ADDENDUM
DATED NOVEMBER 10, 2008
TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE ARADON PROJECT (94-EIR-9),
THE RESIDENCES AT SANDPIPER PROJECT
SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AND THE
GOLETA GENERAL PLAN/COASTAL LAND USE PLAN EIR

HASKELL'S LANDING PROJECT
07-102-GP, - TM, -DP, -OA, -RN
ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER 079-210-049

A. LOCATION

The 14.46-acre Haskell's Landing project site is located at the northwestern corner of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection, in western Goleta (Assessor's Parcel Number 079-210-049) (see Figure 1; all figures are included at the end of this Addendum).

B. BACKGROUND

Aradon Project EIR (94-EIR-9)

The proposed Haskell's Landing project is the identical parcel that has been subject to a prior certified Aradon Project Environmental Impact Report (94-EIR-9), prepared and certified by the County of Santa Barbara. The 94-EIR-9 evaluated the development of 105 attached residential units and daycare center. Significant, unavoidable impacts on Aesthetics/Visual Resources, Public Facilities, and Transportation Circulation were identified. The proposed Aradon Project was never undertaken, and the associated approvals lapsed. The 94-EIR-9 Summary Impact Tables are included as Attachment 1.

The Residences at Sandpiper Supplemental EIR (2001)

The Residences at Sandpiper project was a subsequent project proposed after the Aradon Project approvals lapsed. This project proposed development of 119 attached and detached residential units. The two central entitlements requested were similar to the proposed project. They included:

TM 14,541: A Tentative Tract Map to allow for the subdivision of the 14.46-acre project site into three lots, including two lots for condominium purposes and one common open space lot. The lots would allow for the development of proposed community infrastructure, tract grading and drainage, perimeter walls and related improvements.

99-DP-051: A Development Plan for the 119 attached and detached units, including detached, market rate single family dwellings, and a market and affordable rate (total of 23) townhouses, including triplex and four-plex structures.

The Supplement to 94-EIR-9 identified six environmental impacts which could not be fully mitigated to a level of insignificance and were, therefore, considered *significant and unavoidable* (Class I). Those impact areas were: aesthetics, air quality, hazards (exposure to elevated electromagnetic fields), public services (schools & solid waste, cumulative), recreation, and transportation (project-specific and cumulative). The County of Santa Barbara determined that the identified, *significant, unavoidable* impacts were found to be acceptable when weighed against the overriding benefits provided by the project. The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR Summary Impact Tables are included as Attachment 2.

Goleta General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan EIR (2006)

The assessment of impacts associated with City of Goleta General Plan Polices that would be amended as part of the proposed project was previously identified in the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR (City of Goleta 2006). Impacts associated with Conservation Element 2, Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas, Housing Element 11, Inclusion of Very-Low, Low-, and Moderate-Income Housing in New Development, and Public Safety and Services Facility Policy 3.2, Increased Demand on Fire Protection, were identified as *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II). Excerpts from the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR Summary Impact Tables are included as Attachment 3.

C. ADDENDUM

Based on analysis contained herein, an Addendum to 94-EIR-9 and the Residences at Sandpiper Project EIR Supplement is considered the appropriate environmental review for this project. This conclusion is based on the fact that all previously identified impacts will remain the same or less than previously identified in 94-EIR-9. There are no new significant impacts (i.e. no new Class I, significant and unavoidable or Class II, significant, but feasibly mitigated to less than significant impacts) or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts (i.e. a Class II impact identified in 94-EIR-9 or the Sandpiper Project EIR Supplement is not characterized as a Class II or Class I impact with the Haskell's Landing Project; a Class II impact identified in 94-EIR-9 or the Sandpiper Project EIR Supplement is not characterized as a Class I impact with the Haskell's Landing Project). State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 provides that an addendum to an EIR need not be circulated for public review, but can be included in, or attached to, the Final EIR. The Guidelines further provide that the Planning Commission and City Council must consider the addendum together with the previously certified Final EIR prior to taking action to approve the project.

D. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is requesting approval of a vesting tentative tract map, general plan amendments, final development plan, Design Review Board approval, and Road Naming, as described below.

Vesting Tentative Tract Map (32,032; 07-102-TM)

The applicant requests a one lot subdivision of the 14.46-acre parcel for airspace condominium purposes to provide for 101 residential units, associated infrastructure, and common open space (see Figure 2).

General Plan Amendments (07-102-GP)

The project description included several proposed amendments that have been adopted by the City of Goleta through the Track 2 General Plan Amendment process. Only three amendments to Goleta General Plan policies and tables specific to development on the project site remain as part of the project. These amendments address issues include: allowing for a 50-foot development setback from Devereux Creek top of bank (Conservation Element Policy 2.2); affordable housing inclusionary standards (Housing Element Policy 11.5); and a correction to a Housing Element Table (Table 10-A16).

Two other amendments (Public Facilities Policy 3.2 and Figure 8.1) are associated with locations identified for constructing a County Fire Station No. 11 directly west and adjacent to the proposed project site. This specific location had not been identified prior to the initiation of the City of Goleta's General Plan Amendment process, though the requirement for providing a City site in this area is already identified in Public Safety and Services Facility Policy 3.2. One last amendment that would be addressed during the Track 3 GPA process is for TE 13.4, Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development, which would revise text to provide for options to initiate development if capital improvement projects needed to maintain adopted transportation LOS standards are not able to be funded. The proposed General Plan Amendment text is provided in Attachment 4.

Final Development Plan (07-102-DP)The Final Development Plan is a request to allow the construction of a 101-unit residential condominium project totaling 138,061 square feet (s.f.) of building coverage, and 95,628 s.f. of streets, sidewalks, driveways, and parking areas (see Figure 3).

Development Agreement (07-102-OA)

A Development Agreement (DA) between the City of Goleta and Oly Chadmar Sandpiper General Partnership has been proposed that would address funding of infrastructure addressing General Plan concurrency policies PF 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, as well as Section PF 9, particularly PF 9.6 and 9.7.

Unit and Building Design

Seven residential two-story building types are proposed, arranged around two loop road configurations, accessed from Hollister Avenue on the west, and Las Armas Road on the east. Single family residence (SFR detached) and single family attached duplex units would be three bedrooms with half of the units having an option for an additional bedroom. These units would have a maximum height from finished floor to roof ridgeline of 26.5 feet, and Townhouse (T.H., attached) triplex and four-plex units would have a maximum height of 27 feet. The 2- and 3-bedroom T.H. floor plan to be offered at the market sales category would provide for an extra optional bedroom. Habitable building areas would vary as identified in Table 1:

As illustrated in Table 1, a total of 20 units, a mix of Studio, One-Bedroom, and Two-Bedroom units, would be offered at the affordable upper moderate income level. These affordable units would be distributed throughout the project site (see Figure 4).

Table 1: Haskell's Landing Residential Habitable Building Areas

Unit Type	Number	Area (square feet)	Sales Category
Three-Bedroom[1] SFR	19	3,050	Market
Three-Bedroom[1] SFR Detached	3	3,050	Market
Three-Bedroom SFR	19	2,650	Market
Three-Bedroom SFR Detached	1	2,650	Market
Three-Bedroom T.H. [1]	17	2,324	Market
Two-Bedroom[1] T.H.	17	1,813	Market
Two-Bedroom[1] T.H. detached	2	1,813	Market
Two-Bedroom[1] T.H.	3	1,364	Market
Unit Type	**Number**	**Area (square feet)**	**Sales Category**
Two-Bedroom T.H.	8	1,364	Affordable
One-Bedroom T.H.	6	774	Affordable
Studio	6	566	Affordable

Note: 1: Option for one additional bedroom

A total of 42 buildings would be constructed as identified in Table 2 (see Figure 4):

Table 2: Haskell's Landing Residential Buildings and Unit Types

Unit Type	Number of Buildings
One Four-Bedroom SFR unit + One Three-Bedroom SFR +	19
Two 3-Bedroom T.H. units + (1) 2-Bedroom T.H. affordable unit *or* (1) 1-Bedroom affordable unit and (1) affordable Studio	17
Two-Bedroom + detached T.H.	2
Three-Bedroom+ detached SFR	4

Parking

A total of 258 parking spaces would be provided, exceeding the 218 spaces required under the Coastal Zoning Ordinance Parking Regulations Division 6, Section 35-108. All market-rate SFR and Townhomes units would include a private 2-car garage, while two-bedroom (market rate and affordable) and one-bedroom (affordable) carriage would include a private

1-car garage. Additional uncovered parking would be provided within 200-feet of the affordable units, as required by ordinance. The parking provides 218 Resident spaces and 40 visitor spaces, of which 173 are enclosed, 40 are driveway guest, and 45 are on-street within strictly designated pockets (see Figure 5). The spaces meet the Zoning Ordinance requirement and provide a reserve of 40 on-site spaces. An additional 59 additional parking spaces would be available within the longer driveways that serve a portion of the residential units. An additional estimated 20 parking spaces would also become available on Las Armas Road as a result of the improvements mentioned above.

