EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section summarizes the characteristics of the Project and the Project alternatives, the environmental impacts associated with the Project and alternatives, and required and recommended mitigation measures.

PROJECT SYNOPSIS

Lead Agency

City of Goleta
Planning & Environmental Review
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California 93117

Project Applicant

Michael Towbes
The Towbes Group
21 E. Victoria Street, Suite 200
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Project Description

A detailed description of the applicant's proposal is included in Section 2.0, *Project Description*. The key characteristics of the Project are summarized below.

Project Characteristics

The Heritage Ridge Residential Project (the "Project") involves proposal to develop 360 housing units and a two-acre neighborhood park on a 17.36 gross acre site within the Inland Area of the City of Goleta ("City").

The western portion of the Project (Area A) would be senior housing comprised of two residential buildings with a total of 132 units and one recreation building with a pool, spa and gym, plus outdoor recreation and barbecue facilities. The eastern portion of the Project (Area B) would be workforce housing comprised of six residential buildings with a total of 228 units (Buildings 3 through 8) and one recreation building with pool, spa, gym, children's play equipment and barbecue facilities. The northern portion of Area B (Buildings 3, 4 and 5) would include 80 workforce housing units. Of the 80 units, 56 would have one bedroom and 24 would have three bedrooms. The eastern portion of Area B would be developed with three three-story buildings (Buildings 6, 7, and 8) that would include 148 workforce housing units. Buildings 6, 7, and 8 would include 93 one-bedroom units and 55 two-bedroom units. A total of 228 parking spaces would be provided for Buildings 6, 7, and 8 in Area B. A pool, recreation area, and leasing office would be located to the south of Building 8.

Without a density bonus, the maximum number of units allowed on the site based on General Plan density for this site (up to 25 units per acre) is 356 units. However, as Area A is proposed as a housing development for seniors 55 years and older or 62 years and older, this portion of the site is eligible for

density bonus pursuant to California Civil Code section 51.3(a). These provisions allow for up to a 20% density bonus for senior units or 26 additional senior housing units at this site. The senior housing component would have 132 units, four of which would be senior density bonus units as permitted by Government Code sections 65915(b)(1)(C) and 65915(f)(3). The applicant is proposing a 3% density bonus associated with the senior units. The project site would have a total density of 25.4 units per acre.

Access to the Project site would be provided via three driveway connections providing ingress and egress to Camino Vista.

Grading/Walls

The Project would include mass grading to prepare the site to support the residential development. Grading operations would include the construction of individual building pads for each structure, over-excavation as needed for roadways and driveways, and trenching and backfilling for installation of underground utilities. Preliminary earthwork quantities are estimated at 178,000 cubic yards of cut and 15,500 cubic yards of fill. Approximately 115,000 cubic yards of export required before construction of the Project.

Proposed development within the sensitive portion of the identified on-site archaeological site (CA-SBA-56 site plus a 50-foot buffer) would use protective fill soils to cap the existing cultural resource. To prevent disturbance of the soil at this location, existing vegetation within the boundary of the archaeological site would be removed by hand, remaining root balls and masses would be sprayed with a topical herbicide to ensure no further growth, and the resulting dead masses of vegetation would be left in place. A geotextile tensar fabric (Tensar BX1200 or equivalent) would be placed on top of the existing ground surface to reduce the force of compaction from overlying fill soils and redistribute the compaction load force over a wider area, thereby minimizing the disturbance of friable (brittle) cultural remains such as shellfish and animal bone. No remedial grading, subgrade preparation or scarification would occur prior to placement of the geotextile fabric. Then the archaeological site and a 50-foot buffer would be covered in a minimum of two feet of protective fill soil to prevent direct impacts to archaeological resources. Fill soils would be spread from the outside in no greater than eight-inch lifts with rubber-tired equipment, such that equipment only operates on top of the fill soils.

The Project would include a masonry wall of approximately eight feet in height along the northern and western project boundaries.

Landscaping

The landscape plan is comprised primarily of native or climate appropriate plants with some small turf areas for recreation purposes. Plant species in the plant palette include but are not limited to coast live oak, California sycamore, fruitless olive, dwarf bottle brush, and dwarf coyote bush. Trees, shrubs and other vegetation would be planted throughout the development as well as low-water-use, Mediterranean and wildlife habitat plant species. Landscape treatments would be provided between buildings, curb bump-outs throughout parking areas, along common walkway areas, within the neighborhood park, recreation areas, and around the perimeter of the two development sites. Within the park, a turf area is proposed on the western side adjacent to picnic tables, and a meadow with native plantings is proposed in the center of the Project site. A portion of the park area with sensitive archeological resources would be fenced. Based on the Project site plan, the total landscaped area for the Project is approximately 1.6 acres, excluding the 2.0-acre park area, or about 10% of the 17.36-gross-acre Project site.

Stormwater and Drainage

The Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plans (dated September 2014) for the Project show permeable pavement and bioretention area locations. The Project site includes three primary bioretention basins, as well as other smaller bioretention areas and permeable pavement throughout the Project site. The Project would be required to incorporate best management practices (BMPs) to reduce stormwater runoff from the site, consistent with the County of Santa Barbara's Storm Water Technical Guide, which the City adopted in March 2014 (County of Santa Barbara, 2014).

Utilities

Water would be provided by the Goleta Water District. Sewer would be provided by the Goleta Sanitary District. Utility easements would be recorded for utility services. A portion of the Goleta West Sanitary Sewer line which is now in an easement at the eastern property boundary would be relocated into the proposed driveway at the west side of the site. All electrical distribution lines, fiber optic lines, cable television lines, phone lines, gas lines, water lines, and sewer lines would be undergrounded. Other components of the site's utility infrastructure, such as backflow preventers, transformers, water meter assemblies, gas meters, power meters, cable TV pedestals, etc. would be installed above ground. Mechanical equipment would be ground-mounted on concrete pads adjacent to the residential structures.

Water use restrictions and a temporary halt on new water services are currently being instituted by the Goleta Water District; however, a Superior Court judgment [*Wright v. Goleta Water Dist.* (1985) 174 Cal. App.3d74] has allocated 100.9 acre-feet per year (AFY) of water to serve development on the site (refer to Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*, for more detail regarding water supply to the Project site). Therefore, the temporary halt on new services does not apply to the Project.

Construction

Construction activities would include site preparation, export of excess dirt, grading, building construction, paving and architectural coating phases. Construction of the proposed Project is estimated to take approximately 2.5 years. Pre-construction removal of the stockpiled soil on the project site is estimated to take up to 24-27 weeks and require between 5,750 and 12,778 round truck trips (depending on whether 20 CY or 9 CY haul trucks are used). No phasing plan is proposed at this time.

