receive a large number of emergency calls. According to the Guadalupe Fire Department, they typically handle over 500
medical emergency responses annually. In addition, in the last five years, the number of emergency calls recorded by the Department has increased by 150 percent (Patrick Schmitz, Guadalupe Fire Department, Personal Communications, October 6, 2008). With further increases, it may be more challenging to meet the five minute response times; thus, the Department should monitor population growth carefully and provide facilities and training to meet emergency medical response needs.

**Schools**

The Guadalupe Union School District (GUSD) operates the Mary Buren Elementary School that serves kindergarten through fifth grade, and the Kermit McKenzie Junior High School that provides sixth through eighth grade education within the City of Guadalupe. High school students from Guadalupe attend Righetti High School, which is operated by the Santa Maria Joint Union High School District (SMJUHSD). Mary Buren Elementary School is situated on nine acres of land and has 67,600 square feet of floor area, including twenty permanent classrooms, two portable classrooms, a library, a computer lab, a cafeteria, administrative offices, a teacher’s workroom housed in a portable building, restrooms, and storage rooms. Kermit McKenzie Junior High School is situated on 1.1 acres. School facilities have nearly 30,000 square feet of floor area, and include ten permanent classrooms, nine portable classrooms, a library, a computer lab, a cafeteria, administrative offices, restrooms, and storage rooms. The District is planning a new middle school to be built at the southeast corner of State Route 1 and State Route 166.

A year-round school feasibility study conducted for the GUSD found that both the elementary and junior high schools are being utilized beyond their designed capacities. Mary Buren Elementary was designed to accommodate approximately 600 students; however in 2009 there were over 794 kindergarten and elementary aged students enrolled. McKenzie Junior High School was originally designed as an elementary school. It has the capacity to accommodate approximately 240 students, but in 2009 there are approximately 372 students enrolled. Thus, the school district is at 135 percent capacity (Guadalupe Union School District, 2009).

**Library**

The Guadalupe Library is one of the three County branches that is part of the Santa Maria Library. The Guadalupe Library is located at 4719 Main Street, Suite D, at the corner of Main Street and Pioneer Street and is open to the public five days a week. The library is a full-service extension that provides Internet access, materials in both Spanish and English, and interlibrary loans. There are five computers, three of which have internet access, one that is for homework, and one that contains the library's catalog. As part of the Black Gold Cooperative, access to libraries in Santa Maria, Lompoc, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, and Paso Robles is available to Guadalupe Library cardholders. According to Librarian Cynthia Cadena (2008), the library has approximately 2500 to 6000 visitors a week and has sufficient resources to meet existing community needs.
7.3 Emerging Directions

In 2009, Guadalupe is adequately meeting public needs for water, wastewater collection and treatment, solid waste collection, police protection, fire protection, and library services. Public schools, however, are over capacity and the City is not meeting its 50 percent waste diversion requirement as mandated by the California Integrated Waste Management Board. Accordingly, there are several emerging directions for Guadalupe’s public facilities and services. For example, the Guadalupe Unified School District should expand the educational facilities to meet the community’s present and future needs. In addition, the City should expand its recycling program through innovative policies and programs. In general, the City should also expand public facilities and add staff as necessary to meet future needs. Incorporating these items into the updated General Plan document will provide Guadalupe with the necessary tools to accommodate growth.
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8.0 CONSERVATION

8.1 Introduction
Conservation is the planned management, preservation, and wise use of natural resources. The conservation element of the General Plan provides direction regarding the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources within the community and surrounding area (Office of Planning & Research [OPR], 2003). California Government Code Section 65302(d) requires that the conservation element describe water, forests, soils, rivers, harbors, fisheries, wildlife, minerals, and other natural resources to the extent that they are relevant within the community.

This chapter provides an inventory of the location, physical and biological conditions, as well as land use implications of Guadalupe's natural resources. Findings in this chapter serve as the factual basis for the Community Plan and will help guide future policies and land use decisions.

8.2 Existing Conditions
Physical Setting
The physical setting describes conditions including:

- Climate
- Geology
- Soils
- Topography
- Hydrology
- Water Quality and Supply
- Air Quality

These conditions affect the location, type, and density of development feasible within the community. Water quality, air quality, and the condition of natural resources also affect the quality of life for City residents. These resources, therefore, should be considered when making land use decisions.

Climate

The Central Coast of California is characterized by a Mediterranean climate, with mild summers and winters and an average rainfall of 4 to 50 inches (Western Regional Climate Center [WRCC], 2007). A semi-permanent high pressure region that lies off the Pacific Coast results in relatively low rainfall amounts on the coastal plain, with warm, dry summers and cool, damp winters. Summer temperatures average about 70 degrees Fahrenheit near the coast and in the high 80s to 90s inland. During winter, average minimum temperatures range from the 40s along the coast to the 30s inland. Overall, temperature averages 50 to 63 degrees Fahrenheit with small daily and seasonal temperature fluctuation and high relative humidity. The growing season lasts up to 330 days (United States Forest Service [USFS], 2008). The City of Guadalupe experiences an average annual precipitation of 14 inches with
frost being extremely rare. Year-round west and northwest winds are common (Citydata.com, 2008). Additionally, cool, humid marine air causes frequent fog and low clouds along the coast, generally during the night and morning hours in the late spring and early summer. The fog and low clouds can persist for several days until broken up by a change in the weather pattern (DJ Farms Specific Plan EIR, 2005).

Average temperature, precipitation and wind speed conditions are illustrated in Figures 8-1A, B and C.

Figure 8-1A. City of Guadalupe Average Temperatures

![Average Temperatures](image)

Source: City Data.com

Figure 8-1B. City of Guadalupe Average Precipitation
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Source: City Data.com

Figure 8-1C. City of Guadalupe Average Wind Speed
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Source: City-Data.com
Geology

The City of Guadalupe is located in the Santa Maria Valley on the alluvial plain of the Santa Maria River. Surface geology underlying the Valley is characterized by a succession of alluvial sands, silts, and clays progressing downward to include the Paso Robles Formation and the Careaga Sand formation. These geologic units are the main sources of domestic and agricultural water supplies in the area (DJ Farms Specific Plan EIR, 2005).

Soils

Soil formation within Guadalupe has been strongly influenced by the Santa Maria River floodplain. Soils underlying and surrounding the City are fertile and alluvial in nature, consisting primarily of loams, sandy loams, and silty clay loams. Nearly all the soil map units within the area are considered prime agricultural farmland within Santa Barbara County (California Department of Conservation, 2005). The flat topography of the Santa Maria Valley, combined with well-drained soils, also create excellent urban development conditions. However, the superior fertility and cultivation potential of these soils makes them an important local and statewide agricultural resource. Figure 8-2 illustrates the various soil map units present within the Guadalupe area. Characteristics of the main soil types are further described in Table 8-1.

Figure 8-2. Soil Map Units in the Guadalupe Area

## Table 8-1. Soil Types and Characteristics of the Guadalupe Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Symbol</th>
<th>Soil Name</th>
<th>Land Capability Class</th>
<th>Soil Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SaA</td>
<td>Salinas Loam 0-2% Slopes</td>
<td>LCC I and Prime Farmland</td>
<td>Occurs on broad floodplains. Well drained with high fertility, moderately slow permeability, slow runoff rate, and low erosion potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StA</td>
<td>Sorrento Sandy Loam 0-2% Slopes</td>
<td>LCC I and Prime Farmland</td>
<td>Occurs on smooth floodplains. Well drained with high fertility, moderately rapid permeability, slow runoff, and low erosion potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>Camarillo Sandy Loam</td>
<td>LCC II and Prime Farmland If drained</td>
<td>Poorly drained floodplain soil, characterized by shallow water table. Moderate fertility and permeability, low erosion potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs</td>
<td>Riverwash</td>
<td>LCC VIII Very Limited Use</td>
<td>Consists of water-deposited sand, gravel, and cobblestones in active stream channels. Supports little to no vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SdA</td>
<td>Salinas Silty Clay Loam 0-2% Slopes</td>
<td>LCC I and Prime Farmland</td>
<td>Occurs on alluvial fans and floodplains. Well drained with high fertility, moderately slow permeability, slow runoff rate, and low erosion potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoA</td>
<td>Metz Loamy Sand 0-2% Slopes</td>
<td>LCC III and Prime Farmland</td>
<td>Found on low lying floodplains. Excessively drained with rapid permeability, slow surface runoff, low erosion potential, and low fertility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Northern Santa Barbara County CA, 1972*

## Topography

The City of Guadalupe is located in the Santa Maria River Valley, a broad, flat expanse of prime agricultural land bordered by the river and the Nipomo Dunes complex to the west, the Casmalia Hills to the south and agricultural lands, to the east, stretching toward the City of Santa Maria. Guadalupe has very little topographic variation within the city limits and is located roughly 85 feet above mean sea level.

## Air Quality

The City of Guadalupe is located within the South Central Coast Air Basin. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is the regional agency responsible for tracking, reporting, and reducing air pollution. Air quality in the basin is influenced by local topography as well as meteorological conditions. Poor air quality is usually associated with air stagnation, characterized by restricted air movement. Prevailing winds in the Santa Maria Valley are usually strong and therefore air quality in the City of Guadalupe is generally good. Air quality at a given location can be described by the concentrations of various pollutants, harmful substances, in the atmosphere.
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(Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District [SBCAPCD], 2007). The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) have established ambient air quality standards for common pollutants. Properties, sources, and effects of common air pollutants are outlined in Table 8-2. The APCD maintains 17 monitoring stations within Santa Barbara County. The closest station to Guadalupe is located in the City of Santa Maria. According to the 2006 APCD Annual Air Quality Report, the Santa Maria monitoring station measures the following pollutants: Ozone (O₃), Nitrogen Oxides (NOₓ), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Suspended Particulate Matter (PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅), wind speed, and wind direction. According to the 2006 Report, the Santa Maria monitoring station met all federal standards for measured pollutants. The station also met all state standards with the exception of particulate matter (PM₁₀), where the annual mean level exceeded the state maximum twice during the year. Santa Barbara County is an attainment area for the federal eight-hour ozone standard, however the County has yet to attain the California one-hour standard, which is considered to be more protective of public health (SBCAPCD, 2007). Figure 8-3 illustrates the number of days ozone levels were exceeded in Santa Barbara County from 1988 to 2007.

Table 8-2. Common Air Pollutant Properties, Sources and Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Major Sources</th>
<th>Related Health &amp; Environmental Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>Ground level ozone is created by the chemical reaction between oxides of nitrogen and volatile organic compounds (VOC) in the presence of heat and sunlight.</td>
<td>Motor vehicles, industrial emissions, gasoline vapors, and chemical solvents.</td>
<td>Irritation of lung airways and inflammation; aggravated asthma; reduced lung capacity; and increased susceptibility to respiratory illnesses (i.e. bronchitis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>Suspended particulate matter is a term used to describe particulates in the air including dust, soot, smoke, and liquid droplets.</td>
<td>Motor vehicles, factories, construction sites, agricultural fields, unpaved roads, and burning woods.</td>
<td>Aggravated asthma; increases in respiratory symptoms, decreased lung function; and reduced visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Carbon Monoxide is a colorless, odorless gas that is formed when carbon in fuel is not burned completely.</td>
<td>Fuel compaction, industrial processes, and areas of high traffic density during the peak hour traffic (localized sources of concern).</td>
<td>Chest pain for those that suffer from heart disease; reduced mental alertness; and death (at high levels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides (NOₓ)</td>
<td>Generic form of highly organic gases, all of which contain nitrogen in varying amounts. Nitrogen Oxides are odorless and colorless.</td>
<td>Motor vehicles, electric utilities, etc.</td>
<td>Toxic to plants; reduced visibility; and respiratory irritant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>Sulfur oxide gases are formed when fuel containing sulfur such as coal and oil is burned and when gasoline is extracted from oil by metals extracted from ore.</td>
<td>Electric utilities especially for those that burn coal and industrial facilities that derive their products from raw materials to produce heat.</td>
<td>Respiratory illness, particularly in children and the elderly; and aggravates existing heart and lung disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)</td>
<td>Precursor of ground-level ozone.</td>
<td>Petroleum transfer and storage, mobile sources, and organic solvent use.</td>
<td>Potential carcinogen (e.g., benzene) and toxic to plants and animals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District Clean Air Plan, 2007
To address air quality and emissions reduction, the APCD has partnered with the California Air Resources Control Board and the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) to develop and implement the 2007 Clean Air Plan for Santa Barbara County (CAP). The CAP identifies countywide sources of pollutants which serve as precursors to the formation of Ozone. Potential sources of air quality concern within the Guadalupe area include emissions associated with:

- Fuel combustion attributed to food and agricultural production
- Industrial processes associated with food and agricultural production
- Particulate matter emissions associated with farm equipment
- Solvent evaporation of pesticides and fertilizers

Additionally, the City of Guadalupe serves as a bedroom community for other cities within the county, including Santa Maria. Vehicle miles travelled by City residents to and from employment, coupled with heavy truck traffic associated with industrial and agricultural industry also represent a source of emissions and air quality concern.

**Physical Setting Implications**

The City of Guadalupe has very few physical constraints to development. Mild climate and flat topography make much of the land within the City limits suitable for intensification. The high value of agricultural soils within and surrounding the City represents the largest development barrier. Much of the land surrounding the City is encumbered in Williamson Land Conservation Act contracts, which will be further discussed in Chapter 9.0, Open Space. Other constrained areas include the Santa Maria River floodplain, areas of perched/shallow groundwater in the
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**Figure 8-3. Number of Days Exceeding State and Federal Ozone Standards 1988 – 2007 Santa Barbara County**

Source: Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District – Clean Air Plan, 2007
northern section of the City, and the wetlands complex located at Ninth and Obispo Streets. Water supply currently meets demand; however, depending upon climate/recharge conditions and other basin allocations, future adjudication of groundwater rights within the basin is possible which could form a severe development constraint. Water supply and demand is further discussed in Chapter 7.0, Public Facilities and Services.