Access

Access to and from the condominiums would be provided from Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Road. A minimum 28-foot wide interior loop is provided on each side of Devereux Creek (see Figure 6). A portion of the eastern interior loop adjacent to the proposed open space landscape restoration area would incorporate a "grass-crete" type substructure material that would allow for natural dispersal of native grass seed. This paving material, in addition to interior road width and turning radius, was determined in consultation with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department.

A pedestrian trail linking the eastern and western residential components is proposed adjacent and south of the northern property boundary; a 10-foot wide pre-fabricated clear-span steel would span Devereux Creek. A meandering perimeter sidewalk would parallel Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Drive within the project site right of way. The City Design Review Board has requested inclusion of a third pedestrian trail crossing Devereux Creek to facilitate pedestrian access. The applicant has proposed an optional configuration for this trail and bridge within the southern half of the property (see Figure 17).

Architecture and Landscaping

The proposed architecture proposed for both detached and attached units is described as a mix of Coastal, Ranch, and Monterey styles (see Figures 7a through 15b). Perimeter units would be oriented toward Hollister Avenue; no sound wall along the roadway is proposed. Units adjacent to Devereux Creek would be oriented to take advantage or proposed restoration of this biologically sensitive area. All units would have private outdoor areas. Common open space would total approximately 346,080 square feet (55%) exclusive of the right-of-way area to be dedicated to the City of Goleta, and includes a children's play area, and trail, with benches throughout the proposed Devereux Creek restoration area. Private open space would equal 49,992 square feet (8%), such that total project open space would be 63% of all the project area.

The project proposes a 6-foot high sound wall along the northern property boundary, but would not have a perimeter wall along any other property line. Instead, proposed residential units would be oriented outwards with their front yards towards Hollister Avenue, Devereux Creek, or towards interior landscaped common areas.

The project's conceptual landscaping includes a Vegetation Enhancement Plan for the Devereux Creek corridor. All landscaping would be maintained with a pesticide- and herbicide-free program. A total of 87 eucalyptus and 8 cypress trees over 6 inches in diameter measured at breast height would be replaced with a total of 282 drought tolerant Mediterranean and native tree species, both ornamental (e.g., Melaluca, London Plane Tree, etc.) and indigenous to the area (e.g., coast live oak and sycamore) (see Figure 16).

Site Preparation

The site would require approximately 105,610 cubic yards of cut and 75,126 cubic yards of fill, which would be balanced on site. Maximum vertical height of cut and fill slopes would be 4 feet. A retaining wall on the northern project boundary would have a maximum 6-foot height.

Utilities

The Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District would provide water and sewer service to the site, and the applicant has been provided with service letters.

Public Services

Fire protection would in the long term be provided by a proposed County of Santa Barbara Fire Station No. 10, adjacent and west of the project site. Police protection would be provided by the City of Goleta. School facilities would be provided by the Goleta Valley Unified School District, including Elwood Elementary School, Goleta Valley Junior High, and Dos Pueblos High School.

Road Naming (07-102-RN)

The proposed project would include naming of eight internal street segments, pursuant to direction from the Santa Barbara County Fire Department.

E. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The property is currently undeveloped, and is located north of Hollister Avenue, south of Union Pacific Rail Road, east of vacant land zoned Highway Commercial and the west of Las Armas. The property has a land use designation of Planned Residential, 8 units per acre, and is zoned Design Residential (DR-8).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures Associated with the Proposed Project

1. Aesthetics/Visual Resources

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified significant, unavoidable impacts on aesthetics resulting from changes in the open space character of the project site. Project Impacts defined in the 2001 Supplemental EIR on aesthetics/visual resources resulting from the change in existing open space character to urban development, and the substantial obstruction of important public views along the Hollister Avenue corridor, were considered *significant and unavoidable* (Class I). Short-term impacts during construction were *significant and feasibly mitigated* (Class II). Added night lighting from street lamps and security fixtures, and proposed residential development and architectural style would be *less than significant* (Class III) impacts. Undergrounding of existing above-ground utility lines would be a *beneficial* impact (Class IV) on visual resources.

Haskell's Landing Project

The proposed project would have very much the same building footprint and orientation as the previous Residences at Sandpiper Project, based on two internal circulation loop streets on either side of Devereux Creek. The main change in the development footprint from the Sandpiper Residences Project is the emphasis on attached, rather than detached, single family residences. The proposed project, as defined in Table 2, (see Figure 3) would result in only 5 detached duplex units (5 percent of all units), whereas the previous 119-unit project would result in 60 detached duplex units (50 percent of all units).

Coastal, Ranch, and Monterey architectural styles deviates from the previous project's Spanish Colonial Revival architecture, in response to City Design Review Board (DRB) direction. Architectural revisions reviewed by the DRB on October 14, 2008, removing all Mediterranean influences (e.g., Tuscan rural Italian design elements including red-tile roofs) were endorsed (see Figures 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14).

The proposed building coverage is 37.1%. The proposed roof heights range from 26.5 to 27.5 feet. The project size, footprint and height are consistent with Zoning Ordinance requirements (including maximum height of 35 feet). Duplex units would have interior courtyard gardens.

Vehicular ingress and egress is proposed from Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Road. A landscaped perimeter buffer both frontages, along with a meandering sidewalk, would be provided.

The landscape palette is emphasizes drought-tolerant species and complements the proposed Vegetation Enhancement Plan for Devereux Creek (see Figure 16). The proposed landscape coverage is 24.5%, which is not inclusive of the 16,000 square feet of landscaping located within the right-of-way. Approximately 4-foot tall decorative masonry walls would be constructed along residential unit patios fronting Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Road. Additional lighting is also proposed throughout the project site.

The Design Review Board (DRB) considered the project for Conceptual review on March 25, April 22, June 10, July 22, August 26, and October 14, 2008. The series of meetings resulted in project redesigns to increase clustering of project components, in particular, minimizing the use of detached single family residences. The use of Mediterranean architectural style elements, including red-tile roofs and stone-lined facades was removed in favor of motifs consistent with contemporary continental designs (e.g., the Coastal and Ranch styles instead of a Tuscan, Rustic Farm House). Integration of proposed internal pedestrian linkages with Las Armas Road and potential parking areas there was requested. The resulting project revisions submitted received favorable review in regards to landscaping, architecture, design/height, and compatibility with the adjacent developments).

Project Specific Impacts

The proposed project would result in the following impacts:

Impact AES-1: *Short-term Impacts During Construction*. Project construction would be essentially the same as the Residences at Sandpiper project. *Significant but feasibly mitigated impacts* (Class II) would result from potential improper disposal of refuse or waste construction materials.