Project Objectives

The objectives of the Project are to:

1. *Complete development of residential units in the Central Hollister Residential Development area on Affordable Housing Opportunity Site.*
2. *Construct 132 senior apartment units and 228 market rate/workforce apartment units.*
3. *Create an infill development of high density senior and workforce rental housing to be at lower rental rates than the adjacent Willow Springs I and Willow Springs II multifamily housing projects.*
4. *Fully utilize the existing public infrastructure (Camino Vista and all utilities) provided by Willow Springs and Willow Springs II.*

5. *Promote City planning goals by developing a high density residential project located conveniently close to a major transportation corridor and to employment and recreational areas.*
6. *Provide a public neighborhood park in the location shown in General Plan Figure 3-2 (Park and Recreation Plan Map).*
7. *Protect, and preserve on-site cultural resources.*
8. *Develop multifamily residential housing while maintaining visual resources.*

ALTERNATIVES

As required by CEQA, the EIR examines a range of alternatives to the Project. The alternatives, described and evaluated in Section 6.0, *Alternatives*, include the following:

- No Project Alternative. This alternative assumes that the Project is not implemented and that the Project site remains in its current condition.
- Alternative 2: Avoid CA-SBA-54. This alternative would eliminate the portion of the proposed development that lies within the boundary of the CA-SBA-56 archaeological site and the 50-foot buffer surrounding CA-SBA-56, which includes Buildings 3, 4, 5, and 6 and on-site parking. In order to avoid impacting CA-SBA-56 and the 50-foot buffer, some or all of four proposed residential buildings in Area B (Buildings 3, 4, 5, and 6) and approximately 21 uncovered parking spaces and 9 carport parking spaces would be eliminated from the plan.
- Alternative 3: Increase Railroad/Freeway Buffer and Higher Sound Barrier. This alternative, would reconfigure the development to provide a larger buffer between the railroad and the U.S. 101, and increase the height of the masonry wall to reduce noise impacts. In this alternative, the height of the proposed noise barrier would be increased to 12 feet and would consist of a six-foot tall masonry wall on top of a six-foot tall berm.
- Alternative 4: Reduced Building Height. This alternative would involve changing the five three-story buildings to two-story buildings and modifying the bedroom mix of the remaining units in order to meet the minimum density of 20 units/acre. Under this alternative, there would be 75 fewer residential units or 285 units provided (approximately a 21% decrease).
- Alternative 5: Mixed Use Development. This alternative would involve a mixed-use business park in place of the proposed residential development. The business park would include approximately 260,400 square feet of building area and would be two stories in height.

Alternative 4 would eliminate two of the six identified Class I impacts of the Project, which relate to scenic resources and solid waste generation. None of the alternatives would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts related to the identified burial site within CA-SBA-56, construction noise, or hazardous materials/ risk of upset. All other project impacts would be reduced below identified thresholds of significance through implementation of the mitigation measures described in this EIR. Although some alternatives would reduce impacts in such areas as cultural resources and noise, these reductions would be incremental in nature and adoption of an alternative rather than the Project would not be necessary to avoid significant environmental effects. Therefore, based on the reduction of impacts and ability to meet the