In 2009, the City of Guadalupe experiences drainage issues within the City service area and has begun to address those issues through the development of a Storm Drain Master Plan. The City does not presently have standards and specifications for stormwater controls. Development of stormwater management practices, as well as preparation of requirements for a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Permit, should be explored to meet NPDES Phase II Regulatory Requirements and to protect water quality in the Ninth Street wetlands and the Santa Maria River. New State standards requiring California cities and counties to implement low impact development (LID) standards will also affect storm runoff rates and water quality in the near future.

A community’s land use patterns have a direct influence on air quality, most notably through travel distances between employment and housing for local residents. The balance between jobs and housing is important for the overall health of a community. Compact development, mixed-use zoning, transit-oriented development, and infill development as planning tools that can reduce reliance on motor vehicles, and therefore, improve air quality. Wise land use planning decisions combined with community level education and incentive programs may positively affect air quality within the City of Guadalupe.

**Biological Setting**

Biological resources include plant and animal species, as well as their habitats and ecosystems. The City of Guadalupe’s General Plan outlines goals, objectives, and recommendations to protect and enhance the quality of the natural environment, including wildlife and riparian habitat. Protection and conservation of biological resources is undertaken by several federal, state and local agencies, including the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Department of Fish and Game, and local non-profit entities such as the Dunes Center. The federal Endangered Species Act serves to protect plant and animal species deemed to be threatened or endangered at the state or federal level and prohibits harm to such species and their degradation of their habitat.

No published biological surveys are available that cover the entire City of Guadalupe planning area. Therefore, biological resource information for this section was obtained from environmental documents pertaining to specific areas of the City such as the DJ Farms site as well as regional data resources for Santa Barbara County including the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). A sensitive species list for the City of Guadalupe was developed with data from the Guadalupe Quadrangle. Table 8-3 displays this information.
Natural Vegetation

Plant communities and ecosystems in the Northern Santa Barbara County region have developed over time in response to influences of a variety of environmental factors, including climate and topography. Clearing of native vegetation on the Santa Maria River valley floor for cultivation and within riparian areas for channel modification and floodwater diversion have served to alter the landscape into its present state. Key plant communities located in the Guadalupe Area and their characteristics are discussed below (SAIC, 2004):

1. Coastal Strand and Coastal Scrub
2. Riparian Woodland
3. Wetlands
4. Non-Native Grassland and Agriculture
5. Coastal Strand and Coastal Scrub

To the west of the City begins the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Complex which is characterized by coastal strand, sandy beach, coastal scrub, and wetland habitat. The complex includes the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes National Wildlife Refuge (managed by the US Fish and Wildlife Service) north of the Santa Maria River Estuary as well as the Rancho Guadalupe Dunes Preserve which is located south of the estuary, owned by Santa Barbara County and managed by the non-profit Center for Natural Lands Management (CNLM). The complex represents a National Natural Landmark and is home to many species of rare plants and animals including La Graciosa Thistle, California Red-Legged Frog, Western Snowy Plover and California Least Tern (SAIC, 2004). Resident and migratory shorebirds utilize this habitat for foraging and nesting. Figure 8-5 illustrates the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes habitat as viewed from the Rancho Guadalupe Dunes Preserve.

Figure 8-4. Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes

Source: Cal Poly, 2008

Figure 8-5. Wetlands Complex

Source: Google Earth, 2008

Riparian Woodland

Riparian woodland habitat occurs along the wetted channel of the Santa Maria River, along remnant channeled breaches, and along the edges of riparian habitat located in the northern section of the City. Arroyo Willow tends to dominate the plant species composition within riparian woodlands; however, the occasional Black Cottonwood, Elderberry and Sycamore trees may be inter-dispersed with Willow. Riparian woodland vegetation transitions into herbaceous wetland habitat within the floodplain of the River (SAIC, 2004).
Wetlands

Wetlands systems are common throughout the Santa Maria River floodplain, particularly west of the City within the Estuary and Dunes Complex. A wetland system exists within the City limits at the junction of Ninth and Obispo Streets. The wetland area is thickly surrounded by woody vegetation nearly concealing it from view. Figures 8-6 and 8-7 illustrate an aerial view as well as its appearance from Obispo Street looking east.

Figure 8-6. Wetlands Complex and Riparian Vegetation, Obispo Street View

Source: Cal Poly, 2008

Wetland systems are often remnant features of lateral river migration. The Ninth Street wetlands complex is bound by urban development to the north. Perennial species are often present including Rushes, Cattails and floating aquatic plants. Wetland areas serve as important sources of habitat for wildlife, invertebrates, resident, and migratory birds, and provide stormwater detention and natural filtering (SAIC, 2004).

Non-Native Grassland and Agriculture

Non-native grassland areas are upland areas characterized by annual, non-native grass species typically found throughout rangelands in California, such as Avena fatua, Poa species and other introduced forbs. Cattle grazing is common in the Guadalupe area in the herbaceous wetland areas along the floodplain of the river, and in irrigated pastures west of the City (SAIC, 2004). Many of the species found within non-native grassland areas tend to be classified as weedy and invasive. Areas throughout the City adjacent to agricultural fields, access roads, levees, or urban development are dominated by invasive annual plants characteristic of disturbed areas. Agricultural landscapes within the City planning area include productive fields located to the east (generally west of Simas Road) as well as cultivation to the south and west. Row crops are the dominant type of agricultural commodity produced in the area including broccoli, cauliflower, and squash (DJ Farms Specific Plan EIR, 2005). Figure 8-8 illustrates agricultural landscapes within the City limits in the DJ Farms Specific Plan area and 8-9 illustrates non-native grasslands to the west of Leroy Park.
Wildlife

The preservation of wildlife habitat is essential to maintaining biodiversity of species within the Guadalupe Planning Area. The City specifically provides goals, policies, and objectives within its General Plan for the protection and enhancement of wildlife resources. Although the City itself has limited habitat, the nearby coastal dunes complex, Santa Maria River estuary, and riparian corridor provide considerable habitat for a number of wildlife species. Table 8-3 outlines the common plant and wildlife species found in the Guadalupe Quadrangle, including possible threatened and endangered species which are highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>CA Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ambystoma californiense</em></td>
<td>California Tiger Salamander</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Spea hammondii</em></td>
<td>Western Spadefoot Toad</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rana draytonii</em></td>
<td>California Red-Legged Frog</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gila orcuttii</em></td>
<td>Arroyo Chub</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Taxidea taxus</em></td>
<td>American Badger</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Actinemys marmorata pallida</em></td>
<td>Southwestern Pond Turtle</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>CA Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Cirsium lonchol epis</em></td>
<td>La Graciosa Thistle</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Deinandra increscens ssp. Foliosa</em></td>
<td>Leafy Earplant</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Atriplex serenana var. davidsonii</em></td>
<td>Davidson’s Saltscale</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arctostaphylos rudas</em></td>
<td>Sand Mesa Manzanita</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Monardella crispa</em></td>
<td>Crisped Leaf Monardella</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Orobanche parishii ssp. brachyloba</em></td>
<td>Short-Lobed Broomrape</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Scrophularia atrata</em></td>
<td>Black-Flowered Figwort</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Fish and Game, CNNDB Quick Viewer, 2008
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Table 8-3. Common Plant and Wildlife Species Present in the Guadalupe Quadrangle
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Biological Setting Implications
As the City develops, wildlife habitat should be preserved several ways:

1. Development should be directed away from sensitive ecosystems and habitats including the river corridor and the Ninth Street wetlands complex which serve as valuable habitat within the urban context of Guadalupe. Boundaries of the Ninth Street wetlands resource are largely unknown and efforts should be directed to define them so that potential impacts caused by adjacent development can be adequately measured.

2. Wildlife corridors, paths or channels accommodating wildlife foraging, nesting and movement through urban areas, should be identified and protected where located near development; and

3. Open space areas should be protected to establish a buffer between the City and other urban areas, both to define urban boundaries and to permanently protect watershed and habitat areas.

Other Natural Resources

Sustainability
Sustainability has become an increasingly important topic in land use planning documents around the state. As implementation of state legislation, including AB 32 and the more recent SB 775 begin, cities and counties must incorporate goals, policies, and programs to directly address climate change and the conservation of finite natural resources. The Office of the California Attorney General recently updated its Global Warming Measures publication (2008) which serves to identify how municipalities can incorporate global warming measures into the California Environmental Quality Act and General Plan process. The document features generally applicable measures to address global warming including:

- Energy efficiency
- Renewable energy
- Water conservation and efficiency
- Solid waste reduction
- Land use measures
- Transportation and motor vehicle measures
- Off-site mitigation

Additionally, the Office of the Attorney General identifies specific global warming measures that should be addressed in the required elements of the general plan or an optional climate change or energy element. The conservation element of the general plan should include goals, policies, or programs which address specific program measures to promote energy efficiency, green building, minimization of greenhouse gas emissions, water conservation strategies, recycling and composting, preservation of open space, and provision of public education regarding sustainability issues.

Currently, the City of Guadalupe does not offer a streamlined process or incentives for green or energy efficient projects. Rate of development is slow and enforcement staff is limited. The City does have a compact footprint with ample opportunity for infill development. Transportation choices among City residents lean heavily toward automobile dependence. The majority of resident jobs and services are
located outside the City service area. The development of locally serving amenities within the City, as well as economic opportunities to foster job creation are greatly needed.

**Energy and Materials Conservation – Environmental Sustainability**

In 2009, the City of Guadalupe does not have policies that directly address climate change or environmental sustainability. However, recent State laws, such as SB 375, require cities to identify strategies to promote sustainable communities and to reduce global warming due to energy use and greenhouse gas emissions. The City does, however, have the ability to enact and implement policies to promote sustainability within the community. Specific policies and programs which may be feasible within the context of Guadalupe include:

- Strengthen building codes to require energy efficiency
- Require all new government building projects meet green building standards
- Adopt a “Green Building Program”
- Require orientation of buildings to maximize passive solar heating
- Provide permit streamlining and other incentives for energy efficient projects
- Conduct energy efficiency audits
- Partner with community services agencies to fund energy efficiency projects for low-income residents
- Seek local funds as well as redevelopment and Community Development Block Grant funding to assist affordable housing developers with energy efficient design
- Preserve existing conservation areas (i.e., wetlands and riparian corridors)
- Adopt a “heat island” mitigation plan which requires trees and the development of an urban forestry program to provide shade, carbon reduction and improve streetscapes
- Provide public education and information about options for recycling, conserving water and reducing greenhouse gas emissions

The implementation of policies to address sustainability and climate change should incorporate the use of volunteers and non-profit collaboration to obtain grant funding, land, regional coordination and stewardship to maximize the protection of natural resources.

**8.3 Emerging Directions**

Emerging directions regarding conservation of Guadalupe’s natural resources were derived from community comments at focus group meetings held in October and November 2008. Emerging directions are also based upon the research findings outlined in this chapter.

Community residents expressed the need to preserve the Ninth Street wetlands complex through public purchase of the land when there is a willing seller. Public access, management and the creation of a wetlands educational facility similar to that located at Oso Flaco Lake was also identified as a conservation goal. Resident input and background research also indicates the need to preserve groundwater and surface water quality within the watershed through proper stormwater planning. Water conservation is a high community priority and conservation education opportunities should be pursued.
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In addition to water conservation, there is also a community need for improved solid waste recycling efforts within the City to meet target waste diversion rates. Opportunities to provide recycling education and incentivize recycling participation should be explored. Citizens are interested in pursuing City beautification efforts to collect garbage, plant trees, and provide landscaping in public places. Efforts of other local communities to implement volunteer-based beautification programs, such as America in Bloom, should be studied.

City residents and background research also indicates a strong need to address sustainability through implementation of policies such as green-building incentives, use of renewable energy, and water conservation measures.
9.0 PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

9.1 Introduction
The \textit{parks and open space element} of the \textit{general plan} is dedicated to the long-range preservation and conservation of open space. Open space is defined by the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) General Plan Guidelines (2003) as "an parcel or area of land or water that is essentially unimproved and devoted to open-space use" (p. 82). According to the OPR Guidelines, a general plan’s open space element must address the following topics:

- Preservation of natural resources
- Managed production of resources
- Outdoor recreation
- Public health and safety
- Trail-oriented recreational use
- Retention of all publicly owned corridors for future use
- City and county trail routes linking segments of the California Recreational Trails System

In this report, these topics are divided into four categories. Existing conditions in Guadalupe, implications and emerging directions are discussed for each category. These four categories are:

- Parks and outdoor recreation
- Passive Open Space
- Agricultural resources
- Local and statewide trail systems

9.2 Existing Conditions
Information on existing open space conditions was gathered from the City of Guadalupe’s General Plan (2002) and supplemented with site reconnaissance and additional research.