Impact AES-2 *Significant Change to Open Space Character.* Development of 101 units throughout the 14.46-acre site would occupy essentially the same footprint as the Residences at Sandpiper project. The landscape plan and Devereux Creek Vegetation Enhancement Plan would provide for a break in the middle of the site from structural massing between 26.5 and 27-feet high. The change from the existing open space character, however, would remain *significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

Impact AES-3: *Substantial Obstruction of Important Public Views*. Development of 101 units throughout the 14.46-acre site would occupy essentially the same footprint as the Residences at Sandpiper project. Views of open space and the Santa Ynez Mountains and foothills would be lost or obstructed. Views from U.S. 101 of eucalyptus trees located on the project site would be in part obstructed by the proposed 6-foot high sound wall. Impacts on visual resources would remain *significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

Impact AES-4: *Increased Night Light and Glare*: Development of 101 units throughout the 14.46-acre site would occupy essentially the same footprint as the Residences at Sandpiper project, though the number of units would be reduced by 18, or 18 percent. Development would generate lighting and glare compared to the existing open space, although the types of lighting would be comparable to nearby residential and commercial development. External perimeter lighting for the hotel would typically be illuminated all night long. Though reduced from the Residences at Sandpiper project, the increase in glare and loss of the night sky character would be a "substantial alteration of the natural character," a s*ignificant but feasibly mitigated impact* (Class II).

Impact AES-5: *Consistency with Project Vicinity Visual Character.* Proposed two-story residential units with Coastal, Ranch, and Monterey architectural styles would be consistent with western Hollister Avenue development, including the recently constructed Comstock Homes project on Santa Barbara Shores, and Camino Real Shopping Center. Impacts on visual resources would be *less than significant* (Class III).

Impact AES-6. *Removal of Above-ground Utility Lines.* Like the Residences at Sandpiper project, existing Southern California Edison utility lines bordering Las Armas Road and along the northern boundary of the site would be undergrounded. This would be a *beneficial impact* (Class IV) on visual resources.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact AES-7: *Proposed Project Contribution to Cumulative Loss Of Open Space*. Like the Residences at Sandpiper project, the cumulative effect on visual resources, in particular views of the views of open space and the Santa Ynez Mountains and foothills experienced from Hollister Avenue, would be exacerbated by the Haskell's Landing project in combination with proposed Cathedral Oaks Overpass/Union Pacific Railroad Overcrossing, and a new Santa Barbara County Fire Station to be constructed west of the project site. The cumulative impact would remain *significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

Impact AES-8: *Proposed Project Contribution to Cumulative Change in Character Along the Hollister Avenue Corridor.* The project, along with recent development at Santa Barbara Shores, and the Dixon Senior Housing project to the west, would contribute to the intensified and urban visual character of the western Hollister Avenue corridor. This impact on visual resources would remain *significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures (revised to reflect the City's current condition language) would still be required:

AES-1 To prevent construction and/or employee trash from blowing offsite, covered receptacles shall be provided onsite prior to commencement of grading or construction activities. Waste shall be picked up weekly or more frequently as directed by City staff. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Prior to and as a condition of precedent to issuance of any LUP for the project, the applicant shall designate and provide to City staff the name and phone number of a contact person(s) to monitor construction trash/waste and organize a clean-up crew. Additional covered receptacles shall be provided as determined necessary by city staff. This requirement shall be noted on all plans. Trash control shall occur throughout all grading and construction activities. (*Addresses Impact AES-1*)

Monitoring: City staff shall inspect periodically throughout grading and construction activities to verify compliance.

AES-2 The design, scale and character of the project architecture, landscaping and signage shall be compatible with vicinity development. The preliminary development plans shall be revised to address issues raised by DRB in its Conceptual Review and shall incorporate all applicable mitigation measures and conditions of approval. The exterior elevations shall be fully dimensioned, showing existing grade, finished grade, finished floor, average height and peak height. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Architectural drawings, lighting plans, landscape plans, grading plans, and signs shall be submitted to Planning & Environmental Services prior to Design Review Board (DRB) plan filing and plans shall be

approved prior to approval of Land Use Permits for the project. (*Addresses Impact AES-3*)

Monitoring: City staff shall verify that the project is constructed per the final plans approved by DRB prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy.

AES-3 All exterior night lighting shall be of low intensity/low glare design, and shall be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill over onto adjacent parcels. Exterior lighting fixtures shall be kept to the minimum number and intensity needed to ensure the public safety of employees and visitors. All upward directed exterior lighting shall be prohibited to protect night sky views of the stars and "dark-sky" lighting fixtures shall be used throughout. All exterior lighting fixtures shall be appropriate for the architectural style of the proposed structures and the surrounding area. The applicant shall develop a lighting plan incorporating these requirements and provisions for dimming lights after 11:00 p.m. to the maximum extent practical without compromising public safety. The final lighting plan shall be amended to include identification of all types, sizes, and intensities of wall mounted building lights and landscape accent lighting. Wall wash type lighting should be avoided, except if required for safety reasons. "Moonlighting" type fixtures that illuminate entire tree canopies should also be avoided (up-lighting and down-lighting as separate methods are acceptable). **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The locations of all exterior lighting fixtures and an arrow showing the direction of light being cast by each fixture and the height of the fixtures shall be depicted on the preliminary/final lighting plan and shall be reviewed and approved by DRB and City staff. The preliminary/final lighting plan shall be reviewed and approved by DRB and City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. (*Addresses Impact AES-4*)

Monitoring: City staff shall inspect all exterior lighting to verify that exterior lighting fixtures have been installed consistent with their depiction on the final lighting plan.

AES-4 The applicant shall prepare detailed landscape and irrigation plans for the project that identifies the following:

a) Type of irrigation proposed;
b) All proposed trees, shrubs, and groundcovers by species;
c) Size of all planting materials including trees; and
d) Location of all planting materials.

The project landscaping shall consist of drought-tolerant native and/pr Mediterranean type species which adequately complement the project design and integrate the site with surrounding land sues. Landscaping shall be compatible with the character of the surroundings, the architectural style of the structures and shall be include landscape

planters outside and adjacent to any perimeter noise walls such that irrigation systems can provide for watering of the screening plantings on both sides of the walls (interior and exterior). **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Landscape plans shall be submitted to Planning & Environmental Services prior to Design Review Board (DRB) plan filing and plans shall be approved prior to approval of Land Use Permits for the project. (*Addresses Impact AES-3*)

Monitoring: City staff shall verify that landscaping is installed per the final plans approved by DRB prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy.

AES-5 To ensure installation and long-term maintenance of the approved landscape plans, the applicant shall enter into an agreement to install required landscaping and water-conserving irrigation systems as well as maintain required landscaping for the life of the project. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Performance securities for installation and maintenance for at least three (e) years shall be subject to review and approval by City staff. At a minimum, performance securities guaranteeing installation of the landscaping shall be furnished by the applicant prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. The landscape maintenance agreement shall be signed and filed with the city prior to approval of any certificate of occupancy for the project. (*Addresses Impact AES-3*)

Monitoring: City staff shall photo-document installation prior to occupancy clearance and shall check maintenance as needed. Release of any performance security requires City staff signature.

AES-6 The height of structural development shown on final plans shall not exceed the mean height and peak height shown on the approved project exhibit maps. Finish grade shall be consistent with the approved final grading plan. Height limitations shown on preliminary plans shall be carried through on final plans and in the field. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: During the framing stage of construction and prior to commencement of roofing, the applicant shall submit verification from a licensed surveyor demonstrating that the mean height and peak height conform to those shown on the preliminary and final plans. This survey shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta prior to commencement of roofing. (*Addresses Impact AES-3*)

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance with this requirement prior to commencement of roofing.

AES-7 All new utility service connections and above-ground mounted equipment such as backflow devices, etc, shall be screened from public view and painted (red is prohibited) so as to blend in with the project. Screening may include a combination of landscaping and/or masonry or lattice walls. Whenever possible and deemed appropriate by City staff, utility transformers shall be place din underground vaults. All gas and electrical

meters shall be concealed and communications equipment shall be completely concealed in an enclosed portion of the building, on top of the building, or within a screened utility area. All transformers and vaults that must be located within the right-of-way shall be installed below grade unless otherwise approved by the City, and then must be completely screened from view. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: the site and building plans submitted for DRB Preliminary /Final Review shall identify the type, location, size, and number of utility connections and above-ground mounted equipment as well as how such equipment would be screened from public vie and the color(s) that it would be painted so as to blend in with the project and surrounding area. (*Addresses Impact AES-2*)

Monitoring: City staff shall verify that all above-ground utility connections and equipment is installed, screened, and painted per the approved plans.