objectives of the Project, Alternative 4 "Reduced Building Height" is identified as the environmentally superior alternative of those described above.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1 summarizes the identified environmental impacts for each issue area studied in the EIR, recommended mitigation measures (if any), and the level of significance after mitigation. Class I impacts are defined as significant, unavoidable adverse impacts which require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued per CEQA Guidelines § 15093 if the Project is approved. Class II impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels and which require findings to be made under Section 15091 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Class III impacts are considered less than significant impacts. Class IV impacts are those for which the Project's impact would be beneficial.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics		
Impact AES-1 The Project would convert an open and undeveloped property into a multi-family housing complex with two- and three-story buildings. Due to the three-story height of proposed buildings on the western portion of the Project site, the Project would significantly obstruct views of the foothills and Santa Ynez Mountains from S. Los Carneros Road at Calle Koral looking northward, which is a City-designated view corridor. Therefore, impacts to this scenic view corridor would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	Given the proposed location of three-story residential buildings in the southwest portion of the Project site, mitigation is not available to reduce the obstruction of scenic views of the foothills and Santa Ynez Mountains from the vantage point on S. Los Carneros Road near Calle Koral. These buildings would unavoidably obstruct scenic views.	Significant and unavoidable.
Impact AES-2 The Project would not impact scenic resources identified in the City's Visual and Historic Resources Element, including the Santa Ynez Mountains, coastal mesas, bluffs, and the Pacific Ocean. Impacts to these scenic resources would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact AES-3 Construction of the proposed multi-family housing development would involve removal of native shrub vegetation on most of the site. However, no trees currently exist on-site and Project landscaping would include planting native trees on-site. Therefore, impacts to scenic natural landforms would be Class III, *less than significant*.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact AES-4 The Project would permanently alter the Project site, replacing open and undeveloped land with a residential complex. The massing and architectural style of the proposed buildings would not be compatible with that of adjacent multi-family residential development, although landscaping would incrementally reduce this contrast. Impacts to	**AES-4(a) Architectural Review.** The applicant must submit revised plans to the City of Goleta Design Review Board for review before applying for building permits. Plans must address compatibility of massing, heights and consistency with neighborhood character.	Less than significant with mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
the visual character of the site and surroundings would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**Plan Requirements and Timing.** Before applying for building permits, the applicant must apply for design approval from the Design Review Board and submit plans wherein the massing, height, and architectural style of apartment buildings are consistent with neighborhood buildings and do not detract from existing neighborhood characteristics. Pursuant to GMC § 2.08.150, the Design Review Board must determine whether the proposed buildings, structures, landscaping, and signs are appropriate and of good design in relation to other buildings, structures, landscaping and signs, on-site or in the immediately affected area. Plans also must specifically be evaluated for consistency with adopted regulations pertaining to the aesthetics of development in the Visual and Historic Resources Element of the Goleta General Plan. **Monitoring.** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must conduct a final review of final plans, before the City issues grading permits. In the event that final plans are not in substantial conformance with the approved plans, the Planning and Environmental Review Director may refer the matter back to the full Design Review Board for a final determination. **AES-4(b) Height Limitations.** Finished floor elevations of each lot must be consistent with the finished floor elevation shown on the Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan dated September 2014, based on the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey (USC&GS) Datum elevation 8.92' or equivalent. In addition, maximum building heights must not exceed 35 feet in height, and height must be measured from the established finished floor elevation as described above. The applicant must ensure that the Project complies with the grading limitations and height limitations as established with the approved entitlement plans. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** At the time of grading plan review, the applicant must submit verification from a licensed surveyor/civil engineer demonstrating that the finished floor heights will be at the elevations shown on the entitlement plans.	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	If a different datum is used, then the applicant must submit documentation demonstrating that the finished floor elevations are at equivalent heights. **Monitoring.** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before the City issues grading permits.	
Impact AES-5 The Project would introduce on-site sources of lighting and glare to an open, undeveloped parcel that currently has none. Impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**AES-5 Lighting Specifications.** Any exterior lighting installed on the Project site must be of low intensity, low glare design, and must be hooded to direct light downward onto the Project site and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels and must otherwise meet dark night sky requirements. Exterior lighting fixtures must be kept to the minimum number and intensity needed to ensure public safety. These lights must be dimmed after 11 p.m. to the maximum extent practical without compromising public safety as determined by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee. Upward directed exterior lighting is prohibited. Lighting fixtures must be appropriate for the architectural style of the structure and surrounding area. The final lighting plan must be amended to include identification of all types, sizes, and intensities of wall-mounted building lights and landscape accent lighting, and a photometric map must be provided. "Moonlighting" type fixtures that illuminate entire tree canopies should also be avoided. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The locations of all exterior lighting fixtures, complete cut-sheets of all exterior lighting fixtures, and a photometric plan prepared by a registered professional engineer showing the extent of all light and glare emitted by all exterior lighting fixtures must be reviewed and approved by Design Review Board before the City issues a building permit for construction. **Monitoring:** Before the City issues a certificate of occupancy, the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must inspect exterior lighting features to ensure that they have been installed consistent with approved plans.	Less than significant with mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality		
Impact AQ-1 The Project would be consistent with the SBCAPCD 2013 Clean Air Plan (CAP) because it would not generate population in excess of that used in the CAP to forecast population-related emissions. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact AQ-2 The Project would result in operational air pollutant emissions from area sources, natural gas use, and increased vehicular traffic. However, the increase in emissions would not exceed thresholds established by SBCAPCD. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact AQ-3 Project construction would generate temporary air pollutant emissions. Such emissions may result in temporary adverse impacts to local air quality, but are below SBCAPCD guideline thresholds for construction emissions. Additionally, standard dust and emissions control measures are required by the SBCAPCD. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact AQ-4 New sensitive receptors on the Project site would be exposed to hazardous air pollutants at levels that may cause health risks. The proposed residences closest to U.S. 101 and the Union Pacific Railroad would be exposed to hazardous air pollutants that exceed significance thresholds. This impact would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**AQ-4 Indoor Air Pollution.** The mitigation actions listed below apply to all new residential units on the Project site: Forced air ventilation with filter screens on outside air intake ducts must be provided for all residential units proposed on the site. The filter screens must have a minimum MERV 13 rating, capable of removing at least 90% of the particulate matter including fine particulate matter (PM<2.5 micron). For individual residential units with separate HVAC systems, a brochure notifying the future residents of the need for maintaining the filter screens must be prepared and provided at the time of ownership exchange. In addition, a notice of the diesel particulates risk hazard and the need for screen maintenance must be recorded in the property title and included with lease agreements. Windows and doors must be fully weatherproofed with caulking and weather-stripping that is rated to last at least 20 years. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** These mitigation measures must be incorporated	Less than significant with mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	into the Project and shown on the plans submitted to the City for zoning clearance. The brochure and the specifications for the filter screens must also be submitted to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review before the City provides zoning clearance for the project. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must review the hazard avoidance measures and confirm acceptable wording in the brochure and the suitability of the proposed screens before the City provides zoning clearance. City building inspectors must check for installation of the filter screens and adequate weather-proofing in the appropriate units before the City issues certificates of occupancy.	
Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1 Biological surveys of the project site identified a lack of special status plant species or suitable habitat for special status wildlife species. However, the project site contains habitat that could support nesting and/or foraging birds protected under state and federal law. Impacts on sensitive species are Class II, significant but mitigable.	**BIO-1 Nesting Birds and Raptors.** To avoid construction impacts to nesting birds and raptors, vegetation removal and initial ground disturbance must occur outside the bird and raptor breeding season, which is typically February 1 through September 1 (January 1 through September 1 for some raptors), but can vary based on local and annual climatic conditions. If construction must begin within the breeding season, then not more than two weeks before ground disturbance and/or vegetation removal commences, a bird and raptor pre-construction survey must be conducted by a City-approved biologist within the disturbance footprint plus a 300-foot buffer, as feasible. If the Project is phased, a subsequent pre-construction nesting bird and raptor survey is required before each phase of construction within the Project site. If no raptor or other bird nests are observed no further mitigation is required. Pre-construction nesting bird and raptor surveys must be conducted during the time of day when bird species are active and be of sufficient duration to reliably conclude presence/absence of nesting birds and raptors within the 300-foot buffer. A report of the nesting bird and raptor survey results, if applicable, must be submitted to the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval before the City issues grading permits.	Less than significant with mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	If active nest of species protected by CFG Code 3503 or the MBTA Migratory Bird Treaty Act protected bird nests are found within 300 feet of the Project site, their locations must be flagged and then mapped onto an aerial photograph of the Project site at a scale no less than 1"=200' and/or recorded with the use of a GPS unit. If active raptor nests are detected the map will include topographic lines, parcel boundaries, adjacent roads, known historical nests for protected nesting species, and known roosting or foraging areas, as required by Conservation Element Policy 8.3 of the Goleta Community Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan. If feasible, the buffer must be 300 feet in compliance with Conservation Element Policy CE 8.4 of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. If the 300-foot buffer is infeasible, the City approved biologist may reduce the buffer distance as appropriate, dependent upon the species and the proposed work activities. If any active non-raptor bird nests are found, a suitable buffer area (varying from 25-300 feet), depending on the species, must be established by the City approved biologist. No ground disturbance can occur within the buffer until the City-approved biologist confirms that the breeding/nesting is completed and all the young have fledged. Alternately, a City approved biologist must monitor the active nest full-time during construction activities within the buffer to ensure Project activities are not indirectly impacting protected nesting birds and raptors. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues a grading or building permit(s), the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify that construction and grading is occurring outside the nesting season, or that nesting bird and raptor surveys have been conducted, and buffer requirements specified above are in place (if applicable). This measure, and any buffer requirements, must be incorporated into the grading plans for the Project. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before the City issues any grading or building permit(s) and conduct periodic site inspections to ensure	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	compliance throughout the construction period.	
Impact BIO-2 No riparian habitat or sensitive community is present on-site; therefore, no direct impact to will occur. Indirect Impacts to off-site sensitive community from the introduction of invasive species would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**BIO-2 Invasive Species Seeding and Landscaping**. Nonnative, invasive plant species cannot be included in any erosion control seed mixes and/or landscaping plans associated with the Project. The California Invasive Plant Inventory Database contains a list of nonnative, invasive plants (California Invasive Plant Council [Updated 2011] or its successor). **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues a Building Permit, the applicant must submit a final landscape plan for review and approval by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before the City issues any grading or building permit(s). Before the City issues a certificate of occupancy, the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must inspect landscape plantings features to ensure that they have been installed consistent with approved plans.	Less than significant with mitigation.
Impact BIO-3 No jurisdictional water or wetlands are present on-site. Therefore, no direct impact to will occur. Indirect Impacts to off-site waters and wetlands would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact BIO-4 The project is located within local wildlife linkage. Indirect impacts to wildlife movement from development of residences would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.	**BIO-4(a) Lighting Plan.** In addition to the lighting specifications in Mitigation Measure AES-5, light and glare from new development must be controlled and directed away from the wildlife corridors shown on the conceptual landscape plan, Los Carneros Creek SPA ESHA, Los Carneros Wetland ESHA, and the open space areas adjacent to the development. Exterior night lighting must be minimized, restricted to low intensity fixtures, shielded, and directed away from ESHAs, wildlife corridors, and open space. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The locations of all exterior lighting fixtures, complete cut-sheets of all exterior lighting fixtures, and a photometric plan prepared by a registered professional engineer showing the extent of all light and glare emitted by all exterior lighting fixtures must be approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director,	Less than significant with mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	or designee, before the City issues a Building Permit for construction. **Monitoring:** Before the City issues a certificate of occupancy, the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must inspect exterior lighting features to ensure that they have been installed consistent with approved plans. **BIO-4(b) Landscape Chemical and Pest Management Plan.** All pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers used at the Project site must be those designated for use near aquatic and wetland habitats, and must be applied with techniques that avoid over-spraying and control application to avoid excessive concentrations. Rodenticides are prohibited**.** **Plan Requirements and Timing:** A Landscape Chemical and Pest Management Plan (Plan) must be developed by the applicant and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, before a final map is recorded. The requirements must be printed on the final approved landscape plans, each residential unit lease document, the map, and recorded on the property deed. The Plan must provide a prohibition on use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers and rodenticides. These prohibitions must be the subject of at least one annual communication by the applicant to the residents in the form of a meeting and/or newsletter or electronic update that is distributed to residents. **Monitoring:** Evidence of this effort must be provided to the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, each year by January 1st. The management must also provide the Planning and Environmental Review Director with an annual monitoring report by January 1st of each year demonstrating the use of aquatic and wetland habitat appropriate fertilizer, herbicides, and pesticides consistent with the Plan on the property. If determined necessary by the **City,** the City may require the applicant to retain a City approved qualified biologist to verify the correct use of appropriate herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers as part of the annual monitoring report. **BIO-4(b) Landscape Chemical and Pest Management Plan.** All pesticides,	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	herbicides, and fertilizers used at the Project site must be those designated for use near aquatic and wetland habitats, and must be applied with techniques that avoid over-spraying and control application to avoid excessive concentrations. Rodenticides are prohibited. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: A Landscape Chemical and Pest Management Plan (Plan) must be developed by the applicant and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, before a final map is recorded. The requirements must be printed on the final approved landscape plans, each residential unit lease document, the map, and recorded on the property deed. The Plan must provide a prohibition on use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers and rodenticides. These prohibitions must be the subject of at least one annual communication by the applicant to the residents in the form of a meeting and/or newsletter or electronic update that is distributed to residents. **Monitoring:** Evidence of this effort must be provided to the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, each year by January 1st. The management must also provide the Planning and Environmental Review Director with an annual monitoring report by January 1st of each year demonstrating the use of aquatic and wetland habitat appropriate fertilizer, herbicides, and pesticides consistent with the Plan on the property. If determined necessary by the City, the City may require the applicant to retain a City approved qualified biologist to verify the correct use of appropriate herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers as part of the annual monitoring report. **BIO-4(c) Domestic Pet Predation, Feline Disease, and Wildlife Corridor Education**. The applicant must prepare a public education campaign for future residents of the Project site regarding: 1) the effects of domestic animal predation on wildlife (e.g., domestic cats and protected bird species); 2) promoting indoor cats since bobcats are susceptible to the same diseases as domestic cats, and disease can be transmitted between domestic cats and	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	bobcats (or vice versa); and 3) the importance of wildlife corridors. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The education materials must be prepared by a City approved qualified biologist, approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) and must be recorded with the Final Map. The education materials must be distributed with the unit lease documents, and the subject of at least one annual communication by the applicant to the residents in the form of a meeting and/or newsletter or electronic update that is distributed to all residents. Monitoring: Evidence of this effort must be provided to the Planning and Environmental Review Director each year by January 1st.	
Impact BIO-5 The Goleta General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan identifies the presence of coastal sage scrub, an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area, on the project site. However, biological assessment surveys for this EIR indicate that no protected habitat ESHAs are present on-site. Impacts to ESHA would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant.
Cultural Resources		