Parks and Recreation
Land classified as parks includes existing and proposed facilities designed for active recreational use. Guadalupe’s parks and recreation system includes State, County, and City parks, as well as schools. These parks provide space for outdoor recreation and often include improved facilities such as playgrounds. In this report, school playgrounds are known as joint-use facilities. Excluding the vast Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve, which lies outside the City limits, Guadalupe has 20.78 acres of park space, two joint-use facilities, and a gymnasium in City Hall. Table 9-1 lists the various amenities found in Guadalupe’s parks, and Figure 9-1 shows their locations.
Figure 9-1. Parks Map

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008.
### Table 9-1. City Park Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Lawn</th>
<th>Sports Field</th>
<th>Other Sports Facility</th>
<th>BBQ</th>
<th>Playground</th>
<th>Restrooms</th>
<th>Picnic Tables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leroy Park¹</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack O'Connell Park</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park²</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paco Pereyra Park</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Mini Park on Tognazzini Ave.</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Mini Park on Pioneer St. and Hernandez Dr.</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Buren Elementary School</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermit McKenzie Junior High School</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The Leroy Park Property consists of 25 acres, but only four are developed with recreational facilities (Guadalupe General Plan, 2002).
²Central Park is currently being used for the construction of the new water tower so park amenities are not yet known.

Source: California Polytechnic State University

### City Parks

- **Leroy Park.** Leroy Park is shown in Figure 9-2. The park covers 25 acres, however, all but four of these acres are in the Santa Maria River floodplain and are not used for recreation. The four usable acres include a grassy field, barbeques, picnic benches, restrooms, and a playground.
- **Jack O'Connell Park.** Jack O'Connell Park, shown in Figure 9-3, is located on the corner of Calle Cesar E. Chavez and West Main Street. The park consists of 14.53 acres and includes all football field, soccer field, baseball field, horseshoe pits, barbeques, restrooms and a playground.
- **Central Park.** Central Park is located on the corner of Pacheco Street and Tenth Street. The park consists of 1.18 acres. In 2009, Central Park was being used for construction of the new water tower and its final amenities and design are undetermined.
- **Paco Pereyra Park.** Paco Pereyra Park is located on the corners of Carlin Drive and Mahoney Lane, and Third Street and Lindy Drive. The park consists of 0.72 acres and contains picnic tables and a lawn.
- **Unnamed Mini Park on Tognazzini Avenue.** This mini park consists of 0.04 acres and includes horseshoe pits and a playground. There is open space and turf.
- **Unnamed Mini Park on Pioneer Street and Hernandez Drive.** This park consists of 0.31 acres and consists of turf areas and shade trees.
State Parks

- **Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve.** The Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve is a State facility located outside of Guadalupe’s sphere of influence. However, the preserve is only three miles from the City limits and provides recreational space for Guadalupe residents. The Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve consists of 22,000 acres, or just over 34 square miles (Dunes Center Conservation, 2008).

Schools

- **Mary Buren Elementary School.** Mary Buren Elementary School is located at 1050 Peralta Street. School facilities include a sports field, basketball courts, a playground and restrooms.
- **Kermit McKenzie Junior High School.** Kermit McKenzie Junior High School is located at 4710 West Main Street. School facilities include sports fields, basketball courts and restrooms.

Parks and Recreation Standards

There are two standards used for evaluating park and recreation space. Table 9-2 shows how Guadalupe fulfills these standards. The first standard comes from the Quimby Act (Government Code §66477). The Quimby Act gives cities discretion in adopting a local standard. The City of Guadalupe General Plan (1989) does not specify a standard. Most cities aim for a ratio of three...
to four acres per 1,000 residents, and the City meets this, with approximately 3.22 acres of park land per 1,000 residents.

The second standard comes from the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA). This standard is more complex and divides the park system into neighborhood parks, community parks and regional parks.

**Neighborhood Parks.** Neighborhood parks are parks serving the surrounding neighborhoods with open space and facilities such as basketball courts, picnic tables and children’s playgrounds. Leroy Park, Central Park, Paco Pereyra Park and both Unnamed Mini Parks are considered neighborhood parks. There are 6.25 acres of neighborhood park space in Guadalupe, excluding playgrounds at Mary Buren Elementary School and Kermit McKenzie Junior High School. If these playgrounds are included in the acreage, Guadalupe meets the NRPA standards for neighborhood parks.

**Community Parks.** Community parks are parks including areas suited for intense recreation facilities such as athletic complexes and swimming pools. Jack O’Connell Park, consisting of 14.53 acres, is the only community park in Guadalupe. Based on this standard, Guadalupe needs an additional 18.17 acres of community park space.

**Regional Parks.** Regional Parks can serve several communities and encompass natural resources. The Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve is a regional park consisting of 22,000 acres. This exceeds NRPA requirements for regional park space.

Park standards concerning the population to park acreage ratio in Guadalupe are met according to the Quimby Act, but are not met according to the NRPA. A common target for urban areas is to have neighborhood and community park space within one-quarter mile of all residences. Figure 9-4 identifies areas of the City within one-quarter mile of a neighborhood park.
### Table 9-2. Application of Park Standards to City Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Calculated Need*</th>
<th>Existing Park Space</th>
<th>Deficiency/Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common City Standard</strong> 3 acres/1,000 population</td>
<td>19.62 acres</td>
<td>20.78 acres</td>
<td>(1.16) acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NRPA Standard for Neighborhood Parks</strong> 1-2 acres/1000 population</td>
<td>6.5 acres</td>
<td>6.25 acres</td>
<td>0 acres (once joint-use facilities are considered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NRPA Standard for Community Parks</strong> 5-8 acres/1000 population</td>
<td>32.7 acres</td>
<td>14.53 acres</td>
<td>18.17 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NRPA Standard for Regional Parks</strong> 5-10 acres/1000 population</td>
<td>32.7 acres</td>
<td>22,000 acres</td>
<td>(21,967.3) acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated need based on lowest parameter of NRPA standard*

Source: California Government Code §66477, City of Frederick General Plan, 2004; Guadalupe General Plan, 2002.
Figure 9-4. Residential Uses within ¼ mile of a Park

Residential Uses within 1/4 mile of a Neighborhood Park or School Playground
October 2008

Legend
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- City Boundary

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008.
Implications

Park acreage in the City meets the Quimby Act standards in terms of the park area to population ratio, but does not meet the NRPA standards for community park space. If the City would like to meet this standard and additional 18.17 acres of community park space need to be added. Not all residents live within one quarter mile of a neighborhood park, which is something the City might want to pursue by acquiring and improving additional parkland near this neighborhood. It is up to the City to decide if more park space will be designated in the land use plan.

The Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve is a special outdoor recreation resource for the city. Pedestrian and bicycle access from the City to the Preserve is incomplete and poses safety concern in some sections.

Open Space

Land classified as open space includes areas subject to flooding, and adjacent to creeks, beds, and rivers, well farms, and groundwater recharge areas. Existing open space in and around the City serves several purposes. It provides resource preservation and management, enhances public health and safety, and adds to the aesthetic quality of the area. Many issues related to open space are discussed in greater depth in chapter 8.0, Conservation. The following is a list of open space areas in the City. These areas are mapped in Figure 9-5.

Santa Maria Floodplain. Areas subject to flooding by the Santa Maria River are unavailable for development. These areas are a valuable visual asset. These areas also provide important natural habitats for various plant and animal species which enhance the quality of the natural world in and around Guadalupe.

Ninth Street Wetland Complex. There is a large, privately owned wetland located on the eastern side of the City. The wetland is fenced off and inaccessible to the public. Due to the riparian overgrowth, it is difficult to get a sense of the wetland’s acreage, which somewhat limits the area’s open space value, although it provides significant wildlife value.

Open Space Standards

Growth limitations for the Santa Maria Floodplain have to do with safety standards and are discussed in chapter 10.0, Safety. Development limitations for the Ninth Street Wetland Complex have to do with endangered species habitat protection. Details about wetland species are discussed in chapter 8.0, Conservation.
Implications
The Santa Maria Floodplain provides Guadalupe with permanent open space to enhance the City’s visual quality. Considering this land can never be developed, other recreational options in and around the area should be explored.
Agricultural Resources

Land classified as agriculture is land managed for the production of resources. Agriculture in the Santa Maria Valley is a mainstay of Guadalupe's economy, protects the area’s rural setting, and views of open space and is an important part of the City’s cultural heritage. “Island pockets” of agriculture exist within the City limits; however, these “island pockets” have been re-designated for urban and mixed uses due to potential conflicts of having agriculture too close to urban activity. Agricultural land use requires activities like crop dusting, pesticide and insecticide spraying, agricultural burning, and consequently, can generate odors and dust (City of Guadalupe, 2003). Because of these issues, careful land use planning is necessary in the City of Guadalupe.

Agricultural Resources Standards

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act) established a standard for the preservation of agricultural land. The Williamson Act enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of preserving specific parcels for agricultural or open space use. In return, landowners receive lower property tax assessments than normal because these assessments are based on open space and agricultural uses rather than on the land’s full market value under a “highest and best use” scenario (GC§51297). All of the parcels bordering the City, except those in the flood zone, are under Williamson Act contracts. Figure 9-6 shows the location of Williamson Act parcels around Guadalupe.

If a landowner wishes to terminate a Williamson Act contract, he or she must provide notice of nonrenewal to the contracting agency. A notice of nonrenewal begins the nine-year nonrenewal period during which the annual tax assessment gradually increases. After nine years the contract is terminated. Cancellation of a contract can be granted by the decision-making body only if it makes public interest or consistency findings (GC§51297).

To determine if a cancellation is consistent with the purpose of the Williamson Act, the decision-making body must also find:

- Cancellation is for land on which a notice of nonrenewal has been served.
- Cancellation is not likely to result in the removal of adjacent lands from agricultural use.
- Cancellation is for an alternative use which is consistent with the applicable provisions of the city or county general plan.
- Cancellation will not result in discontiguous patterns of urban development.
- There is no proximate, non-contracted land which is both available and suitable for the proposed use or that development of the non-contracted land would provide a more contiguous pattern of urban development (GC§51297).

Implications

All City adjacent parcels are under Williamson Act contracts. One parcel, located just outside of the City limits along the northeast border, is up for non-renewal. If the City hopes to eventually expand its sphere of influence or annex land, these Williamson Act contracts will have to be considered. Due to the growth limitations caused by the Williamson Act, Guadalupe should first consider infill development to preserve adjacent prime agricultural land.
Figure 9-6. Williamson Act Contracts

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Inventory, 2008.
Local and Statewide Trail Systems

The OPR Guidelines suggest the open space element of a general plan address open space demands for trail-oriented recreational use (2003). There are three state trails in the vicinity of the City. Connectivity to these trails should be addressed, and appropriate signage might be beneficial to City tourism.

Pacific Coast Trail. The Pacific Coast Trail is a continuous public right-of-way along the California coastline designed to foster appreciation and stewardship of the scenic and natural resources of the coast through hiking and other complementary modes of non-motorized transportation (The Coastal Trail Bill, 2001). The stretch of trail beginning in Grover Beach and running south to Point Sal is considered to be well established and open to the public. No improvements are necessary (Coastal Trail Bill, 2001).

Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail. The Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail is a 1,210-mile historic route stretching from Nogales, Arizona to San Francisco, California. The trail commemorates the travels of some 30 families who were part of the 1775 Spanish Expedition that established numerous Missions throughout California. The historic trail corridor runs along State Route 1 through Guadalupe (US Department of the Interior, 2008).

California Pacific Coast Bicycle Route. The California Pacific Coast Bicycle Route runs the length of the state and passes through the City along State Route 1 (SR 1), where it becomes a Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane).

Local and Statewide Trail System Standards

Standards for the Pacific Coast Trail are set by the National Park Service. If the City plans to build a pedestrian and bike path connecting SR 1 to the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve, Americans with Disability Act (ADA) standards must be implemented.

Standards for the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail are set by the National Park Service. The trail runs along SR 1, which is controlled by the State of California. Any changes to SR 1 will require CalTrans’ approval. Appropriate signage for the Historic Trail exists just north of the City boundary.

Standards for the California Pacific Coast Bicycle Route can be found in the California Streets and Highways Code Section 890.4. Table 9-3 shows the standards for various bikeways. The bicycle route is a Class II Bikeway. Class II Bikeways provide a restricted right-of-way designated for the exclusive use of bicycles, with through travel by motor vehicles for pedestrians prohibited, but with vehicle parking and cross flows by pedestrians and motorists permitted (California Streets and Highways Code, Section 890.4).
Implications

Considering the wide range of trails existing in and around Guadalupe, connectivity between the trails and appropriate signage can be explored. The trails offer an opportunity for economic development through tourism.

Table 9-3. Bikeway Design Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Bikeway</th>
<th>Minimum Paved Width (feet)</th>
<th>Bikes Per Peak Hour</th>
<th>Pedestrians Per Peak Hour</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Design Speed (Bicycles)</th>
<th>Stripping</th>
<th>Additional Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>&lt;80</td>
<td>&lt;4%</td>
<td>20 mph</td>
<td>Edge Strips</td>
<td>Also use when located in creek setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>&lt;80</td>
<td>&gt;4%</td>
<td>20 mph</td>
<td>Center Strip</td>
<td>Also use on bridge ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>&lt;4%</td>
<td>20 mph</td>
<td>Center Strip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 ft.</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>&gt;150</td>
<td>&lt;4%</td>
<td>20 mph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Width (feet)</th>
<th>Vehicles Per Day</th>
<th>85% Vehicle Speeds (kiloMeters/hr)</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Bicycle Speed (KiloMeters/hr)</th>
<th>Stripping</th>
<th>Additional Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class II-A</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>&lt;10,000</td>
<td>&lt;35 mph</td>
<td>&lt;4%</td>
<td>&lt;20 mph</td>
<td>5 in. outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 ft.</td>
<td>≥ 10,000</td>
<td>≥35 mph</td>
<td>≥ 4%</td>
<td>≥ 20 mph</td>
<td>Same as Above</td>
<td>State Highways and on all new highway bridges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>≥ 10,000</td>
<td>≥ 45</td>
<td>&lt;4%</td>
<td>&lt;20 mph</td>
<td>Same as Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II-B</td>
<td>4 ft.</td>
<td>&lt;10,000</td>
<td>&lt;35 mph</td>
<td>&lt;4%</td>
<td>&lt;20 mph</td>
<td>6 in. outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>≥ 10,000</td>
<td>≥35 mph</td>
<td>≥4%</td>
<td>&lt;20 mph</td>
<td>Same as Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 ft.</td>
<td>≥ 10,000</td>
<td>≥35 mph</td>
<td>≥4%</td>
<td>≥20 mph</td>
<td>Same as Above</td>
<td>Also use where there is adjoining high turn over curb parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channelization</td>
<td>4 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include at intersections with dedicated right or left-turn lanes for vehicles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of San Luis Obispo Bicycle Transportation Plan

9.3 Emerging Directions

Guadalupe’s residents determined long-term goals regarding open space at a focus group meeting and subsequent community meeting. The results are summarized in this section of the Parks and Open Space Chapter.