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, project specific and cumulative impacts on visual resources associated with loss of open space (Impact AES-2) and obstruction of important visual resources from Hollister Avenue (Impact AES-3) would remain *significant and unavoidable*. Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce all other residual project-specific and contributions to cumulative aesthetic and visual resources impacts to less than significant.

2. Air Quality

Previous Review

The Aradon Project EIR found that fugitive dust emissions from earthmoving activities associated with proposed project construction has the potential to cause a nuisance to the public, triggering Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) requirements for dust control mitigation measures during construction. Operational impacts to air quality were assumed to derive mainly from new commuter vehicle emissions associated with the residential component of the proposed project; impacts were calculated using the California Air Resources Board (ARB) URBEMIS3 model and were determined to be less than significant. The EIR found that future resident so the project would likely be affected by odor emissions form potential future malfunctions of the neighborhood oil processing facility as well as from offshore seepage; these impacts were determined to be potentially significant and mitigable through required inclusion of buyer beware provisions in the proposed project's CC&Rs.

Cumulative impacts to air quality from buildout under the Goleta Community Plan (GCP) were identified in the GCP EIR (91-EIR-13); statements of overriding considerations for these cumulative impacts were made in association with certification of the EIR and adoption of the GCP.

The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR found that the 119-unit project would result in *significant unavoidable* project specific impacts associated with generation of Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) and Reactive Organic Compounds (Class I). Short-term construction impacts associated with PM10 particle dust and heavy equipment NOx and ROC emissions were adverse, but less than significant (Class III). Exposure of project residents to odor and hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions associated with the Venoco Ellwood oil and gas processing plant, 0.25 miles southwest of the project site were identified as *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). Cumulative ROC emissions were considered *significant, unavoidable* (Class I), but cumulative NOx emissions were considered *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II) by eliminating all wood burning fireplaces.

Haskell's Landing Project

Regulatory Setting

The regulatory setting, including federal, state, and local standards has been revised since 2001. It is updated below.

Air quality at a given location can be described by the concentration of various pollutants in the atmosphere. Units of concentration are generally expressed in parts per million (ppm) or micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m3). The significance of a pollutant concentration is determined by comparing the concentration to an appropriate national and/or state ambient air quality standard. These standards represent the allowable atmospheric concentrations at which the public health and welfare are protected and include a reasonable margin of safety to protect the more sensitive individuals in the population. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) establishes the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Maximum pollutant concentrations generally may not exceed a short-term NAAQS more than once per year and they may not exceed the annual standards. The state standards, established by the California Air Resources Board (ARB), are termed the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). Maximum pollutant concentrations may not equal or exceed the CAAQS. Pollutants that have established national or state ambient air quality standards are known as criteria pollutants. The NAAQS and CAAQS are presented in Table 3 (page 14).

The criteria pollutants of primary concern that are considered in this air quality assessment include ozone (O_3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$). Although there are no ambient standards for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) or nitrogen oxides (NO_X), they are important as precursors to O_3.

Table 3. California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	*Averaging Time*	*CALIFORNIA STANDARDS* [a,c]	*----NATIONAL STANDARDS* [b]----	
			Primary [c,d]	*Secondary* [c,e]
Ozone (O_3)	1-hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m^3)	0.12 ppm (235 µg/m^3)	Same as primary
	8-hour	---	0.08 ppm (157 µg/m^3)	Same as primary
Carbon monoxide (CO)	8-hour	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m^3)	9 ppm (10 mg/m^3)	---
	1-hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m^3)	35 ppm (40 mg/m^3)	---
Nitrogen dioxide (NO_2)	Annual	---	0.053 ppm (100 µg/m^3)	Same as primary
	1-hour	0.25 ppm (470 µg/m^3)	---	---
Sulfur dioxide (SO_2)	Annual	---	0.03 ppm (80 µg/m^3)	---
	24-hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m^3)	0.14 ppm (365 µg/m^3)	---
	3-hour	---	---	0.5 ppm (1,300 µg/m^3)
	1-hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m^3)	---	---
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	Annual	20 µg/m^3 [f]	50 µg/m^3 [g]	Same as primary
	24-hour	50 µg/m^3	150 µg/m^3	Same as primary
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	Annual	12 µg/m^3	15 µg/m^3	Same as primary
	24-hour [f]	—	35 µg/m^3	Same as primary

Notes:

a. California standards for O_3, CO, SO_2 (1 hour), NO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and visibility reducing particles, are values that are not to be exceeded. The standards for SO_2 (24-hour) is not to be equaled or exceeded.

b. National standards, other than O_3 and those based on annual averages, are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The O_3 standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with maximum hourly average concentrations above the standard is equal to or less than one.

c. Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parenthesis are based on a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 mm of mercury (1,013.2 millibars). All measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 mm of mercury; ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.

d. National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health.

e. National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.

f. Measured as an arithmetic mean. New standard promulgated by the ARB on June 20, 2002.

g. Measured as an arithmetic mean.

Source: CARB 2008

Santa Barbara County Attainment Status

Presently, Santa Barbara County is in attainment for all NAAQS with the exception of the PM_{10} standard. Currently, there is not enough data available to determine whether the County attains the national $PM_{2.5}$ standards. Santa Barbara County is designated as a federal ozone attainment area for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS (the 1-hour federal ozone standard was revoked for Santa Barbara County).

Presently, Santa Barbara County is in nonattainment of the CAAQS for O_3 and $PM_{10,}$ and in attainment for NO_2, SO_2, and CO. The County is also considered in attainment for the state 1-hour standard for ozone as of June, 2007. The County violates a new state 8-hour ozone standard that was implemented in May, 2006. It also does not meet the state standard for particulate matter less than ten microns in diameter (PM_{10}).

APCD Health and High Traffic

The northern property line of the project is approximately 500 feet from US Highway 101. The California Air Resources Board ("CARB"), in its informational guide to air quality and land use issues, "recommends avoiding siting new sensitive land uses such as residences, schools, daycare centers, playgrounds, or medical facilities within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day" (CARB, 2005). CARB's recommendation does not distinguish between high traffic freeways and low volume freeways, such as the segment of US. 101 in the vicinity of the Project versus Interstate 80 and the 710 and 405 freeways, which are the predicate for the 500 foot siting recommendation.[1] However, the Handbook does acknowledge that "The risk at that distance [500 feet] for other freeways will vary based on local conditions - it may be higher or lower."

CARB recommends 100,000 vehicles/day as the sensitive land use siting limit for urban roads, and 50,000 vehicles/day for rural roads. The average daily trips (ADTs) for the segment of U.S.101 between the Storke Road and Hollister/Winchester Avenue interchanges for 2008 is 34,500.[2] As such, the ADTs on the segment of US. 101 closest to the project site are 65,500 less than CARB's 100,000 vehicles/day recommended sensitive land use siting limit for urban roads and 15,500 less than its 50,000 vehicles/day recommendation for rural roads. Thus, CARB's and APCD's 500 foot siting recommendation is not applicable to the project site.