Impact CR-1 Based on archaeological investigations conducted on the Project site, there is evidence that an intact archaeological deposit (associated with CA-SBA-56) is present. Construction activities for the Project could potentially have a significant impact on CA-SBA-56. This would be a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.	**CR-1(a) Limited Phase 3 Data Recovery.** The applicant must provide a Phase 3 Data Recovery Program Plan developed by a City-approved archaeologist for excavations at the low density artifact scatter at CA-SBA-56. **Plan Requirements:** The Phase 3 plan must be prepared in accordance with the City of Goleta's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, Open Space Element Policy 8.5, the California Office of Historic Preservation's (1990) *Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format*, and CEQA § 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4(b). The plan must include: • *Research design;* • *Discussion of relevant research questions that can be addressed by the CA-SBA-56 resources;* • *Methods used to gather data, including data from previous studies;* • *Laboratory methods to analyze the data;* • *An assessment of artifacts recovered and any corresponding field notes, graphics, and lab analyses; and*	With implementation of the required mitigation measures, potential impacts to known and as-yet undetected archaeological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	• *Results of investigations.* The plan must provide for a systematic sample of the area to be capped, such that the research value of the deposit is adequately characterized. The Phase 3 must be funded by the applicant and must be prepared by a City-approved archaeologist. The Phase 3 must be documented in a draft and final report and must be reviewed and approved by a City-retained archaeologist. Pursuant to City Cultural Resource Guidelines, the final report, archaeological collections, field notes, and other standard documentation must be permanently curated at the UCSB Repository for Archaeological Collections. The Phase 3 must specify that a Chumash Native American observer must be retained by the applicant to observe all excavation activity associated with the Program. The observer must maintain daily notes and documentation necessary, and provide the observation notes and documentation to all interested Chumash representatives who request to be informed of the Phase 3 excavation progress. **Timing:** A Phase 3 research design prepared pursuant to City of Goleta's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, and a copy of a contract (including a detailed scope of work) between the applicant and a City-approved archaeologist and Chumash Native American observer for the Phase 3 program, and the subsequent draft and final Phase 3 report, must be reviewed and approved by the City and City-retained archaeologist (funded by the applicant) before recordation of the final map. The applicant must provide a bond subject to City approval to the City for completion of the Phase 3 program that must be released upon completion of the Phase 3 mitigation and all contract requirements as determined by the City in writing. All excavation and curation requirements must be met prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit for grading. The Phase 3 excavation must be undertaken before placement of fill over the low density artifact scatter. **Monitoring:** The Phase 3 Data Recovery Program must be submitted for approval by	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	the City and City-approved archaeologist before the applicant records a final map. City staff and the City-retained archaeologist must periodically site inspect to verify completion of the Phase 3 field work. The City-retained archaeologist must review and approve the draft and final Phase 3 reports. The applicant must provide the City with a letter from the UCSB Repository for Archaeological Collections indicating that all required materials have been accepted for curation. **CR-1(b) Surface Preparation and Fill Soils within CA-SBA-56.** Preparation of the ground surface and the placement of fill soils within the CA-SBA-56 boundary must adhere to the following requirements: • *Systematically collect all diagnostic artifacts on the ground surface;* • *Remove all organic material from the archaeological site surface by hand (including brushing, raking, or use of power blower);* • *Place a layer of geotextile fabric over all archaeological site areas to receive fill;* • *Use fill soils within 1 pH of that identified in the low density artifact scatter soils, as evaluated in the field prior to construction;* • *Use a contrasting color for the lower six inches of fill soils, signaling to any future sub-surface activity (e.g., landscaping activity) that excavation shall not extend deeper; and* • *Place the fill soils ahead of the loading equipment so that the machine does not have contact with the archaeological site surface.* • *Moisten fill soils sufficient so that they are cohesive under the weight of the heavy equipment as the material is spread out over the archaeological site and buffer area.* **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues any grading permit, the Planning and Environmental Review Director must approve a Construction Monitoring Plan prepared by the applicant. Plan specifications for the monitoring must be printed on all plans submitted for grading, landscaping, and building permits. The applicant must enter into a contract with a	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	City-approved archaeologist and an applicant selected Chumash Native American observer(s) and must fund the provision of on-site archaeological/cultural resource monitoring during initial grading and excavation activities prior to any LUP issuance for grading. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must approve the Construction Monitoring Plan and ensure there is a valid contract with an archaeologist and a Chumash Native American observer, and must conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground-disturbing activities. **CR-1(c) Excavations within Low Density Artifact Scatter.** Excavations for all landscaping and recreational improvements within the low density artifact scatter cannot encroach within six inches of the existing ground surface: **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement must be printed on all plans submitted for any LUP for grading. The area where excavations would not encroach on the low density artifact scatter as specified herein must be clearly marked on the plans. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground-disturbing activities. **CR-1(d) Monitoring.** Before initiating any staging areas, vegetation clearing, or grading activity, the applicant and construction crew must meet on-site with a City-approved archaeologist and appropriate local Chumash consultant(s) and present the procedures to be followed in the unlikely event that cultural artifacts are discovered on site. If cultural resources of potential importance are uncovered during construction, the following must occur per the Goleta General Plan Open Space Policy 8.6: a. The grading or excavation shall cease and the City shall be notified. b. A qualified archeologist shall prepare a report assessing the significance of the	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	find and provide recommendations regarding appropriate disposition. c. Disposition will be determined by the City in conjunction with the appropriate Chumash representatives. A City-approved archaeologist and local Chumash consultant must monitor all ground-disturbing activities on the Project site, including surface vegetation removal and the Phase 3 Data Recovery Program. The monitor(s) must have the following authority: 1. The archaeological monitor(s) and Chumash monitor(s) must be on-site on a full-time basis during any earthmoving activities, including preparation of the area for capping, grading, trenching, vegetation removal, or other excavation activities. The monitors will continue their duties until it is determined through consultation with the applicant, City Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee, archaeological consultant, and Chumash consultant that monitoring is no longer warranted; 2. The monitor(s) may halt any activities impacting previously unidentified cultural resources and conduct an initial assessment of the resource(s); 3. If an artifact is identified as an isolated find, the monitor(s) must recover the artifact(s) with the appropriate locational data and include the item in the overall inventory for the site; 4. If a feature or concentration of artifacts is identified, the monitor must halt activities in the vicinity of the find, notify the applicant and the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee, and prepare a proposal for the assessment and treatment of the find(s). This treatment may range from additional study to avoidance, depending on the nature of the find(s); 5. The monitor must prepare a comprehensive archaeological technical report documenting the results of the monitoring program and include an inventory of recovered artifacts, features, etc.; 6. The monitor must prepare the artifact assemblage for curation with an appropriate curation facility (e.g., UCSB	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	or local Chumash facility) and include an inventory with the transfer of the collection; and 7. The monitor must file an updated archaeological site survey record with the UCSB Central Coastal Information Center. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement must be printed on all plans submitted for any land use, building, grading, or demolition permits. The applicant must enter into a contract with a City-approved archaeologist and applicant-selected Chumash consultant and must fund the provision of on-site archaeological/cultural resource monitoring during initial grading and excavation activities before issuance of a land use permit. Plan specifications for the monitoring must be printed on all plans submitted for grading, and building permits. **Monitoring:** City Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground-disturbing activities. **CR-1(e) Continued Chumash Consultation.** Previous Chumash consultation with the City of Goleta and Project applicant resulted in the archaeological site CA-SBA-56 being identified as important to the Chumash community. Continued Chumash consultation must occur throughout the remainder of the Project including any design changes, alternatives analysis, or mitigation measure implementation to ensure that impacts to CA-SBA-56 are mitigated in a manner that would be respectful of the site's Chumash heritage. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This condition must be printed on all building and grading plans. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must check plans before the City issues a land use permit and must spot check in the field throughout grading and construction. **CR-1(f) Human Remains.** Before initiating any staging areas, vegetation clearing, or grading activity, the applicant and	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	construction crew must meet on-site with a City-approved archaeologist and appropriate local Chumash consultant(s) and present the procedures to be followed in the unlikely event that human remains are uncovered. These procedures must include those identified by Public Resources Code § 5097.98. In addition, a satisfactory disposition of the remains must be agreed upon by the City-approved archaeologist and appropriate local Chumash consultant(s) so as to limit future disturbance. If the remains are determined to be of Chumash descent, the County Coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) of the deceased Chumash, who will then help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues grading permits, the applicant must provide the City Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee the contact information of the Chumash consultant and the agreed upon procedures to be followed. In the event that remains are found and if the remains are found to be of Chumash origin, the County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission and the Commission will name the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD, consulting archaeologist, applicant, and City Planning and Environmental Review staff will consult as to the disposition of the remains. If the remains are identified as non-Chumash, the County Coroner will take possession of the remains and comply with all state and local requirements in the treatment of the remains. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must confirm that the County Coroner is notified in the event human remains are found, and that the Native American Heritage Commission is contacted if the remains are of Chumash origin.	