Parks and Outdoor Recreation

Emerging directions for parks and recreation include the improvement of Leroy Park, particularly improvements to turf areas and picnic tables, as well as the addition of shade trees.
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and lighting. Community members would like to see a recreation center in Guadalupe similar to the Abel Maldonado Community Youth Center in Santa Maria, California. Ideally, the recreation center in Guadalupe would include a gym, swimming pool, tennis court, game room with amenities like billiards and foosball, a snack bar and childcare. A recreation center can provide after-school jobs for teenagers. This space can also be a resource for displaying local public art. Community members would like to see a general increase in the number of parks, including small neighborhood parks with shade trees. Guadalupe can aim to create enough park space so that every resident lives within one-quarter mile of a neighborhood park. Community members would also like to see a dog park and a skate park to provide a recreation resource for Guadalupe’s youth.

Open Space

Guadalupe residents would like to have better access to the Ninth Street Wetland Complex. Although this property is privately owned, City officials can keep this request in consideration in the event that the property becomes available. Open space requirements for new housing developments and a general increase in the amount of landscaping downtown are also goals presented by Guadalupe residents.

Agricultural Resources

Agriculture is an important part of Guadalupe’s culture and history. Protection of prime agricultural land surrounding Guadalupe is an important long-term goal.

Local and Statewide Trail Systems

Guadalupe residents would like to see a pedestrian and bicycle path connecting Guadalupe to the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve through Leroy Park, running along the Santa Maria River. Residents would also like a network of paved, lighted pedestrian and bicycle paths connecting the various parks in the City. These paths would be used for transportation as well as fitness activities such as jogging and skating.
10.0 SAFETY

10.1 Introduction

The safety section of a general plan is concerned with the reduction of potential risks of death, injuries, property damage, and economic and social dislocation resulting from fires, floods, earthquakes, landslides, and other locally relevant safety issues. The following hazards are discussed in this section:

- Emergency Response
- Crime Reduction
- Compressible-collapsible soils
- Expansive Soils
- High Ground Water
- Seismic, Tectonic
- Liquefaction
- Slope Stability, Land Slides
- Slope Creep Potential
- Tsunamis, Seiches
- Unreinforced Masonry Buildings
- Flood
- Wildfire

Hazard and hazard abatement provisions guide local decisions related to zoning, subdivisions, and entitlement permits. This element contains general hazard and risk reduction strategies and policies supporting hazard mitigation measures as outlined in the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (2000).

Regional hazards influence population growth, density, and distribution. They may also affect both the nature and cost of public improvements. Since these are guided by hazard mitigation project priorities, seismic hazards, geologic hazards, meteorological hazards, and human-caused hazards are issues which affect the construction, operation, and sustainability of local facilities.

Detailed safety studies are required for public and private development. The development of specific programs for system and infrastructure improvements of both the present and long-range needs is outside the scope of this study. Such improvements should be the subject of a study for a Local Hazard Mitigation Project and Planning Program including a plan for financing.

Legal Basis and Requirements

California Government Code Section 65302(g) requires that general plans include a safety element for the protection of the community from unreasonable risks associated with the effects of earthquakes, ground failure, tsunami, seiche and dam failure; slope instability leading...
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to mudslides and landslides; subsidence, liquefaction and other seismic hazards identified pursuant to Chapter 7.8 of the Public Resources Code, and other geologic hazards known to the local legislative body; flooding; and wildland and urban fires. Safety elements must also include mapping of known seismic and other geologic hazards; and address evacuation routes, peak load water supply requirements, and minimum road widths and clearances around structures, as those items relate to identified fire and geologic hazards. Safety is related to virtually all other elements of the General Plan.

Office of Planning and Research Guidelines

The intent of the safety element is to reduce the potential risk of death, injuries, property damage, and economic and social dislocation resulting from fires, floods, earthquakes, landslides, and other hazards. Other locally relevant safety issues, such as airport land use, emergency response, hazardous materials spills, and crime reduction, may also be included. Some local jurisdictions have even chosen to incorporate their hazardous waste management plans into their safety elements (OPR, 2002).

The safety element must identify hazards and hazard abatement provisions to guide local decisions related to zoning, subdivisions, and entitlement permits. The element should contain general hazard and risk reduction strategies and policies supporting hazard mitigation measures. Policies should address the identification of hazards and emergency response, as well as mitigation through avoidance of hazards by new projects and reduction of risk in developed areas (OPR, 2002).

The community may use the safety element as a vehicle for defining “acceptable risk” and the basis for determining the level of necessary mitigation. Policies may address not only methods of minimizing risks, but also ways to minimize economic disruption and expedite recovery following disasters (OPR, 2002).

10.2 Emergency Response

The speed and efficiency at which an emergency response agency can respond is paramount to the overall safety of the associated community. If there are significant “pinch points”, or known geographical characteristics that limit or hinder emergency response or evacuation, the response efforts of local agencies can be seriously affected. It is important to ensure minimum response times and capabilities.

Existing Conditions

Guadalupe’s transportation routes have multiple “pinch points”. The rail line bisecting the City is a significant hindrance to response efforts, considering the police and fire department are both on the same side of the tracks. The second pinch point is Highway 1, which runs parallel to the rail line and limits cross-town response capabilities. However, the City is very small, so response times are much faster than in many other small cities.
Furthermore, there are currently no hospitals within a nine-mile radius. The health care options include the Community Health Center (CHC) and Marian Community Clinic; however, there are no ambulatory services in the City. This hinders response capabilities and decreases chances for survival for those that stroke or heart attack victims, or severely injured persons.

Implications
Transportation route safety needs improvement in and around the City of Guadalupe. The emergency response capabilities in the City are hindered by the current transportation conditions and should be reviewed. Furthermore, increased emergency response services would greatly improve response options and capabilities.

10.3 Crime Reduction
Planners, architects, and law enforcement officials have become increasingly aware of the relationship between urban design and crime prevention. Terms for this concept include Safescape, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), and defensible space. These are site planning and architectural design strategies that deter crime by promoting routine, public surveillance (eyes on the street), walkable environments (human/pedestrian scale), clearly defined public and private space, and mixed-use development with high levels of activity.

Existing Conditions
In 2009, Guadalupe is perceived by its constituents as a safe community. However, concerns have been expressed about vandalism and night time safety and security. Neighborhood lighting, particularly public street lighting, is a citizens’ concern. While the crime rate in the City is low, the citizens’ perception of safety must also be addressed.

Implications
Measures should be taken to increase night time neighborhood visibility and decrease vandalism in the community. The more emphasis placed on a sense of security the easier it will be to increase the sense of community.

10.4 Compressible/Collapsible Soils
Compressible/collapsible soils can cause settlement and damage to structures unless adequate precautions are taken (Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, 1979).

Compressible Soils. Compressible Soils are fine-grained cohesive soils of low strength, which consolidate and cause settlement when surcharged with fill or structure loads, particularly when saturated. Settlement of soil under load occurs slowly and may continue, although at a diminishing rate, for several years (Santa Barbara County [SBC] Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2004).
**Collapsible Soils.** Collapsible soils are low-density, fine-grained, predominantly granular soils, usually with minute pores and voids. When these soils become saturated with water, they undergo a rearrangement of their grains, resulting in substantial and rapid settlement under relatively low loads (SBC Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2004).

**Existing Conditions**

Neither compressible nor collapsible soils are common in Santa Barbara County or Guadalupe. Figure 10-1 shows the risk varies from low to moderate west of State Road 1 in Guadalupe. This is where the dunes and riverbed are located. Most development in Guadalupe has avoided these areas.

**Implications**

Although settlement from compressible and collapsible soils can be prevented during development, it can cause significant property damage and can be expensive to prevent. The compressible/collapsible soils problem rating map, Figure 10-1, should help identify areas where these soils could potentially be a problem. Assimilation of further, more detailed, information as more exploration is done in these areas could make the map an even more useful tool, and should be considered for future study.

**10.5 Expansive Soils**

Expansive soils cause problems because they contain clay minerals that swell when the moisture content increases and shrink when the moisture decreases. Such soils are usually described as “adobe,” forming ground cracks when they are allowed to dry out. The volume changes due to variable moisture conditions can cause movement and cracking of structures built on expansive soils. Soils beneath concrete floor slabs tend to increase in moisture content, thus causing heave. Soils under raised floors tend to dry out and shrink, causing settlement of the structure (Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, 1979).

**Existing Conditions**

Expansive soils are very common in Southern California, and fairly common in Santa Barbara County. Figure 10-2 shows that Guadalupe has areas ranging from low to moderate expansive soil risk.

**Implications**

Expansive soils are a common hazard in the local area and are a common obstacle for local developers. Proper mitigation efforts should be taken in any future development proposal.
10.6 High Ground Water

Near-Surface ground water, either as a main aquifer or in a perched condition, can be a geologic and engineering problem in regards to liquefaction, settlement, slope stability, construction difficulties, and nuisance (Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, 1979).
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Figure 10-1. Compressible/Collapsible Soils

Source: University California Santa Barbara, 1979
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Existing Conditions
As seen in Figure 10-3, high ground water is currently known to exist in the lowlands west of Guadalupe. Furthermore, the dune sands in the Santa Maria Valley area have a moderate incidence of perched water conditions generated by impervious cemented “hard pan” zones within the dunes – generally ferric oxide layers.

Implications
Although high ground water incidences can be prevented during development, high ground water can cause significant property damage and can be expensive to prevent. Figure 10-3 identifies areas of potential problems.

10.7 Seismic Hazards
Zoning for seismic hazards should consider all adverse aspects of seismic events. These include ground surface rupture along the fault, ground shaking due to the propagation of seismic shock waves, liquefaction of saturated soils, settlement of granular soils due to seismic densification, seismically-induced landslides, and generation of tsunamis. This chapter covers ground surface rupture and ground surface shaking. Other adverse effects of earthquakes are addressed under separate sections and their effects on land use planning are taken into account separately (Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, 1979).

Ground Rupture. The ground surface rupture along a fault, although limited in area, is disastrous when it occurs under a structure, particularly dams. Engineering design can do little for such movement, and for practical purposes, the only solution is to avoid locating development on a fault (SBC Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2004).

Ground Shaking. The severity of ground shaking at a specific site is dependant on the following items:

- The source mechanism which initiates the energy release. This is commonly described in terms of the Richter magnitude of the earthquake.
- Energy attenuation in the bedrock during wave transmission between the earthquake focus and the site. This is a function of the distance between two points, the type of rock, and the geologic structure of the bedrock. Distance is probably the most important factor.
- Bedrock geometry at the site. This is determined largely by the subsurface or surface bedrock topography.
- Soil properties, if soil is present at the site.
Figure 10-2. Expansive Soils

Source: University California Santa Barbara, 1979
Figure 10-3. High Ground Water

Source: University California Santa Barbara, 1979
Existing Conditions
While all of California is at some potential risk of earthquake and ground shaking, Guadalupe is at relatively low risk in comparison to the rest of the region. There are few faults located near Guadalupe, but none that are active. However, the San Simeon Earthquake in 2003 did affect many buildings in Guadalupe, primarily due to the fact that they were Unreinforced Masonry buildings (URM). A separate section is dedicated to addressing the hazards of URM structures and the mitigation efforts that need to be made. A map of the local seismic faults can be seen in Figure 10-4.

Regulatory Framework
The safety element must establish policies to minimize the loss of property and life as a result of earthquake. The 1972 Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Public Resources Code §2621, et seq.), the 1990 Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (Public Resources Code §2690, et seq.), and the 1986 Unreinforced Masonry Law (§8875, et seq.) stipulate many requirements involved with land uses and information pertaining to seismic hazards and threats. These laws mandate zoning restrictions over faults and high threat areas, ensure the mapping and freedom of information about local threats, hazards, historical events, building conditions, and mandate mitigation efforts on hazardous structures.

The California Legislature originally enacted the Alquist-Priolo Act in 1972 (Public Resources Code §2621, et seq.) to assure that homes, offices, hospitals, public buildings, and other structures for human occupancy are not built on active faults. The Act requires a geological investigation before a local government may approve most development projects in the vicinity of known earthquake faults.

The 1990 Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (Public Resources Code §2690, et seq.) complements the Alquist-Priolo Act by requiring the State Geologist to compile maps identifying seismic hazard zones—those areas that are susceptible to ground shaking, landslides, or liquefaction during an earthquake. Where official seismic hazard maps exist, cities and counties must require that the developer prepare a geotechnical report delineating any seismic hazard and proposing mitigation measures before approving any project in a seismic hazard zone (Public Resources Code §2697).