[1] In analyzing those heavily travelled freeways CARB's study observes that "the relative exposure and health risk dropped substantially within the first 300 feet." Handbook, p. 10.
[2] Reported by Caltrans between the Storke Road and Hollister Avenue interchanges for 2006

Venoco Ellwood Onshore Facility

The Venoco Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) oil and gas processing plant and associated Marine Terminal (EMT) and Platform Holly facilities continue to operate, and have applied for a new State lease for an additional 10 years through February 28, 2013 (CSLC, 2008). This would allow Venoco to continue operating the EMT, a crude-oil marine loading terminal and associated storage facility, with the potential to increase oil throughput and transportation from the current levels to the permitted levels. The APCD issued Abatement Order No. 99-6(A) on April 14, 1999 included measures that targeted reduction and elimination of nuisance odors from the named facilities. Typically, the APCD receives at least 20 nuisance odor complaints per year associated with emissions from the EMT area. From the period August 2003, to April 2005, there was one instance of a series of odor complaints attributed to the EMT operations—the April 2005 oil storage tanks internal floating roof leaks (CSLC, 2008). A series of storage tank repairs have addressed these issues. Odor complaints attributed to the EOF and EMT from 2005-2007 were analyzed, but none were determined to be associated with these facilities (CSLC, 2008).

A Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was completed for the EOF in 2005 (CSLC, 2008). Currently, at the closest sensitive receptor, the cancer health risk is below the significance threshold of 10 in a million; chronic health index (HI) and acute HI are both below the significance threshold of one.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following Air Quality impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project follow the same enumeration as the previous SEIR. The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR identified Impact AQ-3 as significant and unavoidable (Class I) for the air pollutant ROC and *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (Class II) for NO_X emissions. The revised project would result in operational emissions classified as *less than significant* (Class III) for both ROC and NO_X, as discussed below in Impact AQ-3.

Impact AQ-1: *Construction Activity Ground Disturbances.* The project site grading of approximately 105,610 c.y. of cut and 75,126 c.y. of fill is increased over the previous 77,958 c.y. of cut and 75,126 c.y. of fill for the Residences at Sandpiper Project, but the material would still be balanced on site. Impacts of grading short-term PM_{10} emissions would remain *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Impact AQ-2: *Construction Heavy Equipment Emissions.* Heavy equipment emissions would be greater than for the Residences at Sandpiper Project, but are accounted for in the Santa Barbara County Clean Air Plan. Therefore, these short-term combustive NO_X and ROC emissions would remain *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Impact AQ-3: *Project Operation ROC and NO_X emissions.* Air quality emissions associated with long-term buildout and occupation of the Haskell's Landing

project were analyzed based on land use and types of residences proposed. The proposed project would produce ROC and NO_X emissions from all combined residential project sources, including vehicle trips (mobile emissions), space heating, water heating, and consumer products The analysis assumed that the project would be fully built out by the year 2011. The traffic report prepared for the Haskell's Landing project estimates that the project would generate 772 average daily trips (ADT), 59 A.M. peak hour trips and 76 P.M. peak hour trips. The air quality analysis employed the URBEMIS 2007 model, version 9.4.2, to estimate daily emissions from proposed vehicular sources. In addition to estimating mobile source emissions, the URBEMIS 2007 model was also used to estimate emissions from project stationary and area sources. Attachment 5 includes data and assumptions used to estimate project stationary and area sources.

In addition to the 772 trips generated by the project, increased electricity and natural gas would be consumed by the net increase of 102 residential units. As typical of development, project operation would increase emissions of air pollutants that would contribute to the degradation of regional air quality.

Estimates of project emissions are identified below in Table 4.

Table 4. Operational Emissions Associated with the Proposed Project (lbs/day)

Emission Source	***ROC***	***NO_X***	***CO***	***SO_2***	***PM_{10}***	***$PM_{2.5}$***
Area Source	6.61	1.04	4.07	0.00	0.01	0.01
Vehicular						
Single family housing	4.04	5.23	46.92	0.03	5.63	1.08
Condo/townhouse general	3.05	3.75	33.62	0.02	4.03	0.78
Vehicular Subtotal	*7.09*	*8.98*	*80.54*	*0.05*	*9.66*	*1.86*
Total Emissions	**13.70**	**10.02**	**84.61**	**0.05**	**9.67**	**1.87**
Vehicular Significance Threshold	*25*	*25*	*n/a*	*n/a*	*n/a*	*n/a*
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	*n/a*	*n/a*	*n/a*	*n/a*
Area + Vehicle Threshold	240	240	*n/a*	*n/a*	*80*	*n/a*
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	*n/a*	*n/a*	No	*n/a*

Source: URBEMIS 2008 Version 9.2.4 Attachment 5 for calculations.

As indicated in Table 4, ROC and NO_X emissions would not exceed SBCO APCD thresholds of 25 lbs/day. Additionally, combined project-generated area source and vehicle emissions would not exceed the combined area source and vehicle emissions thresholds for ROC, NO_X, or PM_{10}. The potential effect on long-term air quality would be *less than significant* (Class III).

Impact AQ-4 *Exposure to sources of odor within the region.* The Venoco Ellwood Onshore oil and gas processing plant continues to operate, but with minimal incidences of excessive odor (personal communication, Terry Snyder 2008). Potential odor impacts on proposed residents would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Impact AQ-5: *Exposure to HAP emissions within the region.* The Venoco Ellwood Onshore oil and gas processing plant has implemented measures identified in a Risk Reduction Audit and Plan from January 25, 2001, such that levels of acute non-cancer airborne toxins are under the APCD threshold identified in the Air Toxics "Hot Spots' Program (CSLC, 2008). Potential HAP impacts on proposed residents would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Cumulative Impacts

Impact AQ-6 *PM_{10} Emissions from Project Construction.* All related projects would be required to implement standard APCD dust control measures. The project's contribution to other cumulative project sources of PM_{10} emissions in the region would produce *adverse, but less than significant* impacts (Class III).

Impact AQ-7 *NO_X and ROC Emissions from Project Construction.* All related projects would be required to implement standard APCD measures related to construction equipment maintenance. The project's contribution to other cumulative project sources of NO_X and ROC emissions in the region would produce a*dverse, but less than significant* impacts (Class III).

Impact AQ-8 *Cumulative ROC Emissions.* Emissions of ROC, NO_X, and PM_{10} emissions from project operations, in combination with emissions from other probable future proposed and approved projects in the cumulative impact study area, would exacerbate the existing O_3 and PM_{10} nonattainment status within the County. Each project would be conditioned to comply with APCD standard measures to reduce vehicular emissions and many would have incrementally less than significant impacts, including the proposed project. However, the combined, cumulative effect of these projects on ROC, NO_X, and PM_{10} emissions would be *significant and unavoidable (Class I)***.** As the project's mitigated contribution to the cumulative ROC, NO_X, and PM_{10} emissions would exceed thresholds set by the APCD, the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would be *cumulatively considerable*.

Impact AQ-9 *Cumulative Odor Emissions.* Continued operation and increased barge loadings at the Venoco EOF would have the potential for increased odor emissions (CSLC 2007). These impacts were considered significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II) by implementation of emission control devices on oil storage tanks and the barge Jovolan transported oil from the facility. These measures would ensure that potential odor impacts on future Haskell's Landing receptors would also be *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Impact AQ-10. *Cumulative HAP Emissions*. Continued operation and increased barge loadings at the Venoco EOF would generate worst case emissions below the respective thresholds for cancer risk and both chronic and acute Health Index (His) such that the health risk impact would be less than significant (Class III) (CSLC 2007). Therefore, the cumulative HAP emissions impacts on Haskell's Landing residents would be *less than significant* (Class III).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures (updated to reflect current City condition language) would be required:

AQ-1 To mitigate fugitive dust emissions, the applicant shall implement APCD dust control measures, including the following:

a. Use water trucks or sprinkler systems to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the construction area. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day, and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.
b. Minimize the amount of disturbed area and speeds of on-site vehicles.
c. Install gravel pads at all access points to prevent tracking of mud onto public roads.
d. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.
e. After completion of clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation, treat the disturbed areas by watering, revegetation, or by spreading soil binders until they are paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.
f. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent the transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to land use clearance.

Plan Requirements and Timing: All APCD required dust control measures shall be noted on all construction plans and shall be submitted for approval by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. The name and telephone number of a designated person to monitor the dust control program shall be provided to City staff and the APCD. (*Addresses Impact AQ-1*)

Monitoring: City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance as well as contact the designated monitor as necessary to ensure compliance with dust control measures.