Impact CR-2 The Project would result in a permanent reduction in the heritage value associated with a known undisturbed human burial site located at the low density artifact scatter. This would be a Class I, significant and	Mitigation Measures CR-1(a) through CR-1(f) would reduce the Project's impact on the research value of this cultural resource. However, the heritage value of CA-SBA-56 would be unavoidably impacted through	Significant and unavoidable.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
unavoidable impact.	alteration of the setting	
Impact CR-3 Excavations in the low-lying areas surrounding the elevated knoll have low potential to contribute to the understanding of CA-SBA-56 occupations. This would be a Class III, less than significant impact.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Geology and Soils		
Impact GEO-1 Project site soils are prone to liquefaction, which could cause settlement in a seismic event and expose on-site structures to property damage. Impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**GEO-1 Geotechnical Design Considerations.** The recommendations in the Geotechnical Engineering Report (Earth Systems Pacific, 2014) related to soil engineering within and outside of the Archaeological Area must be incorporated into the Project's grading and building plans, as summarized here: **Areas Outside the Archaeological Area:** All existing fill soils should be completely removed and replaced as compacted fill Any existing utilities that will not be serving the site must be removed or properly abandoned. Voids created by the removal of materials or utilities, and extending below the recommended over excavation depth, must be immediately called to the attention of the geotechnical engineer. No fill may be placed unless the geotechnical engineer has observed the underlying soil. Following site preparation, soils in the building area should be removed to a level plane at a minimum depth of 3 to 8 feet below the bottom of the deepest footing or 3 to 8 feet below existing grade, whichever is deeper, as recommended by the geotechnical engineer in the field. Soils in the surface improvement area should be removed to a level plane at a minimum depth of 1-foot below the proposed subgrade elevation or 2 feet below the existing ground surface, whichever is deeper. Soils in the fill areas beyond the building and surface improvement areas should be removed to a depth of 2 feet below the existing ground surface. Stabilization of surface soils by vegetation or other means during and following	Less than significant with mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	construction must be implemented, particularly those disturbed during construction **Areas Inside the Archaeological Area, including the 50-foot Archaeological Buffer Zone:** Existing ground surface in the grading area inside of the archaeological area should be prepared for construction by removing the stockpile soils and all other existing fill soils down to the native soil surface. All vegetation, debris, and other deleterious material should be removed from the native soil surface by hand (can include brushing, raking, or the use of a power blower) to the degree practicable at the ground surface such that no soil disturbance occurs. Remnants of the vegetation should then be sprayed with topical herbicide per manufacturer's specifications approximately 60 days prior to implementing grading operations Root ball masses must be left in place to die. Any existing utilities that will not be serving the site must be removed or properly abandoned. The appropriate method of utility abandonment will depend upon the type and depth of the utility. Surface vegetation removal and herbicide application must be accomplished 60 days prior to the geogrid placement; it is acceptable to place import sand on the native soil surface where uneven areas or undulations exist to create as level a surface as practicable to place the geogrid on as it improves both the constructability and performance of the geogrid system. The native soil surface must be covered with a tri-axial geogrid such as Tensar TX 7, or an approved equivalent. The geogrid must be anchored and/or overlapped as recommended by the manufacturer prior to placing any fill soil. The first 6 inches of fill placed on top of the geogrid must be an imported sand material reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	to provide a visual indication to avoid impeding into the native soils. Fill soils must be placed and spread from the outside to the inside of the archeological area with track earthmoving equipment such that the equipment must only be working on top of the fill soils. The fill soils must be placed such that the earthmoving equipment does not come into contact with the archeological area native soils or the geogrid. **Grading (General):** On-site material and approved import materials may be used as general fill and up to 18 inches below the bottom of the slab-on-grade elevation within the building area where conventional foundations will be used. A minimum of 18 inches of nonexpansive material when measured from the bottom of the conventional foundation slabs-on-grade should be placed in the building area. Proposed imported soils should be evaluated by a geotechnical engineer before being used, and on an intermittent basis during placement on the site. All materials used as fill should be cleaned of any debris and rocks larger than 6 inches in diameter, and no rocks larger than 3 inches in diameter should be used within the upper 3 feet of finish grade. Fill slopes should be keyed and benched into competent soil. Slopes under normal conditions should be constructed at 2:1(horizontal to vertical) or flatter inclinations. Slopes subject to inundation should be constructed at 3:1 or flatter inclinations. Stabilization of surface soils by vegetation or other means during and following construction must be implemented, particularly those disturbed during construction. If the portions of the site cannot be graded to those recommendations, rigid mat	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	foundations should be used in lieu of conventional foundation systems. **Foundations:** Foundations must not be constructed within 10 feet of LID drainage improvements. If this is not the case, the geotechnical engineer must review the type of LID drainage improvement planned within 10 feet of a foundation to ascertain if revised and/or supplemental foundation recommendations are needed. Conventional and Rigid Mat Foundations systems must be engineered in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Engineering Report (Earth Systems Pacific, 2014). **Plan Requirements and Timing**. Grading and building plans must be submitted for review and approval by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee before the City issues grading and building permits. **Monitoring**. The Project soils engineer must observe all excavations before placement of compacted soil, gravel backfill, or rebar and concrete and report observations to the City. The City will conduct field inspections as needed.	
Impact GEO-2 Expansive soils are present on the project site, which could damage slabs and foundations. Impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	The recommendations in the Geotechnical Engineering Report (Earth Systems Pacific, 2014) related to removal of existing fill, site grading, and foundation design, which are required by Mitigation Measure GEO-1, would reduce impacts related to expansive soils to a less than significant level.	Less than significant with mitigation.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
Impact GHG-1 The Project would generate temporary as well as operational GHG emissions, which would incrementally contribute to climate change. However, combined annual GHG emissions from the Project would not exceed applicable thresholds of significance. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact GHG-2 The Project is consistent with the City of Goleta Climate Action Plan. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset		
Impact HAZ-1 Hazardous materials may be present in the soils on the Project site and adjoining properties. However, due to the depth of potentially contaminated soils and required compliance with local and regional regulations, impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact HAZ-2 Implementation of the Project would place residential structures and persons in proximity to existing businesses that use, store, and transport hazardous chemicals, as well as transport of hazardous materials on the existing UPRR railroad tracks and U.S. 101. Onsite residents would therefore be exposed to a potential risk of upset associated with chemical leaks and fire from nearby businesses, derailed trains, and truck accidents. Although the probability of such incidents would be low, this impact would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	As stated in the General Plan FEIR, mitigation is not available to address the risk of upset associated with train derailment on the UPRR ROW and truck accidents on U.S. 101. The project site is also potentially subject to hazardous material releases from nearby businesses. Beyond existing regulations enforced by the County's Environmental Health Department, measures are not available to mitigate the risk of upset from these sources.	Significant and unavoidable.
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HWQ 1 During grading and construction of the Project, the soil surface would be subject to erosion and downstream watersheds could be subject to temporary sedimentation and discharges of various pollutants. Compliance with discharge requirements during grading and construction would ensure that hydrologic impacts from construction would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact HWQ-2 The Project would alter on-site drainage patterns and increase impermeable surfaces. Preparation of a maintenance agreement is required to ensure long-term protection and maintenance of drainage facilities. Impacts on site drainage would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**HWQ-2 Maintenance Agreement and Stormwater Control Plan.** The applicant must execute a maintenance agreement and Stormwater Control Plan with the City, in a form approved by the City Attorney, that implements maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with all BMPs described in the final approved Hydrology and Hydraulic Analysis and Storm Water Control Plan. The agreement must be executed before the City issues any final certificate of occupancy. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: At a minimum, the maintenance agreement and Stormwater Control Plan between the applicant and City must include requirements that all inline storm drain filters must be inspected, repaired, and cleaned per manufacture specifications and	Less than significant with mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	at a minimum before September 30th of each year. Additional inspections, repairs, and maintenance must be performed after storm events as needed throughout the rainy season (November 1st to April 15th) and/or per manufacture specifications. Any necessary major repairs must be completed before the next rainy season. Before September 30th of each year, the applicant must submit to Public Works for review and approval a report summarizing all inspections, repairs, and maintenance work done during the prior year. **Monitoring:** City Planning and Environmental Review staff must verify compliance before approval of any occupancy permit for the Project. City Planning and Environmental Review staff must verify compliance with the provisions of the agreement periodically and respond to instances of non-compliance with the agreement.	