Implications
Guadalupe is located near a fault line. There are currently a number of URM buildings requiring mitigation to ensure the safety of Guadalupe’s population. These efforts and structures are discussed in greater detail in the URM section of this chapter. It is pertinent to the sustainability of this community to address seismic threats and comply with the most current building codes in the development process.
Figure 10-4. Seismic Conditions

Source: University California Santa Barbara, 1979
10.8 Liquefaction

Liquefaction is the almost complete loss of strength of saturated sandy soil accompanying ground shaking during an earthquake. The seismic shock waves densify loose, saturated, granular soil, causing a reduction in the pore space between the sand grains. This transfers the intergranular load to the pore water and results in a temporary loss of strength. This can have adverse effects on relatively level ground development and sloped ground development (Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, 1979).

Existing Conditions

Although there is no historic evidence of liquefaction anywhere in Santa Barbara County, most of the low coastal plain and valley bottoms underlain with alluvium were given a moderate (2) rating with respect to liquefaction potential. Low coastal areas with high groundwater are the most susceptible to liquefaction. The Santa Maria River near Guadalupe is a good example. Further details regarding the threats of liquefaction are illustrated in Figure 10-5.

Implications

Analysis for liquefaction has just recently been accomplished in the Santa Maria Valley. There are no recent data for evaluation of the problem. Site specific liquefaction analysis should be done on every development site to determine the soil and groundwater conditions before a development begins.

10.9 Slope Stability

One of the major problems in hillside construction is slope stability. This problem tends to be a building and safety rather than a planning concern because almost every landslide or potentially unstable area can be corrected given enough money. However, for areas of severe slope stability problems, prevention or correction of landslides can be prohibitively expensive. These areas are to be left undeveloped and designated to remain in natural open space (Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, 1979).

Existing Conditions

The City of Guadalupe is at little to no risk for slope stability due to the fact that no part of Guadalupe is built or developed on or near large slopes or cliffs. Figure 10-6 is a map of local slope stability hazards.

Implications

Little needs to be done to avoid issues regarding slope stability in the Guadalupe area. It is not a major threat and will not need any formal attention.
Figure 10-5. Liquefaction

Source: University California Santa Barbara, 1979
10.10 Soil Creep Potential

Soil Creep is the slow down slope movement of surficial soils. It involves soils with high clay content and is due, at least in large part, to the volume changes from cyclic wetting and drying. Although it can be a serious problem, it usually occurs on slopes or within a few feet of the top of them, so that most buildings are protected by the required building setbacks. During periods of heavy or prolonged rains, the soils may become saturated and slump – a small shallow form of landslide involving only the upper few feet of surficial material (Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, 1979).

Existing Conditions

The city of Guadalupe is at little to no risk for soil creep potential due to the fact that no part of Guadalupe is built or developed on or near large slopes or cliffs. See Figure 10-7.

Implications

Little needs to be done to avoid this problem in the Guadalupe area because it is not a major threat and will not need any formal attention.

10.11 Tsunamis, Seiches

Tsunamis are sea waves – sometimes erroneously referred to as “tidal waves” – which are caused by submarine or coastline earthquakes. These are relatively low and harmless in the open ocean, but can reach substantial heights and speeds when they approach shallow water depths near shore. They can travel hundreds and even thousands of miles and maintain enough energy to be destructive. Seiches are waves which are generated in an inland body of water by earthquakes (Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, 1979).

Existing Conditions

There have been few to no records of any tidal waves striking the local coastline. Furthermore, Guadalupe is far enough inland to eliminate risk from all but the most devastating of tsunamis. The only real threat lies in the back flooding of the Santa Maria river which still would most likely only result in a small amount of flooding. Figure 10-8 shows that the threat level is low in Guadalupe.

Implications

The few and partly doubtful records of such occurrences on the local coastline justify not taking an alarmist approach. However, it would be wise to ensure some mitigation efforts are taken on the Santa Maria riverbed to ensure it does not overflow or cause flooding due to this or any other event.
Figure 10-6. Slope Stability

Source: University California Santa Barbara, 1979
Figure 10-7. Soil Creep Potential

Source: University California Santa Barbara, 1979
Figure 10-8. Tsunamis, Seiches

Source: University California Santa Barbara, 1979
10.12 Unreinforced Masonry
The 1990 Loma Prieta quake illustrated the advantages of abatement ordinances. Although seismic retrofitting is primarily aimed at saving lives rather than protecting buildings, structural damage was substantially lower in communities that had enacted abatement ordinances than in neighboring communities that did not (SBC Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2004).

Existing Conditions
In 2009 the City has 21 Unreinforced Masonry Buildings. The majority of these buildings are located in the downtown and are of historical importance and key to the identity of the Guadalupe downtown area. Figure 10-9 identifies URM buildings in Guadalupe.

Regulatory Framework
The 1986 Unreinforced Masonry Law (Government Code §8875, et seq.) requires cities and counties within Seismic Zone 4 to identify hazardous unreinforced masonry buildings and consider local regulations to abate potentially dangerous buildings through retrofitting or demolition.

Implications
Guadalupe may be at risk of URM building failures following ground shaking. Guadalupe should enact a priority list for hazard mitigation projects including unreinforced masonry buildings. Furthermore, Guadalupe should seek state and federal funding and grants to help subsidize the cost of these mitigations as they may be cost intensive.

10.13 Flood
Floods are the result of overwhelming surface water due to a number of various causes including but not limited to torrential rains, prolonged rain, failed levees, failed dams, and failed runoff systems. Floods can be extremely hazardous in terms of potential lives lost and property damage (Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, 1979).

Existing Conditions
Guadalupe has some areas that may flood in 100 and 500 year flood events. Due to its proximity to the Santa Maria riverbed, the small possibility for storm surge caused flooding or tsunami, low lying development areas, and marshlands. Historically, however, detrimental floods have not been a major threat to the Guadalupe community.
Figure 10-9. Unreinforced Masonry

Source: Cal Poly, 2008
Figure 10-10. Flood Map

Source: FEMA, 2003
Regulatory Framework

AB 162 requires cities and counties to address flood hazards in their general plans to minimize risk to life and property in flood-prone areas, just as local governments are required under current law to consider the risk posed in areas prone to fire and earthquake. Heavy rains and obstructions in waterways/drainage ways are the most frequent cause of flooding in lower areas. The basis for determining flood hazards is the "base flood" or the "100-year flood", which is a flood condition that has a one percent likelihood of occurring in any given year. The land area subject to inundation by the base flood is referred to as the "100-year floodplain." Typically, the 100-year floodplain is delineated on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for regulatory purposes concerning flood insurance.

Implications

The recommendation is often to avoid development in flood zones. As seen in Figure 10-10, Guadalupe has done a good job of staying out of flood zones and is in compliance with AB162. It would be wise to continue to recognize flood zones in future and continuing development.

10.14 Wildfire

A wildfire is a fire occurring in a suburban or rural area containing uncultivated lands, timber, range, watershed, brush or grasslands. This includes areas where there is a mingling of developed and undeveloped lands (Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, 1979).

Existing Conditions

Guadalupe has historically not had a threat of wildfire due to its consistently high moisture content, locally controlled environment (agricultural land) and the fact that there are very few open wild land areas, and almost no wild land urban interface areas.

Regulatory Framework

The State Board of Forestry has adopted the California Fire Plan, which describes the environment at risk for fire and the state’s activities to reduce that risk. It has also adopted fire safe regulations for counties with State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) as a means of reducing pre-fire fuel loads (Title 14, §1270, et seq., California Code of Regulations). Although most of these regulations are too specific and regulatory in nature to include in a general plan, they offer useful ideas for local policies and can be adapted into local fire safe ordinances and regulations outside of SRAs. The statewide fire safe regulations include:

- Road standards, including width, surface, and grade, for emergency access and evacuation.
- Standards for signs identifying streets, roads, and buildings.
- Minimum water supply reserves for emergency fire use.
• Fuel breaks (i.e., defensible space) around structures and greenbelts around new subdivisions.

Implications
Wildland urban interface, while a major disaster response, emergency management, and hazard mitigation priority in California is not a high priority in the Guadalupe area due to low occurrence of such events. It will not be necessary to place this on the top of any priority lists for mitigation or abatement efforts.
11.0 NOISE

11.1 Introduction
State law requires cities and counties to include a noise element in their general plans. The purpose of the Noise Element is to limit the exposure of citizens to unhealthful noise levels through appropriate land use planning. The legal basis for the inclusion of a noise element as part of the General Plan stems from several California Supreme Court decisions in the early 1980s. Based on the results of those cases, an adequate noise element must include: 1) an analysis of noise levels and the extent of noise exposure through noise measurements or modeling, and 2) noise standards to be used for land use planning.

Several sources were used to complete this report, including Guadalupe’s General Plan (2002), which covers noise exposure information and sources of noise. Data that correlates to noise levels were used, including traffic data taken from Caltrans and the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG), as well as SBCAG’s reports in regards to Rancho Guadalupe Dunes Park. Information from the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) and Union Pacific Railroad, was used to address railroad noise.

This chapter describes existing noise sources in the City of Guadalupe and details the level of noise they produce. It covers four areas: 1) the guidelines provided by the OPR, 2) existing conditions concerning noise, 3) land use standards, and 4) emerging directions for the future of Guadalupe.

Three appendices provide detailed and technical information about noise generation: Appendix 11.1 contains the acoustical terminology used throughout this chapter, and will be a valuable tool in reading the information that follows; Appendix 11.2 provides general acoustic information to provide references to familiar noise generators and their measured noise levels in decibels; and Appendix 11.3 addressed recommended land use compatibility for community noise environments.

11.2 Standards
According to the California Governor’s Office of Planning (OPR), the purpose of the noise element is to “limit the exposure of the community to excessive noise levels” (OPR, 2003, p. 87). According to the OPR, the noise element should:

- Provide technical data relating to mobile and point sources to be collected and analyzed with the sole purpose of minimizing the exposure of noise to the city and its residents.
- Produce noise level contour maps. Currently noise contour maps for Guadalupe do not exist.
- Find solutions to the current and future problems of noise.
- Produce implementation measures to enforce the general plan.
The OPR also identifies sensitive noise receptors that must be taken into account when developing a noise element:

- Hospitals or other medical facilities
- Convalescent homes
- Schools
- Churches
- Sensitive wildlife habitat

Concerning noise data and analysis, the OPR suggests the following topics be addressed in a noise element:

1. Identification of the major sources of noise, as well as appraising the level of these sources, including:
   - Roadways
   - Primary arterials
   - Passenger and freight on-line railroad operations and rapid transit
   - Aviation
   - Industries
   - Other ground stationary noise sources

2. Analysis and quantification of the noise sources, including:
   - Develop a method of noise measurement
   - Measure all major sources of noise
   - Map noise level contours, (expressed in CNEL of Ldn, or dBA)
   - Project future trends of noise
   - Analyze the current and future impacts on community residents from identified sources

For the development of policies, the OPR recommends cities and counties:

- Adopt a noise impact and attenuation standard(s) that is consistent with the International Building Code and the Noise Element Guidelines.
- Adopt noise mitigation standards, to provide guidance for zoning.
- Produce noise baseline specifications for noise evaluation.
- Produce an establishment of local standards and guidelines for noise evaluations.
- Make consistent, the sensitive uses such as residential uses with the noise standards.
- Review and check all development and land use proposals if there are compatibility standards.
- Follow location and transportation design guidance to maintain acceptable levels of noise.
- Use insulation, berms, buffer areas, and other techniques to control stationary noise.
• Correlate noise element concerns with the objectives, plan proposals, and policies of the land use, open-space, and circulation elements in order to minimize community noise exposure.
• Achieve noise compatibility between residential and other surrounding land uses.

11.3 Existing Conditions
This section reports on the status of commonly identified noise sources in Guadalupe in 2009. Figure 11-1 identifies noise sensitive areas in Guadalupe and Figure 11-2 identifies major sources of noise. The Guadalupe General Plan was last revised in February 2002, thus the noise levels may have changed and need to be verified. This report will focus on noise levels of the 2002 General Plan, along with possible noise levels in 2009 due to land use and circulation changes.

Regulatory Framework
The existing Noise Element was adopted by City Council Resolution No. 87-784 on January 26, 1987, and revised in April 2001 and February 2002. It was prepared for the Guadalupe Planning Commission, and complies with the Office of Planning Research Regulation Guidelines.

Population
According to California Department of Finance, there was a 13.5 percent increase in population between 2000 and 2008. This increase in population may indicate an overall increase in noise levels for the City, as an increasing population translates to increased vehicle traffic. (Department of Finance [DOF], 2008).

General Sources of Noise
According to the General Plan, the major sources of noise are:

- Highways and Freeways
- Primary arterials
- Railways
- Industrial plants

Railroad noise is the loudest source of noise in Guadalupe; however, this noise source is intermittent. On the other hand, roadway noise is the most consistent noise source; thus, it has the greatest impact on City residents.
Figure 11-1. Sensitive Areas in Guadalupe

Source: Cal Poly, 2008.
Figure 11-2. Noise Producing Areas in Guadalupe

Source: Cal Poly, 2008
Potentially harmful noise levels are generally caused by local automobile traffic, heavy trucks, airport, and railroad traffic. Industrial plants also produce noise, but, to a lesser extent than traffic, airports and railways. Background or “ambient” noise levels, in the absence of traffic and railroad noise, are caused by urban sounds such as sirens, lawn equipment, amplified sound, animals and human voices. Natural factors like wind, birds, or insects also contribute to ambient noise. Noise level standards and policies in this chapter were adopted to help preserve quiet conditions and minimize potentially harmful noise levels.