AQ-2 In order to minimize ROC and NOx emissions during construction, the following measures equipment control measures shall be implemented:

a. Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated "clean" diesel engines) shall be used.
b. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.
c. The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
d. Construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.
e. Construction equipment operating onsite shall be equipped with two to four degree engine timing retard or pre-combustion chamber engines.
f. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
g. Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California shall be installed, if available.
h. Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.
i. Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes; auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible.
j. Drivers of diesel fueled commercial vehicles weighing more than 10,000 pounds:
    1. shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than 5 minutes at any location; and
    2. shall not idle a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system (APS) for more than 5 minutes to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on the vehicle.
k. Diesel construction equipment meeting the California Air Resources Board's Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used. Equipment meeting Tier 2 or higher emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
l. Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The project applicant shall include these measures as notes on a separate sheet attached to the grading and building plans. City staff shall review and approve the plans prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. These measures shall be implemented during and after project construction. (Addresses Impact AQ-2)

Monitoring: City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance as well as contact the designated monitor as necessary to ensure compliance with equipment control measures.

AQ-3 The project shall comply with all Rules and Regulations required by the Santa Barbara County APCD, including, but not limited to:

a. Compliance with APCD Rule 339, governing application of cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials;
b. Obtaining required permits for any emergency diesel generators or large boilers prior to any LUPs;
c. Obtaining APCD permits prior to handling or treating any contaminated soil onsite, if identified;
d. Limited idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading to five minutes at any location and auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible. State law requires that drivers of diesel fueled commercial vehicles weighing more than 10,000 pounds shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than 5 minutes at any location. Such heavy vehicles shall not idle a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system (APS) for more than 5 minutes to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on the vehicle if you have a sleeper berth and you're within 100 feet of a restricted area (residential uses and schools).

Plan Requirements and Timing: The project applicant shall include these measures as notes on a separate sheet attached to the grading and building plans. City staff shall review and approve the plans prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. These measures shall be implemented during and after project construction. (*Addresses Impact AQ-2*)

Monitoring: City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance as well as contact the designated monitor as necessary to ensure compliance with equipment control measures.

The following mitigation measures would still be recommended to minimize adverse, but less than significant impacts:

AQ-4 Mechanical air conditioners shall use non-CFC refrigerants. The air conditioning systems shall utilize HCFC-123 or other refrigerants which are determined to have a minimal effect on ozone depletion. If feasible, the systems shall be installed shall be designed to accommodate new non-ozone depleting refrigerants as they become available. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Air conditioner information shall be provided on project building plans and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of LUPs for structures. (*Addresses Impact AQ-3*)

Monitoring: City staff shall verify conformance with this measure on project building plans prior to issuance of LUPs and shall verify installation in conformance prior to certificate of occupancy.

AQ-5 The following energy-conserving techniques shall be incorporated unless the applicant demonstrates their infeasibility to the satisfaction of Planning & Environmental Services staff prior to approval of Land Use Permits:

a. Installation of low NOx water heaters and space heaters per specifications in the Clean Air Plan;
b. Installation of heat transfer modules in furnaces;
c. Use of light colored water-based paint and roofing materials;
d. Installation of solar panels and/or use of water heaters that heat water only on demand;
e. Use of passive solar cooling/heating;
f. Use of natural lighting;
g. Use of concrete or other non-pollutant materials for parking lots instead of asphalt;
h. Installation of energy efficient appliances;
i. Installation of energy efficient lighting;
j. Use of landscaping to shade buildings and parking lots;
k. Installation of sidewalks and bike paths;
l. Installation of covered bus stops, with Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) bus route schedules and rideshare information on a central location on a covered message board to encourage use of mass transportation.

Plan Requirements and Timing: Measure components shall be provided on project building plans and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of LUPs for structures. (*Addresses Impact AQ-3*)

Monitoring: City staff shall verify conformance with this measure on project building plans prior to issuance of LUPs and shall verify installation in conformance prior to certificate of occupancy.

AQ-6 To reduce daily ROC and NOx emissions during winter days from combined project sources, residences shall be built without wood-burning fireplaces or only with natural gas-fired burning units.

Plan Requirements and Timing: Measure components shall be provided on project building plans and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of LUPs for structures. (*Addresses Impact AQ-3*)

Monitoring: City staff shall verify conformance with this measure on project building plans prior to issuance of LUPs and shall verify installation in conformance prior to certificate of occupancy.

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative air quality impacts would be considered *adverse, but less than*

significant. Implementation of recommended mitigation measures would minimize adverse project specific and cumulative air quality impacts.

Project Specific and Cumulative Global Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Climate change refers to any significant change in measures of climate (such as temperature, precipitation or wind) lasting for an extended period (decades or longer) (US EPA, 2008).

The Greenhouse Effect and Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are often called greenhouse gases (GHGs). The greenhouse effect traps heat in the troposphere through a three-fold process as follows: Short-wave radiation emitted by the Sun is absorbed by the Earth; the Earth emits a portion of this energy in the form of long wave radiation; and GHGs in the upper atmosphere absorb this long-wave radiation and emit this long-wave radiation into space and toward the Earth. This "trapping" of the long-wave (thermal) radiation emitted back toward the Earth is the underlying process of the greenhouse effect. Principal GHGs include carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), ozone (O_3), and water vapor (H_2O). Some greenhouse gases, such as CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O, occur naturally and are emitted to the atmosphere through natural processes and human activities. Of these gases, CO_2 and CH_4 are emitted in the greatest quantities from human activities. Emissions of CO_2 are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion, whereas CH_4 results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Man-made GHGs, which have a much greater heat-absorption potential than CO_2, include fluorinated gases, such as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6), which are byproducts of certain industrial processes. (Cal EPA, 2006). California emitted 484 million metric tons of GHGs in 2004 (CARB, 2007a, p.7).

The greenhouse effect is a natural process that contributes to regulating the earth's temperature. Without it, the temperature of the Earth would be about zero degrees F (-18°C) instead of its present 57°F (14°C). Global climate change concerns are focused on whether human activities are leading to an enhancement of the greenhouse effect (NCDC, 2008).

The effect each GHG has on climate change is measured as a combination of the volume of its emissions and the potential of a gas or aerosol to trap heat in the atmosphere, known as its global warming potential (GWP). The GWP varies between GHGs; for example, the GWP of methane is 21, and the GWP of nitrous oxide is 310. Total GHG emissions are expressed as a function of how much warming would be caused by the same mass of CO_2. Thus, GHG gas emissions are typically measured in terms of pounds or tons of "CO_2 equivalents" (CO_2E).

According to CARB, some of the potential impacts in California of global warming may include loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more large forest fires, and more drought years (CARB

2006, 2007b). Several recent studies have attempted to explore the possible negative consequences that climate change, left unchecked, could have in California. These reports acknowledge that climate scientists' understanding of the complex global climate system, and the interplay of the various internal and external factors that affect climate change, remains too limited to yield scientifically valid conclusions on such a localized scale. Substantial work has been done at the international and national level to evaluate climatic impacts, but far less information is available on regional and local impacts.

The primary effect of global climate change has been a rise in average global tropospheric temperature of 0.2° Celsius per decade, determined from meteorological measurements worldwide between 1990 and 2005. Climate change modeling using 2000 emission rates shows that further warming would occur, which would induce further changes in the global climate system during the current century. Changes to the global climate system and ecosystems and to California would include, but would not be limited to:

- The loss of sea ice and mountain snow pack resulting in higher sea levels and higher sea surface evaporation rates with a corresponding increase in tropospheric water vapor due to the atmosphere's ability to hold more water vapor at higher temperatures (IPCC, 2007);
- Rise in global average sea level primarily due to thermal expansion and melting of glaciers and ice caps, the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets (IPCC 2007);
- Changes in weather that includes, widespread changes in precipitation, ocean salinity, and wind patterns, and more energetic and aspects of extreme weather including droughts, heavy precipitation, heat waves, extreme cold, and the intensity of tropical cyclones (IPCC, 2007);
- Decline of Sierra snowpack, which accounts for approximately half of the surface water storage in California, by 70 percent to as much as 90 percent over the next 100 years (Cal EPA, 2006);
- Increase in the number of days conducive to ozone formation by 25 to 85 percent (depending on the future temperature scenario) in high ozone areas of Los Angeles and the San Joaquin Valley by the end of the 21st century (Cal EPA, 2006); and
- High potential for erosion of California's coastlines and sea water intrusion into the Delta and levee systems due to the rise in sea level (Cal EPA, 2006).