Impact HWQ-3 New sources of pollution associated with operation of the proposed residential development have the potential to affect impaired waterways in Goleta. However, compliance with State and local requirements would ensure that impacts from water pollutants would remain Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact HWQ-4 The Project site is located outside of a FEMA-mapped flood area. Impacts related to flood hazards would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Land Use and Planning		
Impact LU-1 The Project would be consistent with most applicable General Plan policies, but would be inconsistent with several policies related to preservation of views. Impacts would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	As described in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, mitigation is not available to reduce the obstruction of scenic views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from the vantage point of motorist on S. Los Carneros Road near Calle Koral. These buildings would unavoidably obstruct scenic views.	Significant and unavoidable.
Impact LU-2 The Project would be consistent with the Inland Zoning Ordinance, as adopted by the Goleta Municipal Code, with approval of the requested modification to the required side-yard setback. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact LU-3 Temporary construction activities associated with development of the Project would potentially generate short-term compatibility effects on surrounding uses. However, temporary impacts would be	Mitigation Measure N-1 in Section 4.10, Noise, would reduce construction noise impacts to levels that would avoid significant land use compatibility impacts during construction.	Less than significant with mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures included in Section 4.10, Noise. This would be a Class II, significant but mitigable, impact with mitigation measures for construction noise.		
Impact LU-4 Quality of life issues identified in the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual include loss of privacy, neighborhood incompatibility, nuisance noise, not exceeding noise thresholds, increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods, and loss of sunlight/solar access. Impacts related to privacy, incompatibility, noise, sunlight/solar access, and neighborhood traffic would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	Mitigation measures AES-4(a) and AES-4(b) would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts from the Project's massing and architectural style and to ensure that building heights remain consistent with adjacent development.	Less than significant with mitigation.
Noise		
Impact N-1 Construction activities would be located within 50 feet of sensitive receptors, including existing residential uses approximately 50 feet away along the southern project site border. Therefore, temporary construction-related noise could exceed City of Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 9.09 noise regulations. This impact would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**N-1(a) Construction Timing.** Construction activity and equipment maintenance is limited to the hours between 8 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday. No construction can occur on State holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day). Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** At least one sign near each Project site entrance along Camino Vista stating these restrictions must be posted on the site. Signs must be a minimum size of 24" x 48." Signs must be in place before the beginning of and throughout grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must monitor compliance with restrictions on construction hours and must promptly investigate and respond to all complaints. **N-1(b) Electrical Power.** Electrical power must be used to run air compressors and similar power tools. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The equipment area with appropriate acoustic shielding must be designated on building and grading plans. Equipment and shielding must remain in the designated location throughout construction activities.	Significant and unavoidable.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	Monitoring: The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance with all noise attenuation requirements. **N-1(c) Construction Noise Complaint Line.** The applicant must provide a non-automated telephone number for local residents and employees to call to submit complaints associated with construction noise. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The telephone number must be included in the notice required by Measure N-1(a) and posted on the Project site and must be easily viewed from adjacent public areas. Proof of mailing the notices must be provided to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee before the City issues a grading permit. At least one sign near each Project site entrance along Camino Vista with the phone number must be posted onsite. The applicant must inform the Planning and Development Review Director or designee of any complaints within one week of receipt of the complaint. Signs must be in place before beginning of and throughout grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits. **Monitoring:** Building Inspectors and Permit Compliance staff may periodically inspect and respond to complaints. **N-1(d) Distancing of Vehicles and Equipment.** Noise and groundborne vibration construction activities whose specific location on the Project site may be flexible (e.g., operation of compressors and generators, cement mixing, general truck idling) must be conducted as far as possible from the nearest noise- and vibration-sensitive land uses. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** The location of vehicles and equipment must be designated on building and grading plans. Equipment and vehicles must remain in the designated location throughout construction activities. **Monitoring.** The Planning and Environmental Review Director must	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance. **N-1(e) Avoid Operating Equipment Simultaneously.** Whenever possible, construction activities must be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously, which causes high noise levels. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** The construction schedule and timing of operation of each piece of equipment must be provided by the applicant. **Monitoring.** Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance. **N-1(f) Sound Control Curtains and Acoustical Blankets.** Flexible sound control curtains must be placed around all drilling apparatuses, drill rigs, and jackhammers when in use. Acoustical blankets (or similarly effective temporary noise barriers) must be placed along the southern and eastern Project site boundaries to reduce noise transmission to existing land uses to the south and east, including residential units at the existing Willow Spring I and II sites south of the project site across Camino Vista. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** The equipment area with appropriate sound control curtains and the locations of acoustical blankets must be designated on building and grading plans. Equipment and shielding must remain in the designated location throughout construction activities. **Monitoring.** Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must monitor compliance with restrictions on construction hours and must promptly investigate and respond to all complaints. **N-1(g) Newest Power Construction Equipment.** The Project contractor must use the newest available power construction equipment with standard recommended noise shielding and muffling devices. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** The equipment with appropriate noise shielding	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	and muffling must be designated on building and grading plans. **Monitoring.** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must inspect the building and grading plans before the City issues permits and periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance.	
Impact N-2 Project construction activities could generate intermittent levels of groundborne vibration affecting surrounding residential development. However, the expected vibration levels during temporary construction activity would not exceed applicable standards for infrequent vibration events. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact N-3 Project-generated traffic would incrementally increase traffic-related noise on study area roadway segments, which would potentially affect existing sensitive receptors on area roadways. However, the change in noise levels would not exceed significance thresholds. Therefore, the effect of increased traffic noise would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact N-4 Operation of the Project would generate noise typically associated with residential development. However, noise would not affect sensitive receptors and noise levels would not exceed City thresholds. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact N-5 Construction of the Project near the Union Pacific Railroad, U.S. 101, and existing business park development could expose future residents on the project site to noise levels exceeding City standards. This impact would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**N-5(a) Outdoor Living Area Noise Attenuation.** Residential outdoor living spaces (e.g., patios and balconies) associated with all residential units located in the proposed Buildings 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8, facing U.S. 101 and/or the UPRR line, must be protected from sound intrusion so that they meet the City's standard of 65 dBA CNEL for outdoor living spaces. Patios and balconies for these residential units must include noise barriers up to seven feet in height to reduce traffic and train noise to meet the City's 65 dBA CNEL noise level criterion for exterior living areas. The noise barriers may be constructed of a material such as tempered glass, acrylic glass, or any masonry material with a surface density of at least three pounds per square foot. The noise barriers should have no openings or cracks.	Less than significant with mitigation. Additionally, the following condition of approval to notify potential residents of the UPRR and U.S. 101 associated noise is recommended to further reduce impacts: The applicant must provide a rail line real-estate disclosure to potential occupants, providing notice of the site's proximity to the UPRR and that associated noise and vibration may be perceptible.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	Once building elevations and exterior design details are finalized, further noise evaluation should be performed in order to prescribe the height of necessary noise barrier per balcony area. Failure to conclusively demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed noise attenuation measures must result in the denial of a permit to build the affected unit. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** These requirements must be incorporated into all construction documents submitted for approval before the issuance of a Land Use Permit for all residential units in Buildings 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 that are facing U.S. 101 and/or the UPRR line. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before the issuance of a Land Use Permit for all residential units in Buildings 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 that are facing U.S. 101 and/or the UPRR line. City building inspectors must verify compliance in the field before the City issues a certificate of occupancy for an affected unit. No certificate of occupancy can be issued unless compliance is achieved. As shown in Table 4.10-10, interior living spaces of Buildings 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 that are facing U.S. 101 and/or the UPRR line may be subject to noise exceeding 45 dBA CNEL. Mitigation Measure N-5(b) would be required to ensure that interior noise levels do not exceed City interior noise standards. **N-5(b) Indoor Noise Attenuation.** All residential units located in the proposed Buildings 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 that are facing U.S. 101 and the UPRR rail line to the north and Los Carneros Road to the west must include windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 28 STC, and forced-air mechanical ventilation or air conditioning systems, satisfactory to the local building official, to adequately ventilate the interior space of the units when windows are closed to control noise, and sound rated windows. Incorporation of these design requirements would be expected to achieve an exterior-to-interior noise level reduction of 25 dB or greater.	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	Before the City issues building permits, the applicant must submit an interior noise study to be approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee. This interior noise study must analyze the residential units in the proposed Buildings 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 that are facing U.S. 101, the rail line, and Los Carneros Road. The interior noise study must ensure compliance with the City's 45 dBA CNEL noise standard. Failure to conclusively demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed noise attenuation measures will result in the City denying a building permit for the affected units. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** These requirements must be incorporated into all construction documents submitted for approval before the issuance of a Land Use Permit for the residential units in Buildings 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 that are facing U.S. 101, the UPRR line, or Los Carneros Road. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before the City issues a permit for the residential units in Buildings 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 that are facing U.S. 101, the UPRR line, or Los Carneros Road. The City building inspectors must verify compliance in the field before the City issues a certificate of occupancy for an affected unit. No certificate of occupancy can be issued unless compliance is achieved.	
Impact N-6 Development of the Project near the UPRR could expose future residents to groundborne vibration generated by passing trains. However, because vibration levels would be below applicable thresholds, impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Public Services		
Impact PS-1 The Project would increase the amount of structural development and the number of residents dependent on fire protection service from the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District. However, service ratios and response times would remain at acceptable levels. In addition, Fire Protection District requirements would be incorporated into the Project to ensure adequate access to the Project site. Therefore, impacts related to the provision	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
of fire protection services would be Class III, less than significant.		
Impact PS-2 The Project would increase the amount of structural development and the number of residents dependent on police protection service from the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office. However, the Project would not result in a need for new or expanded police facilities. Therefore, impacts on police protection services would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact PS-3 The Project would increase the number of residents served by GUSD and SBUSD public schools. However, additional residents would not increase school enrollment beyond capacity, and the Project developer would be required to pay school impact fees in accordance with State law. Therefore, impacts to public schools would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Recreation		
Impact REC-1 The Project would accommodate an estimated 776 residents, resulting in an increase in parkland demand of 4.6 acres. The Project would provide two private recreational facilities (clubhouse and pool for each development area) and a two-acre public park, which would partially address the increase in demand for park and recreation facilities. As part of Project approval, City-required mitigation fees would be paid to offset the increased demand for parkland. Impacts related to recreation would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Transportation/Circulation		
Impact T-1 Project-generated traffic would increase existing traffic volumes on area roadways. Roadway volumes would remain within the City's Acceptable Capacity ratings. Impacts related to roadway segment volume increases would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact T-2 Project-generated traffic would increase existing turning volumes at intersections in the study area. However, Existing + Project traffic levels at intersections would operate at LOS C or better. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact T-3 Three intersections and a highway segment in the CMP network are located in the vicinity of the Project site.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
With the addition of Project-generated traffic to existing traffic volumes, CMP intersections are forecast to operate at LOS C or better. Therefore, impacts to the CMP network would be Class III, less than significant.		
Impact T-4 The Project would generate additional demand for public transit services and alternative transportation infrastructure. The Project would not substantially increase transit ridership or impact the operations of bicycle facilities in the Project site vicinity. Impacts to alternative transportation would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact T-5 Pre-Construction soil export activity would add temporary employee and heavy truck trips to intersections in the Project vicinity. Affected intersections would continue to operate at LOS C or better under the Existing + Project and Cumulative scenarios. However, haul trucks using Aero Camino east of the Project site may result in traffic impacts. Therefore, traffic impacts due to pre-construction soil hauling would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**T-5 Pre-Construction Traffic Management Control Plan.** The Project applicant must submit a Pre-Construction Traffic Management Control Plan that describes the hours during which hauling may occur (presumed to be 8:30 AM to 3:30 PM), haul route, and size of trucks to be used for the pre-construction hauling activity. Construction contractors must notify truck operators that all haul trucks associated with the pre-construction soil removal phase are restricted from using Aero Camino for access to the Project site. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Pre-Construction Traffic Management Control Plan must be reviewed and approved by City Planning and Public Works staff before issuance of a Haul Permit for the Project. The approved haul route(s) must be used for soil hauling trips prior to construction as well as for the duration of construction. **Monitoring:** City Planning and Environmental Review staff and Public Works must periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance.	Implementation of Mitigation Measure T-5 would ensure that haul trucks during the pre-construction soil removal phase would not use Aero Camino east of the Project site, which would ensure that temporary traffic impacts would remain less than significant.
Utilities and Service Systems		
Impact UTL-1 The Project would generate water demand of approximately 44.812 AFY. This level of demand is within the GWD's current 1,376 AFY surplus. Therefore, impacts to water supply would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact UTL-2 Wastewater generated by future residents on the Project site would flow through GWSD's conveyance system and into GSD's wastewater treatment plant. Existing	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities have sufficient capacity to accommodate Project-related flows. Therefore, impacts would be Class III, less than significant.		
Impact UTL-3 Construction of the proposed structures is anticipated to take approximately 30 months and result in approximately 724 tons of construction waste or 101 tons per year. Construction waste would not exceed the City's threshold of 196 tons per year. Therefore, impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
Impact UTL-4 The Project would generate an estimated 199 tons of non-recyclable solid waste per year during operation. This amount exceeds the City's Project-specific threshold of 196 tons per year. Implementation of a Solid Waste Management Plan would be required to implement waste diversion in order to reduce the amount of solid waste generated. However, impacts would remain Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**UTL-4 Solid Waste Management Plan.** The Project applicant must develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) to be reviewed and approved by Public Works Director, or designee, and include one or more of the following measures: Provision of space and/or bins for storage of recyclable materials within the Project site. Establishment of a recyclable material pickup area for commercial/industrial projects (i.e., loading docks, etc.). Implementation of a curbside recycling program to serve the new development. Development of a plan for accessible collection of materials on a regular basis (may require establishment of private pick-up depending on availability of County-sponsored programs). Implementation of a monitoring program (quarterly, bi-annually) to ensure a 33 percent to 50 percent minimum participation in recycling efforts. Development of Source Reduction measures, indicating method and amount of expected reduction. Implementation of a program to purchase recycled materials used in association with the Project (paper, newsprint, etc.). This should include requesting suppliers to show recycled material content. Implementation of a backyard composting yard waste reduction program.	Significant and unavoidable.

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	Plan Requirements and Timing: The applicant must coordinate with the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, and prepare SWMP as specified in the measure. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must inspect the Project site periodically for the first five (5) years after completion of Project occupancy to verify compliance with the SWMP.	