Using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Model, the estimated distances from the center of the roadway and railway to the 60, 65, and 70 dB Ldn contours for existing and projected traffic levels are shown in Figure 11-3 (FHWA, 2006). Definitions of the noise measurements, Ldn and dB (decibel) are explained in Appendix 11-1. Both measurements are used for all noise types.

In Figure 11-3, the darker shades show areas exposed to the loudest noise levels, while the lighter shades show areas exposed to quieter noise levels. It should be noted that no field noise measurements were made as part of this Background Report; however, estimates were used to get an idea of noise distances and their relation to noise sensitive areas in the community.

**Roadway Noise**

Guadalupe Street is the primary north-south connector through the City and is designated as State Route 1 (SR 1). SR 1 is frequently used by farmers and tourists. State Route 166 (SR 166) is another major thoroughfare running east to west through the City. The second most important noise source, after highways, are the City’s arterial streets:

- Obispo Street;
- Tognazzini Avenue;
- Tenth Street; and
- Eleventh Street.

The City’s circulation plans call for a connection between both parts of Pioneer Street, while the railroad tracks are to connect through to Fourth Street and eventually east to Simas Street.

Based on a 2002 noise study, significant traffic noise impacts occur during the periods between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. and between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., during peak commute hours.

**Railroad Noise**

The third most important noise source is the railroad, which includes Amtrak and the Union Pacific Transportation Company. Although third in importance, railroad noise is the loudest of all noise generators in the City. Freight trains make both day and night trips through Guadalupe, seven days a week. The rate of speed through the City is 25 miles per hour, while the trip duration is between 5 and 10 minutes, resulting in intermittent noise disturbance to, residents.
Figure 11-3. Noise Contour Estimates in Guadalupe

Source: Cal Poly, 2008
Amtrak (2008) also makes daily runs through the City. According to their October 2008 timetable, Amtrak makes the following stops in Guadalupe:

- 7:21 A.M.
- 12:09 P.M.
- 2:36 P.M.
- 2:36 P.M. (second train)
- 5:05 P.M.
- 7:38 P.M.

According to both the Guadalupe General Plan and the U.S. Department of Transportation, a person is exposed to sound levels of up to 80 decibels (dB) at a distance of fifty feet from the track centerline.

In addition, the Federal Railroad Administration mandates approaching trains blow horns starting at one-fourth mile away from an at-grade crossing. The train's approaching speed determines how often a horn is blown. There is no data on Guadalupe regarding noise contours or decibel measurements from horns.

**Industrial Plant Noises**
Industrial plant operations are the fourth most important noise source. These operations are located adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad. According to the Guadalupe General Plan, only those residents north of Eleventh Street are affected by the noise. Other noise generators pertaining to industrial operations are sufficiently distanced enough away and have no significant impact.

**Other Fixed Noise Sources**
Commercial and agricultural uses have the potential to generate significant noise impacts. As such, the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) includes these uses as noise sources. Noise generation within an industrial or commercial facility, or in close proximity to many types of agricultural equipment is controlled indirectly by Federal and State employee health and safety regulations (OSHA and Cal-OSHA), but exterior noise emissions from such operations have the potential to exceed locally acceptable standards at nearby noise sensitive land uses. This is not reported as a problem in Guadalupe.

**Airport Noise**
The nearest airport is located in Santa Maria; therefore takeoff and landing noise does not affect Guadalupe. However, the City is subject to airplane flyover noise, according to the California Office of Noise Control.
11.4 Standards
This section of the Noise Element concerns land use compatibility with the noise environment in respect to noise sensitive uses such as schools, churches, residences, and hospitals.

The General Plan follows the following state guidelines:

- Section 1092 of Title 25, Chapter 1, Subchapter 1, Article 4 of the California Administrative Code, calls for noise insulation standards located within the 60 CNEL contour adjacent to roads, railroads, rapid transit lines, airports, or industrial areas.
- Title 21 of the California Administration Code (Subchapter 6, Article 2, Section 5014) specifies that multi-family attached units incorporate noise reduction features so that interior noise levels do not exceed 45 CNEL.

The City’s policies include:

- Identifying noise sources and determining noise exposure levels
- Adopting acceptable levels of noise for land use categories
- Adopting a comprehensive noise ordinance
- Promoting effective enforcement of existing federal and state noise standards
- Requiring proper acoustical site planning and acoustical construction
- Evaluating noise analysis for new development projects

The noise policies are based on the following maximum acceptable CNEL noise levels:

- Residential – Low Density (60 dB)
- Residential – Multi-Family (65 dB)
- Transient Lodging (65 dB)
- Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals (65 dB)
- Auditoriums (60 dB)
- Playgrounds, parks (65 dB)
- Commercial Industrial (70 dB)

11.5 Emerging Directions
The emerging directions for noise in Guadalupe are based on data presented in the Existing Conditions. Major noise concerns that have not been previously addressed include increased traffic volume during the weekend at the Rancho Guadalupe Dunes Park. Most of these “other” major noise sources fall outside of the City’s jurisdiction and into the realm of other governing bodies such as Nipomo and Santa Maria.

Traffic Noise
Traffic volumes and noise levels will increase as the City continues to grow. Noise levels need to be monitored for impacts on residents, by engineers who specialize in noise.
Railroad Noise
As freight train traffic increases nationwide, there is the potential for increased freight-related noise. This results from track noise and low frequency volume engine noise, and spike volumes when train horns are blown.

Fixed Noise Sources
Noise from industrial, commercial, and agricultural uses have not been significant nuisances to the City; however noise levels from these sources need to be monitored to ensure that citizens are not subject to unhealthful noise levels in the future.

Major Noise Sources in Relation to Rancho Guadalupe Dunes Park
Rancho Guadalupe Dunes Park is a popular recreation area for residents and for the entire Central Coast. Traffic to the dunes increases on weekends and thus, adds to the overall noise levels in the City. Park attendance records suggest that the number of visitors will increase and increase noise levels from this source.

Potential Mitigation Measures
Possible mitigation measures for these emerging trends could include:

- Increase vegetation (mainly in the form of trees) throughout the City.
- Strategically place aesthetic berms built along roadways and the railroad.
- If absolutely necessary, build sound walls. Sound wall should only be used if all other mitigation ideas have been exhausted.
12.0 COMMUNITY DESIGN AND SENSE OF PLACE

12.1 Introduction
This chapter analyzes the built and social environment of Guadalupe and describes how these contribute to the City’s unique aesthetic qualities, or “sense of place.” The information presented here is connected with information and principles in all other sections through an overall set of qualitative principles given by the California Office of Planning and Research (Office of Planning and Research [OPR], 2003). This chapter of the background report identifies important community characteristics to help guide the revision and creation of a new community plan.

Community Design
The community design element guides the town pattern, architectural design, and spatial qualities, provides the basis for aesthetic guidelines that guide the design of both public and private development projects. Such guidelines can effectively address public spaces, parks, streets, cultural features (public art and historic structures), neighborhoods, Downtown, retail centers, “big box” developments, commercial/industrial parks, and the relationships of these use types to the natural environment.

Sense of Place
A community’s sense of place refers to the specific characteristics that create a unique identity for that place. It can be considered to be a result of the built environment, outdoor spaces, history, and social interaction coming together to create a perception of the community by users. Some of the characteristics that define Guadalupe are the historical buildings, its proximity to the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve, agricultural heritage and setting, and its people.

12.2 Guidelines
Various documents guide development and provide direction for design. These documents include the Guadalupe General Plan (2002), City of Guadalupe Downtown Design Guidelines (1999), and the City of Guadalupe Zoning Code. These documents address a wide range of design elements including site planning, parking and circulation, signs, landscaping, general commercial, residential and historical buildings.

In 2009, no historic sites or buildings in Guadalupe are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Landmark Series, or List of State Points of Historical Interest. However, certain buildings may potentially be historically significant, so protection and conservation of such resources should be considered.

Blighted areas are defined as underutilized, abandoned, or regions that need physical development improvement. There are numerous conflict areas in Guadalupe, which are shown in Figure 12-1. There are areas that can be addressed through additional specific guidelines.
Encouraging specific plans or new ordinances can address current blighted areas, resolve conflict zones and noise issues, revive lower Guadalupe Street, increase visual quality in the downtown core, and treat current substandard housing stock.

12.3 Standards

Community Design

City of Guadalupe Downtown Design Guidelines (1999) provides standards that guide architectural standards and design elements for the City. This document outlines standards in the following areas: (1) site planning, (2) parking and circulation, (3) signs, (4) landscaping, (5) general commercial, and (6) residential. These guidelines provide direction for development in the downtown core and aim to make a friendlier environment for pedestrians. Although these guidelines are in place, they haven’t been effectively implemented because they do not address all parts of the City and do not encourage infill development. Therefore additional standards should be created to address the following subjects:

1. Park and plaza design
2. Treatment of underutilized lots
3. Residential development in the downtown core
4. New additions and new construction in the downtown core
5. Industrial parks
6. Rear elevations of buildings along Pioneer Street
7. Buffer zones along the rail road and agriculture zones

Historic Preservation

In June 2005, the California Office of Historical Preservation released a revised version of “Drafting Effective Historic Preservation Ordinances: A Manual for California’s Local Governments.” This document provides useful information for local governments about historic preservation, including procedures and criteria for designation of historical resources. Designation procedures include notice, hearing requirements, and owner consent (California Office of Historic Preservation, 2005). Designation criteria can be diverse. In California, there are a variety of places designated as historic, including residential subdivisions, commercial buildings, and trailer parks (California Office of Historic Preservation, 2005). Since there are numerous reasons to designate historical sites, it is important that local governments include clear criteria in their preservation ordinances. In addition to clarity, it is important that designation criteria are flexible so that worthy historical resources are not excluded from protection (California Office of Historic Preservation, 2005). For example, some ordinances are based solely on the age of a building, but some worthy resources are less than fifty years old (California Office of Historic Preservation, 2005).

Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Interior provides preservation briefs for the preservation of historical buildings. Preservation Brief 14 guides new development for new exterior additions in historic buildings. Guadalupe’s buildings that may be historic contributors should use the following guidelines in order to preserve the historical architecture in the downtown core.
• Preserve significant historic materials and features
• Preserve the character of the City
• Preserve Historical significance of building by proving a visual distinction between old and new.

Cultural Resource
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has developed procedures on dealing with cultural resources in the state of California. Any capital project undertaken must adhere to the standards provided. Caltrans defines cultural resources in the following manner:

“Cultural resources are physical or observable traces of past human activity, regardless of significance, in direct association with a geographic location, including tangible properties possessing intangible traditional cultural values.”

Cultural standards are also identified throughout every section of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as an overall targeted standard. Cultural preservation is a key component when enacting NHPA standards and the amended act of 2000 clearly makes this a top priority. Cultural significance of properties is left to professional consultants depending on the geographic region and/or historical lineages representing a specific race, religion, or tribe.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) both have provisions for cultural preservation within each respective act. The guidelines are somewhat ambiguous as each act accounts for cultural significant areas and still allows leeway for municipal entities to further define standards. No published document was found for the City of Guadalupe that defines cultural resource standards.

12.4 Existing Conditions
Existing conditions in the City of Guadalupe were compiled through site investigation and community input. Firsthand knowledge was gathered through multiple site visits. The site visits provided opportunity to analyze and document existing conditions of the built environment. Community input was gathered through a series of visioning meetings where residents had the opportunity to provide valuable information and perspective on their surroundings.

Spatial Definition
The City of Guadalupe has distinct neighborhoods and land use patterns that provide spatial differentiation. Current land use designations include commercial, industrial, residential, and open space. These zones have unique qualities characterized by varieties in lot size, densities, setbacks, massing, lighting, and architecture styles. Residential zones and the shopping district have consistent land use patterns that are more attractive for pedestrian activity. In contrast, industrial and commercial areas to the south of the downtown core have abandoned buildings. Along the railroad and south of the downtown core, both need street and design improvements. Figure 12-1 identifies land uses in Guadalupe and highlights major conflict areas needing design improvements.
Downtown

The downtown area maintains a consistent “street wall”, or the arrangement and location of building faces along the street, and contains several buildings of historical or architectural importance. These are listed in Appendix 12-1. The architecture of these historical buildings contributes to Downtown’s unique look and feel. Local restaurants, a theater, and shops serve local residents and can potentially serve tourists and visitors along State Route 1 (SR 1). Design guidelines can address issues such as treatment of storefronts, bars on windows, lighting, signs, awnings, and streetscape to achieve transparency, compatibility, consistency and visual quality. Opportunities for adapt and reuse of buildings (using older buildings for new uses such as residential or mix use) should be explored in the downtown area. In 2009, there are vacant lots in the downtown core that can be used for infill projects. These infill projects should encourage mix uses, and enhance the current commercial district.
Residential Housing Stock
Guadalupe has several distinct residential developments. Figure 12-2 shows the locations of the various housing stock in Guadalupe.

1. Post World War II housing
2. Recent tracked developments (in the south east and southwest) with large garages in front of the property line
3. Historical housing near the downtown core with notable architectural articulation and apartments dwellings in the North East
4. Newer affordable housing projects with higher densities and compact development and common open spaces.

Figure 12-2. Residential Housing Stock

Industrial Park
The industrial park is an important area where many jobs are located (City Administrator’s Office, 2008). The industrial area is in the south central region of Guadalupe and has the following characteristics:

1. Large lot sizes
2. Big warehouses
3. Rail tracks

Source: Google Earth, 2008
4. Unfriendly pedestrian streets
5. Abandoned buildings
6. Blighted areas
7. Light industrial, manufacturing, and storage
8. Streets that are not “pedestrian friendly”
9. No sidewalks
10. Lack of lighting and landscaping

Areas that Need Improvement
Field observations reveal various areas that need aesthetic improvements. They are shown in Figure 12-3.