Regulatory Setting

In response to growing scientific and political concern with global climate change, California recently adopted a series of laws to reduce emissions of GHGs to the atmosphere from commercial and private activities within the State. In September 2002, Governor Gray Davis signed Assembly Bill (AB) 1493, requiring the development and adoption of regulations to achieve "the maximum feasible reduction of greenhouse gases" emitted by noncommercial passenger

vehicles, light-duty trucks, and other vehicles used primarily for personal transportation in the State.

On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order (EO) S-3-05, establishing statewide GHG emissions reduction targets. This EO provides that by 2010, emissions shall be reduced to 2000 levels; by 2020, emissions shall be reduced to 1990 levels; and by 2050, emissions shall be reduced to 80 percent of 1990 levels (Governor's Office, 2005). In response to the Executive Order, the Secretary of Cal/EPA created the Climate Action Team (CAT), which, in March 2006, published the Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature (the "2006 CAT Report"). The 2006 CAT Report identifies a recommended list of strategies that the State could pursue to reduce climate change greenhouse gas emissions.

In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), into law. AB 32 commits the State to achieving 1990 levels of GHGs by 2020, which CARB has established at 427 million metric tons of CO_2 equivalent emissions. To achieve this goal, AB 32 mandates that CARB establish a quantified emissions cap, institute a schedule to meet the cap, implement regulations to reduce statewide GHG emissions from stationary sources, and develop tracking, reporting, and enforcement mechanisms to ensure that reductions are achieved. Governor Schwarzenegger, just two days after signing AB 32, strengthened California's commitment to reducing GHGs by signing SB 1368. SB 1368 requires the CEC to develop and adopt regulations for GHG emissions performance standards for the long-term procurement of electricity by local publicly-owned utilities. These standards must be consistent with the standards adopted by the Public Utilities Commission. This effort will help to protect energy customers from financial risks associated with investments in carbon-intensive generation by allowing new capital investments in power plants whose GHG emissions are as low or lower than new combined-cycle natural gas plants, by requiring imported electricity to meet GHG performance standards in California and requiring that the standards be developed and adopted in a public process.

GHG Emissions and CEQA

GHG emissions contributing to global climate change have only recently been addressed in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents, such that CEQA and case law do not provide much guidance relative to their assessment. Quantitative significance thresholds for this topic have not been adopted by the State of California, or any particular air pollution control district, including the City of Goleta. CEQA does, however, provide guidance regarding topics such as climate change in Guidelines Section 15144, Forecasting. Section 15144 notes that preparation of an environmental impact analysis document necessarily involves some degree of forecasting. While forecasting the unforeseeable is not possible, an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.

As stated above, currently, neither the State of California nor the City of Goleta have established CEQA significance thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions. However, the California Office of Planning & Research (OPR) has issued a Technical Advisory titled *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review* in June 19, 2008. This advisory provides guidance to land use agencies in the interim period, until the state CEQA Guidelines are revised. The advisory states on page 4, in the third paragraph, *"Public agencies are encouraged but not required to adopt thresholds of significance for environmental impacts. Even in the absence of clearly defined thresholds for GHG emissions, the law requires that such emissions from CEQA projects must be disclosed and mitigated to the extent feasible whenever the lead agency determines that the project contributes to a significant, cumulative climate change impact."* Furthermore, the advisory document indicates in the third bullet item on page 6 that *"in the absence of regulatory standards for GHG emissions or other scientific data to clearly define what constitutes a 'significant impact', individual lead agencies may undertake a project-by-project analysis, consistent with available guidance and current CEQA practice."*

The City's methodology to address Global Climate Change in CEQA documents is evolving. The current methodology entails three steps: (1) quantification of the project's GHG emissions, or provide a qualified discussion where quantification is not yet feasible, (2) identification of opportunities to reduce the project's GHG emissions, and (3) identification of global climate change impacts on the project, such as increased incidence of wildfires, increased bluff erosion, and rising sea levels.

Furthermore, the City has reviewed much of the available subject analysis including the CAPCOA paper on CEQA and climate change referenced above. Based on this review, the City believes the intent of the stakeholder agencies at this time is to target the larger sources of GHG emissions rather than every potential project with regards to CEQA analysis. To that end, until a threshold is determined, the City believes it is safe to say that any project with GHG emissions greater than the GHG reporting requirement required under ARB Resolution 07-54 (25,000 tons or more of CO_2 equivalent) should be considered significant.[3] Projects below these levels remain unclassifiable until more evidence becomes available.

Environmental Setting

The proposed Haskell's Landing Residential project site is currently undeveloped. On a continuous basis, there is no existing measurable level of greenhouse gas emissions associated with use of the proposed project sites.

[3] California Air Resources Board Resolution 07-54 establishes 25,000 metric tons of GHG emissions as the threshold for identifying the largest stationary emission sources in California for purposes of requiring the annual reporting of emissions. This threshold is just over 0.005% of California's total inventory of GHG emissions for 2004.

Construction Impacts

Greenhouse gas emissions would be associated with the construction phase of the proposed project through the use of heavy equipment and vehicle trips. Emissions of greenhouse gases would be short-term.

Operational Impacts: Project Energy Use and Vehicle Emissions

It is important to acknowledge that new residential development does not necessarily create entirely new GHG emissions, since most of the persons who will visit or occupy new development will come from other locations where they were already causing such GHG emissions. For most projects, the main contribution of GHG emissions is from motor vehicles, but how much of those emissions are "new" is uncertain. New projects do not necessarily create new drivers; rather, new projects only redistribute the existing traffic patterns.

Further, as discussed above, it has not been demonstrated that even new GHG emissions caused by a local residential development project can affect global climate change, or that a project's net increase in GHG emissions, if any, when coupled with other activities in the region, would be cumulatively considerable.

Nonetheless, increased development, including the proposed project, would cause GHG emissions to be generated. Emissions associated with energy use would arise from the combustion of fossil fuels to provide energy for the development. The proposed project would contribute to long-term increases in GHGs as a result of traffic increases and minor secondary fuel combustion emissions form project elements such as space heating and hot water heating. Additional increases in GHG emissions would occur as a result of the generation of electricity necessary to meet project-related increases in energy demand.

Project Cumulative Impacts

While global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact and the impacts of climate change on California human and natural systems would also be substantial, there currently is no agreed-upon methodology to adequately identify, under CEQA, when project-level GHG emissions contribute considerably to this cumulative impact.

As a result of global fossil fuel consumption for 2004, CO_2 global emissions are estimated at 7,910 million metric tons, a 5.3% increase from CO_2 emissions resulting from global fossil fuel consumption in 2003 (US Department of Energy). Unfortunately, scientific and factual data are not sufficiently available to judge, without undo speculation, whether projects with relatively small, incremental contributions to global GHG emission totals are cumulatively significant or insignificant. CEQA Guidelines §15145 states, *"If, after thorough investigation, a Lead Agency finds that a particular impact is too speculative for evaluation, the agency should note its conclusion and terminate discussion of the impact."* Although the direct output of greenhouse gases from a project can theoretically be estimated (provided valid methodologies are developed), the emission of

GHGs associated with implementation of any one development project would not necessarily result in any discernable direct impact globally or locally on climate, water availability, plant or wildlife species, populations, habitats, or ecosystems. Therefore, until such time that 1) sufficient scientific basis exists to accurately measure GHG emissions and project future climate trends, and 2) guidance is provided by regulatory agencies to evaluate thresholds of significance and control of GHG emissions, the significance of the proposed project's contribution to global GHG emissions and thereby climate change, pursuant to CEQA, cannot be judged and such an evaluation would be speculative.