1. Lower Guadalupe Street has abandoned businesses that are in proximity to the industrial park. Certain areas of throughout the City of Guadalupe lack sidewalks and hinder pedestrian connections.
2. The Northern Region has blighted housing stock.
3. Rear of buildings along Pioneer Street.

Figure 12-3. Areas Needing Aesthetic Improvement

Areas that Need Buffer Zones
Guadalupe’s community form does not address noise and air pollution produced from agricultural lands. For example, tractor traffic generates additional air and noise pollution.
Therefore, buffer zones along agricultural areas abutting residential zones and school playgrounds should be encouraged. Residential areas and playgrounds next to agricultural land need transition areas with landscaping and setbacks.

**Unique Features**
Unique treasures in Guadalupe that should be retained and/or enhance include:

1. Agriculture and Natural Environment
2. Guadalupe Street/SR 1
3. Unique Downtown Core
4. Architecture
5. Landmarks
6. Murals

*Agriculture and Natural Environment*
The City of Guadalupe is surrounded by various open spaces that can be promoted to attract businesses, residents, and visitors. There are prime agricultural lands surrounding the City and a riparian ecosystem to the north. The Santa Maria River leads to the Pacific Ocean via the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Preserve. Vistas of natural features and open spaces are integral parts of the community.

*Guadalupe Street/ SR 1*
Guadalupe Street corridor (SR 1) passes through the center of the city and is an important transportation connector in the region. SR 1 is also the scenic route that runs along the California Coast. Along this corridor there are two major zones, a commercial district and an industrial park. This pathway establishes a sense of place to the area, by being the principal transportation corridor, passing along historic structures and the downtown commercial center.

*Unique Downtown Core*
The downtown is located on upper Guadalupe Street (see Figure 12-1), which is home to many local serving businesses including a theater, restaurants, grocery stores, and local retail stores. Furthermore, there are historical buildings with unique architecture that are important landmarks to the community.

*Architecture*
The City of Guadalupe General Plan (2002) recognizes the value of the historical architecture of downtown Guadalupe. The community values historical architectural details and materials that reflect an architectural style and simpler time. Such buildings are in effect, monuments to the City’s heritage and signposts for the future (as these can help guide the design of new, well-integrated development projects). Un-reinforced masonry, brick buildings, and terrazzo materials and styles are present in the downtown core.
**Landmarks**

The City has various landmarks that add to the visual quality in the community. For example, the downtown historical buildings, the Vietnam memorial, the cemetery, murals, parks, the water tower, and the Amtrak station contribute to Guadalupe’s sense of place and indicate the diversity of local history. These landmarks are illustrated in figure 12-4, 12-5, and 12-6.

Figure 12-4. Vietnam Memorial

Figure 12-5. Water Tower

Figure 12-6. Cemetery

Source: Cal Poly, 2008
Murals
Murals provide insight to Guadalupe’s identity, history, and sense of place. Figures 12-7, 12-8, 12-9, 12-10, and 12-11 illustrate examples of existing murals in Guadalupe.

Figure 12-7. Mural on Downtown Building

Figure 12-8. Image of Marine Life, Main St.

Figure 12-9. Image of Dunes in Downtown

Figure 12-10. Image of Dunes in City Hall

Figure 12-11. Latino Culture, Farm Workers, and Dunes

Source: Cal Poly, 2008
Historic Resources

The City of Guadalupe has several historic sites that help create the unique character of the city. The Rancho de Guadalupe Historical Society was formed in 1989 by residents who are committed to preserving the cultural history of the area. Currently, the museum site is located at 1025 Guadalupe Street, near the north entrance to the City on SR 1. The Historical Society offers a city map showing over thirty historically significant sites that are accessible on foot within a short walking distance from the museum.

Historically Significant Sites

Figures 12-12, 12-13, 12-14, and 12-15 are images of historically significant sites in the City of Guadalupe that can be visited at any time. Although none of these sites are registered as historical landmarks, each one contributes to the historic culture that the City of Guadalupe holds.

Figure 12-12. Royal Theater (437 Guadalupe Street)
Figure 12-13. Cultural Resource Center (1065 Guadalupe Street)

Source: Cal Poly, 2008

Figure 12-14. Historical Museum (1025 Guadalupe Street)

Source: Cal Poly, 2008
Cultural Resources

The area surrounding Guadalupe has a long history of culture beginning with the Chumash people who lived on this land and in surrounding areas thousands of years ago. Many cultural transitions have helped shape the community of Guadalupe; from expeditions and explorations to stage coach stop to agricultural business, which remains the heart of the area is productive activity today. The Guadalupe Cultural Arts & Education Center, located at 1065 Guadalupe Street near the north entrance to the City on SR 1, was established by two residents, Margie & Joe Talaugon, to celebrate and promote the history, culture, and experiences of the city.
12.5 Implications and Emerging Directions

Issues Affecting Guadalupe

*Downtown Core*

The downtown core has many commercial buildings that need rehabilitation and improvement. In order to provide a welcoming ambiance to visitors, there is a need for better visibility into the interior of local businesses. Therefore, buildings need storefront and entryway improvements. These issues can be addressed by adopting guidelines for the maintenance of the following design elements:

- Storefronts
- Signs
- Window treatments
- Grills
- Awnings
- Street Wall
- Lighting

*Underutilized Downtown Plaza*

The small plaza next to the Vietnam memorial (Figure 12-16) is dominated by parking and is an unfriendly environment for pedestrians. The plaza shown in Figure 12-16 and Figure 12-17 have unique features that include a mural, kiosk, and benches. Residents have identified that the benches in Figure 12-16 are underutilized because the benches face the street and contribute to the feeling of exposure.

Figure 12-16. Parking Dominated Plaza

Figure 12-17. Gazebo in Parking Lot

Source: Cal Poly, 2008
Historic Preservation
Several buildings in the downtown core are historically significant and should be protected. Guidelines should be in place to provide guidance for treatment of historical structures, new construction, and additions to ensure compatible and respectful development. These buildings and monuments are identified on the map in Appendix 12-1.

Gateways
Entering the City from the north there is no welcome sign or gateway. In the south, a small sign exists that can be improved. Gateways establish a sense of space and contribute to the spatial definition of Guadalupe. Community stakeholders have identified that two gateways are planned for construction, at the North and South entrances of the City.

Streets, Sidewalks and Sidewalk Width
Along the downtown there are a few portions of extended sidewalks that provide landscaped areas (Figure 12-18). However, providing more sidewalk extensions at the corners and other areas in the downtown can reduce vehicular speed, encourage outdoor dining, and provide a safer pedestrian environment. In 2009, sidewalk bulb-outs are limited to mid-block locations. They should also be located at street corners to promote walking and shopping, and to provide additional room for landscaping. See Figures 12-19 and 12-20.
Industrial area

The industrial zone is located in the center of town, separating the residential areas. This zone has large lot sizes, large warehouses and lacks both landscaping and sidewalks. As a result, the commercial corridor abutting the industrial area needs improvement and has some vacant structures.

Buffer Zones and Noise Issues

Guadalupe has minimal landscaping and transition areas, creating conflict between land uses. The downtown core and recent residential development along Main Street are few places in town that have landscaping. Better landscaping should be incorporated around the industrial park, train tracks and agricultural areas to provide buffer zones between different types of uses and address noise, agricultural and industrial pollution.
Railroad tracks
Homes and pedestrians in the North of the City are exposed to the railroad. The railroads isolate residential neighborhoods in the eastside and hinder connections to the downtown core. Visual or noise buffers like architecturally designed walls with landscaping can protect homes and pedestrians that are exposed to railroad traffic. The rail tracks in the South of the City are hidden from pedestrians and streets by industrial buildings.

Continuity and Connections
The lower southwest residential neighborhoods lack pedestrian connection to the downtown core. Walking trails and bike paths along the riparian ecosystem should be encouraged, as shown in Figure 12-23. Neighborhood sidewalks and streets can feed into a major lighted pathway that connects City parks. Furthermore, Leroy Park does not have adequate access; therefore Pioneer Street can be extended to increase continuity and connectivity. Additionally, there are streets in the downtown core that do not have sidewalks and access to Guadalupe Street.
Figure 12-23. Potential Pedestrian Connections and Network

Source: Google Earth, 2008

*Pedestrian Bridge*

The rehabilitation of the pedestrian bridge is necessary to improve access into the downtown core. The bridge over the railroad tracks is a major walking corridor that connects the eastside of the City to the downtown core.

*Future trends*

A complete tentative outline of the future trends is shown in Appendix 12-2.
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APPENDIX

APPENDIX A: LAND USE CLASSIFICATION

City of Guadalupe
Land Use Classification System
[as adapted from Fairfax County (VA) Coding Scheme for Existing Land Uses]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General land use</th>
<th>General Color Code</th>
<th>Land Use Code</th>
<th>Specific Color Code</th>
<th>Specific land use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Yellow LDR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Single-family detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Density Residential</td>
<td>Yellow MDR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Planned-unit development (2+ SFD on single parcel: list # of units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Density Residential</td>
<td>Yellow MDR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Density Residential</td>
<td>Yellow MDR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Multiplex (triplex, fourplex): list # of units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Density Residential</td>
<td>Yellow MDR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Apartments: list # of units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Density Residential</td>
<td>Yellow MDR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Mobile home park: list # of units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Density Residential</td>
<td>Yellow MDR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Mobile home, not in mobile home park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Density Residential</td>
<td>Yellow MDR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Residential motel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Density Residential</td>
<td>Yellow MDR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Other medium density residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Density Residential</td>
<td>Yellow MDR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>RV Park: list # of spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Lavender IND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Warehouse, primarily manufacturing-based business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Lavender IND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Warehouse, primarily distribution-based business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Lavender IND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Warehouse, with commercial sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Lavender IND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Equipment storage lot (primary use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Lavender IND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mini-storage facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Lavender IND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Printing and publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>Grey TRU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Street and highway right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>Grey TRU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Railroad, including right-of-way and terminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>Grey TRU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Auto parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>Grey TRU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Utilities (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Community shopping center (with anchor tenant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32a</td>
<td>Strip commercial (usu. 3-5 businesses), with parking in front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32b</td>
<td>Strip commercial (usu. 3-5 businesses), no parking in front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Neighborhood market / Convenience store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mixed-use commercial (i.e. near CA-1 and Amtrak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Tourist-serving commercial (i.e. ATV rentals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Auto sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37a</td>
<td>Restaurant, dine-in only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37b</td>
<td>Restaurant, with seating outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Restaurant, drive-through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail Trade</td>
<td>Red CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Other Commercial - Retail Trade (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Blue OFC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Office building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Blue OFC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Central business district office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Blue OFC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Technology-based office building, office park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Blue OFC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Other Office (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer business svcs</td>
<td>Beige CBS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Finance, insurance, real estate, professional services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer business svcs</td>
<td>Beige CBS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Personal services including laundry, photo, beauty, barber, funeral, etc. (if it does not fit into 32a or 32b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer business svcs</td>
<td>Beige CBS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Motor vehicle repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer business svcs</td>
<td>Beige CBS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Veterinary hospitals or pet grooming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer business svcs</td>
<td>Beige CBS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Bank (with or without drive-through)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer business svcs</td>
<td>Beige CBS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Other Consumer business services (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-public</td>
<td>Purple POP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Government offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-public</td>
<td>Purple POP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Fire station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-public</td>
<td>Purple POP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Police station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-public</td>
<td>Purple POP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Hospital and health facilities (are there any?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-public</td>
<td>Purple POP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Other Public/Quasi-public (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural, educational, entertainment</td>
<td>Brown CEE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural, etc.</td>
<td>Brown CEE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Community center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural, etc.</td>
<td>Brown CEE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Public elementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural, etc.</td>
<td>Brown CEE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Private school or preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural, etc.</td>
<td>Brown CEE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Places of public assembly, indoor/outdoor (is there one?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural, etc.</td>
<td>Brown CEE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Other Cultural, educational, entertainment (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Light Grn REC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Recreation facilities and parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Light Grn REC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Recreation facilities (indoors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Light Grn REC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Detention basin/park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Light Grn REC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Golf course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Light Grn REC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Other Recreation (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource uses</td>
<td>Dark Grn RSC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Agricultural activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource uses</td>
<td>Dark Grn RSC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Beach and dunes area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource uses</td>
<td>Dark Grn RSC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Passive open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource uses</td>
<td>Dark Grn RSC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Other Resource uses (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>White VAC</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>White VAC</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>Improved land with dilapidated structure of no visible use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total categories 12 65
### Population Data Tables

#### Table B-1. Population by Sex and Age, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 years</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 years</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59 years</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69 years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74 years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and older</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B-2. Population by Sex and Age, 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total Population</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3126</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>2936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 years</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 years</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59 years</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64 years</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69 years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74 years</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and older</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C: HOUSING

Table C-1. Monthly Owner Costs as Percentage of Household Income, City of Guadalupe, California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specified owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 percent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 percent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 percent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not computed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 percent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 percent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 percent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not computed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 percent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 percent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 percent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not computed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 percent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 percent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 percent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not computed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 percent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 percent</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 percent</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not computed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 or more</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 percent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 percent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 percent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 percent or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not computed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3
Table C-2. Occupation by Gender and number of jobs, City of Guadalupe, California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Both sexes, %</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employed civilian population 16 years and over</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, professional, and related occupations</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, and financial operations occupations</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management occupations, except farmers and farm managers</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers and farm managers</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and financial operations occupations</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and related occupations</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and mathematical occupations</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and engineering occupations</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life, physical, and social science occupations</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and social services occupations</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal occupations</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training, and library occupations</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service occupations</strong></td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare support occupations</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective service occupations (fire fighting, law enforcement, etc.)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation and serving related occupations</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal care and service occupations</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales and office occupations</strong></td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and extraction occupations</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors, construction and extraction workers</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction trades workers</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction workers</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</strong></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production occupations</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and material moving occupations</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors, transportation and material moving workers</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft and traffic control occupations</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle operators</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail, water and other transportation occupations</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material moving workers</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3
APPENDIX D: NOISE

D-1. Definitions of Acoustical Terminology
Definitions extracted from the City of Grover Beach Noise Element, Volume 1, Policy Document (1993), and City of Cloverdale Background Report (2005).

**Acoustics** – The science of sound.

**Ambient Noise** – The distinctive acoustical characteristics of a given space consisting of all noise sources audible at that location. In many cases, the term ambient is used to describe an existing or pre-project condition such as the setting in an environmental noise study.

**Attenuation** – The reduction of an acoustic signal.

**A-Weighted Sound Level** – A frequency-response adjustment of a sound level meter that conditions the output signal to approximate human response.

**Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)** – The equivalent energy (or energy average) sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of approximately five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7:00p.m. to 10:00p.m. and ten decibels to sound levels in the night before 7:00a.m. and after 10:00p.m. The CNEL is generally computed for annual average conditions.

**Day/Night Average Sound Level (Ldn)** – The equivalent energy (or energy average) sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after the addition of 10dB to sound levels in the night after 10p.m. and before 7a.m. The Ldn is generally computed for annual average conditions.

**Decibel or dB** – Fundamental unit of sound. A Bell is defined as the logarithm of the ratio of sound pressure squared over the reference pressure squared. A Decibel is one-tenth of a Bell.

**Equivalent Sound Level (Leq)** – The sound level containing the same total energy as a time varying signal over a given sample period. Thus, the Leq is a single-valued level that expresses the time-averaged total energy of a fluctuation sound level. For example, if 64dB is measure for 10 minutes, 68dB is measured for 20 minutes and 73dB is measured for 30 minutes, the 1-hour Leq is about 71dB. Leq is typically computed over 1, 8 and 24 hour sample periods.

**Frequency** – The measure of rapidity of alternatives of a periodic single, expressed in cycles per second or hertz.

**Impulsive Noise** – Noise of short duration, usually less than one second, with an abrupt onset and rapid decay.

**Ldn** – Day/Night Average Sound Level. Similar to CNEL but with no evening weighting.

**Leq** – Equivalent of energy-averaged sound level.

**Lmax** – The highest root mean square (RMS) sound level measured over a given period of time.
**Loudness** – A subjective term of the sensitive of the magnitude of sound.

**Masking** – The amount (of the process) by which the threshold of audibility is for one sound raised by the presence of another (masking) sound.

**New Development** – Projects requiring land use or building permits, but excluding remodeling or additions to existing structures. Includes modifications to existing stationary noise sources that increase noise levels.

**Noise Exposure Contours** – Lines drawn about a noise source indicating constant noise exposure levels. CNEL and Ldn contours are frequently used to describe community noise exposure.

**Noise Level Reduction (NLR)** – The arithmetic difference between the outside and inside sound levels measured in decibels. For example, if the sound level outside a house is 70dB and the sound level inside the house is 45dB, the NLR is 25dB. (70-45=25).

**Outdoor Activity Areas** – Patios, decks, balconies, outdoor seating areas, swimming pool areas, yards of dwelling units and other areas that have been designated for outdoor activities and recreation.

**Peak Noise** – The level corresponding to the highest (not RMS) sound pressure measured over a given period of time. This term is often confused with the “Maximum” level, which is the highest RMS level.

**RT\(_\infty\)** – The time it takes reverberant sound to decay by 60dB once the source has been removed.

**Resilient Channel (CLIP)** – A metal device that allows the indirect attachment of an interior wall to a stud or ceiling to joist. Resilient channels reduce noise transmissions of walls and roof/ceiling assemblies.

**Sabin** – The unit of sound absorption. One square foot of material absorbing 100% of incident sound has absorption of 1 Sabin.

**Sound Transmission Class (STC)** – A single-numbered rated system used to determine the amount of noise reduction a window, door or other building component provides. The higher the STC rating, the higher the NLR. Windows and doors having a minimum STC rating are sometimes required to insure that a building façade will achieve a minimum NLR. STC ratings may not be subtracted from exterior noise exposure values to determine interior noise exposure values.

**Stationary Noise Sources** – Any fixed or mobile source not preempted from local control by existing federal or state regulations. Examples of such sources include industrial and commercial facilities and vehicle movements on private property (e.g., parking lots, truck terminals, auto race tracks, etc.).

**Threshold of Hearing** – The lowest sound that can be perceived by the human auditory system, generally considered to be 0dB of persons with perfect hearing.

**Threshold of Pain** – Approximately 120dB above the threshold of hearing.
Appendix 11-2. General Acoustical Information

Noise is often defined as unwanted sound. Its perception is characterized as a subjective reaction to a physical phenomenon. Researchers have grappled for many years with the problem of translating objective measurements of sound into directly correlated measures of public reaction to noise. The descriptors of community noise in current use are the results of these efforts, and represent simplified, practical, measurement tools to gauge community response. Table 11-1 provides examples of noise levels associated with common noise sources.

A common statistical tool to measure the ambient noise level is the average sound level (Leq), which is the sound level corresponding to a steady-state, A-weighted sound level, in decibels (dB) containing the same total energy as a time-varying signal over a given time period (usually one hour). The Leq is the foundation for determining composite noise descriptors such as Ldn and CNEL (see below), and shows very good correlation with community response to noise.

Table 11-1: Typical A-Weighted Noise Levels of Common Noise Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decibels</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Threshold of pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Jet aircraft take-off at 100 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Riveting machine at operators position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Shotgun at 200 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Bulldozer at 50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Diesel locomotive at 300 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Cloverdale General Plan Update. (August, 2005). Background Report

Two composite noise descriptors commonly used are the Ldn and CNEL. The Ldn (Day-Night Average Level) is based on the average hourly Leq over a continuous 24-hour period, with a +10 dB penalty applied to nighttime (10 p.m. to 7a.m.) Leq values. The nighttime penalty is based on the assumption that people react to nighttime noise exposure as though they were subjectively twice as loud as daytime exposures. The CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level), like Ldn, is based on the weighted average hourly Leq over a continuous 24-hour period, except that an additional +4.77 decibel penalty is applied to evening (7 p.m. to 10 p.m.) hourly Leq values.

The CNEL was developed for the California Airport Noise Regulations, and is normally applied to airport/aircraft noise assessment. The Ldn descriptor is a simplification of the CNEL concept, but the two will usually agree, for a given situation, within one dB. Like the Leq, these descriptors are also averages, and tend to disguise short-term variations in the noise environment. Because they presume increased evening or nighttime sensitivity, these descriptors are best applied as criteria for land uses where nighttime noise exposures are critical to acceptability of the noise environment, such as residential developments.

The Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines (2003) require that major noise sources be identified and quantified by preparing generalized noise contours for current and projected conditions. Noise measurements and modeling are often used to develop these
contours. Significant noise sources often include traffic on major roadways and highways, railroad operations, airports, and representative industrial sites.

Noise modeling techniques use source-specific data, including average levels of activity, hours of operation, seasonal fluctuations, and average levels of noise from source operations. Modeling methods have been developed for a number of environmental noise sources such as roadways, railroad line operations, and industrial plants. Such methods produce reliable results as long as data inputs and assumptions are valid.
Appendix 11-3. Recommended Land Use Compatibility

Figure 11-4 shows the ranges of noise exposure that are considered to be acceptable, conditionally acceptable, or unacceptable for the development of different land uses.

![Figure 11-4: Recommended Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environments](image)

### INTERPRETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Community Noise Exposure Ldn or CNEL, dBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential: Low-Density Single Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes</td>
<td>![Exposure Ranges]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential: Multiple Family</td>
<td>![Exposure Ranges]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging: Motels, Hotels</td>
<td>![Exposure Ranges]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes</td>
<td>![Exposure Ranges]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters</td>
<td>![Exposure Ranges]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports</td>
<td>![Exposure Ranges]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>![Exposure Ranges]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries</td>
<td>![Exposure Ranges]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings, Business Commercial and Professional</td>
<td>![Exposure Ranges]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture</td>
<td>![Exposure Ranges]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NORMALLY ACCEPTABLE**
Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.

**NORMALLY UNACCEPTABLE**
New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.

**CONDITIONALLY ACCEPTABLE**
New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.

**CLEARLY UNACCEPTABLE**
New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.

Appendix 12-1. Potentially Historic Buildings and Sites

Source: Google Earth (October 2008) and Rancho de Guadalupe Historical Society & Museum (May 2003)

Description

1. Giacomini Home 1900
2. Calloway-Wise Home 1895
3. Grisingher Home 1898
4. Cultural Arts Center / Rosenblum Home 1920
5. Dunes Center / Grisingher Home 1912
7. Historical Society Museum / American Legion Post #371 - Veterans Building 1931
8. Napa Auto Parts - Druids Lodge / 1914 & Masonic Lodge 1913
9. Bondietti Buildings / Katayama Clock 1912 / 1917
10. Far Western Tavern / Palace Hotel 1958 / 1912
11. Margie & Joe's Café / El Ray Liquors 1940
12. Genoa Hotel (site) 1900
13. Chicago Chop Suey 1926
14. King Falafel Café / Bud Wong's New York Restaurant / Hop Sing Tong Benevolent Ass'n 1926
15. Masatani's Market 1922
16. Royal Theater 1939
17. Vietnam Memorial 2002
18. Santa Florita Hotel / Central Hotel 1919
19. Campodonico Store 1894
20. Grisingher Buildings 1916
21. Commercial Hotel 1923
22. Franklin Home 920
23. Tognazzini Home 1920
24. Dolcini Home 1901
25. Campodonico Home 1902
26. Guadalupe Jail 1926
27. Water Tank 1928
28. Buddhist Temple 1915 / 1950
29. Fleck/Wooley Home 1900
30. Tenrikyo / Fourth N. American Church 1948
31. Our Lady Guadalupe Church 1875 / 1957
32. Aratani Home 1925
33. Guadalupe City Hall 1931
Appendix 12-2. Future Trends

The following recommendations are derived from field observations and community input. The following sections highlight the directions that will guide City aesthetic policy and development standards.

Architecture

1. Introduce residential architectural guidelines to beautify residential housing stock and include the protection of historical residential dwellings.
2. Maintain, preserve, and rehabilitate existing commercial buildings.
3. Encourage complementary and new development in the downtown district.
4. Design additional guidelines for storefronts and facades to increase storefront visibility and encourage Downtown shopping and interesting displays.
5. Encourage articulation of new construction.
6. Design guidelines for new construction and additions. Figure 12-24 shows an addition to a historical building.
7. Create architectural guidelines for the rear of buildings along Pioneer Street.
8. Maintain a street wall in the downtown district.
9. Create interim architectural guidelines to rehabilitate unused buildings in the shopping district.
10. Protect ornamentation and details of historical buildings
11. Encourage use of period roll-up fabric awnings that compliment Downtown period architecture.

Figure 12-24. Building Additions

Source: Cal Poly, 2008

Landscape and Streetscape

1. Improve streetscape and landscape along the industrial park area.
2. Introduce corner sidewalk extensions in the downtown core (bulb-outs).
3. Revive lower Guadalupe Street by improving the streetscape and adding lighting.
4. Provide appropriately-designed street furniture
5. Provide street trees that create canopy, texture and seasonal interest
6. Provide interesting pedestrian street lighting for both safety and aesthetic interest.
7. Promote public art and seasonal displays

**Land Use**
- Encourage higher residential and commercial density in the downtown district.
- Encourage outdoor dining in the downtown district.
- Determine areas for mixed-use development.
- Determine opportunities for adaptive reuse.

**Circulation and Connectivity**
- Increase pedestrian and bike path connections through an improved network.
- Increase connection to Leroy Park via Pioneer Street.
- Provide better pedestrian connections to the downtown district from all part of town
- Rehabilitate the bridge over the railroad tracks.

**Parks, Open Space, and Agricultural Lands**
- Encourage a plaza and or park in the downtown district.
- Develop and enhance park design and playgrounds around the City of Guadalupe.
- Increase connectivity between parks.

**Sustainable Design**
- Encourage the use of drought resistant plants.
- Conserve water by limiting large lawns.
- Encourage development near transit stops and community amenities.
- Encourage the use of pervious pavements.
- Introduce energy efficient appliances.
- Encourage LEED-ND development.
- Include “green” and sustainability principles in new development.
- Encourage the use of native species in landscaping.

**Public Facilities**
- Provide design guidelines for patios and playgrounds in schools and public facilities to ensure compatibility with agricultural lands.

**Culture and Landmarks**
- Protect and preserve landmarks.
- Preserve public art and murals.
- Establish community gateways.
Social Environment
The City of Guadalupe has a strong social element that helps shape the community and its sense of place. Through conversations with citizens of Guadalupe and community meetings, the context of the social environment can be seen in the people. The fundamental underpinning of each element are the people who make up the community. Specific items that have been brought to the forefront in community meetings are:

1. Desire for a more walkable community.
2. Maintain and promote an inviting downtown district.
3. Preserve the historic feel of the downtown district.
4. Introduce a local farmers market.
5. Showcase agricultural background with an annual festival.

Each of these items relate to the residents of the City of Guadalupe and their desire to enhance community connections. This social environment plays a significant role in the City’s sense of place.