While no significant impacts have been identified due to the speculative nature of greenhouse gas impact assessment, Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-7 would reduce the amount of GHG emissions generated during construction and operation.

At this time, there are no adopted thresholds of significance for GHG emissions and the methodology of analysis is evolving. The project-specific and cumulative contribution to impacts associated with GHG emissions is considered less than significant in the absence of an adopted threshold and given that climatic change is global in scale.

3. Biological Resources

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II) on biological resources adjacent to Devereux Creek. The Residences at Sandpiper Supplemental EIR identified *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II) on biological resources related to: loss of native grasslands; loss of habitat and reduction in populations of common wildlife species; loss of wetland habitat; degradation of Devereux Creek water quality; and direct impacts to Devereux Creek due to sewer lateral and utility installations.

The City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR (City of Goleta 2006) identified *significant but feasibly mitigated impacts* (Class II) on biological resources, including: temporary Impacts to Special Status Habitats and Special Status Species (Impact 3.4-1); Loss of Special Status Habitats (Impact 3.4-2); Long-term Degradation of Special Status Habitats (Impact 3.4-3); Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats (Impact 3.4-4); Harm to Listed Species (Impact 3.4-5); Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species (Impact 3.4-6) Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species (Impact 3.4-7); Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages (Impact 3.4-8); Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat (Impact 3.4-9); Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy. Devereux Creek is identified as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat, an Unvegetated Open Creek Channel (GP/Figure 4-1).

Haskell's Landing Project

A city-qualified biologist completed a reevaluation of the distribution of native grasslands onsite on February 27 and April 11, 2008, when purple needle grass (*Nassalia pulchra*) and meadow barley (*Horideum brachyantherum*) (see Attachment 6) (Harwayne, 2008). Field conditions were good such that the presence of the species was easily discernable. Though the 2008 survey results resulted in slight variations in the location, size, and density of the native grass species, their distribution, as mapped with Global Positioning System (GPS) technology, was generally consistent with those recorded during preparation of the Residences at Sandpiper Supplemental EIR. The distribution of the native grass species, totaling 0.899 acres (exceeding the 0.81 acres previously identified in 2001) is identified in Figure 16. Minor changes in native grass distributions are expected due to changes in weather conditions including precipitation and temperature. The largest concentrations of purple needlegrass and meadow barley populations, however, were still recorded within the proposed preserve area and proposed 50-foot setback adjacent to Devereux Creek.

The presence and distribution of other sensitive habitats onsite, including wetlands, riparian, and upland species, were verified during site visits on May 10 and June 21, 2007 (Harwayne, 2008, Attachment 6). The distribution of these habitats was consistent with those recorded during preparation of the Residences at Sandpiper Supplemental EIR, based on a detailed visual inspection of previously defined habitat boundaries. Devereux Creek was found to not provide desirable or optimal habitat for any special status species identified elsewhere in the project site vicinity, including steelhead, California red-legged frog, or tidewater goby.

The proposed project provides for 100-foot development setbacks from all identified wetlands (except for meandering sidewalks along the Hollister Avenue frontage that encroach within the setbacks), and continues to provide a Vegetation Enhancement Plan (VEP) for Devereux Creek. The VEP would provide restoration of native grassland and wetland habitats, providing for a native tree and shrub plantings on the margins of wetland setbacks such as sycamore, coast live oak, toyon, coffee berry, lemonade berry, etc. An existing grove of eucalyptus along the southern property boundary on Hollister Avenue and west side of Devereux Creek would remain, as previously proposed.

Project-Specific Impacts

The Haskell's Landing project would result in the following impacts, similar to the previous Residences at Sandpiper project.

Impact BIO-1: *Removal of native grasslands (Class II).* The proposed project design would preserve 0.568 acres of native grasses, including the main concentration (polygon) in the central portion of the project site, east of Devereux Creek (see Figure 17), that was previously proposed within the VEP area. A small portion of this polygon within the proposed eastern interior loop adjacent to

the proposed open space landscape restoration area would incorporate a "grass-crete" type substructure material that would allow for natural dispersal of native grass seed. The project open space would also include two smaller polygons to the east with between 30 and 50 percent purple needle grass cover, which were not to be preserved under the Residences at Sandpiper project plan. A total of 0.283 acres would be removed, compared to 0.53 acres that would have been removed under the Residences at Sandpiper project plan. The additional trail requested by DRB that would traverse the largest native grass polygon east of Devereux Creek would encroach within 0.048 acres of habitat. Though the trail would be constructed on an elevated boardwalk, shading of the vegetation would also contribute to degradation of the habitat. This impact would be *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Impact BIO-2: *Rough Site Grading Vegetation Removal (Class II).* The proposed project would disturb generally the same building envelope as the Residences at Sandpiper Project. Loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat incrementally reducing the amount of habitat available in the area would be *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Impact BIO-3: *Wetland habitat preservation (Class II)*. All wetland habitats would be preserved as in open space and their habitat quality restored as part of the VEP. The proposed sidewalk along Hollister Avenue would meander through two wetland buffers, but this encroachment would be a minimum of 30 feet from the wetland delineated boundaries, and only four feet from the Hollister Avenue pavement. The sidewalks would not require any maintenance or vegetation removal, such that the long term viability of the wetlands would not be compromised. Impacts would be *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II)

Impact BIO-4: *Indirect Effects Associated with Increased Noise and Human Activity (Class II).* This impact would be generally the same as the Residences at Sandpiper Project, though minimized, as the number of units would be reduced from 119 to 101. Impacts resulting from increased human and pet encroachment into Devereux Creek would be *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II). Construction of the additional trail requested by DRB that would traverse Devereux Creek would contribute to this indirect effect of additional noise.

Impact BIO-5: *Long-term water quality impacts from grease and other pollutants in runoff water from paved surfaces (Class II).* The project's generation of non-point pollutants from paved surfaces would be generally the same as the Residences at Sandpiper Project, though minimized, as the number of units would be reduced from 119 to 101. This impact would be *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Impact BIO-6: *Loss of Monarch butterfly habitat (Class III).* Thinning of eucalyptus trees, and the compensatory effects of the VEP, would be the same as the previously proposed Residences at Sandpiper Project. Impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Impact BIO-7: *Loss of Upland Habitat (Class III).* This impact would be generally the same as the Residences at Sandpiper Project, though minimized, as the number of units would be reduced from 119 to 101, and open space area increased. Impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Impact BIO-8: *Devereux Creek and Eucalyptus Grove Disturbances from Sewer Lateral and Utility Installation (Class II).* This impact would be the same as the Residences at Sandpiper Project. Impacts would be *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Impact BIO-9: *Devereux Creek Restoration (Class IV)*: Like the Residences at Sandpiper project, the Haskell's Landing VEP would provide a *beneficial* impact by removing non-native species and restore riparian habitat quality.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact BIO-10: *Loss of Upland Migratory Corridors and Open Land (Class I).* Like the Residences at Sandpiper project, the Haskell's Landing project would remove approximately 12 acres of open lands, a *significant, unavoidable* contribution to this cumulative, regional impact *(Class I).*

Impact BIO-11: *Loss of Foraging Habitat in the Devereux Slough Watershed (Class I).* Like the Residences at Sandpiper project, the Haskell's Landing project would remove approximately 12 acres of grassland foraging, a *significant, unavoidable* contribution to this cumulative, regional impact *(Class I).*

Impact BIO-12: *Fragmentation of Habitat and Loss of Unique Botanical Resources (Class I).* Like the Residences at Sandpiper project, the Haskell's Landing project would remove approximately 12 acres of open land with scattered patches of native grasses and wetlands, a *significant, unavoidable* contribution to this cumulative, regional impact *(Class I).*

Impact BIO-13: *Loss of Monarch Butterfly Basking and Patrolling Habitat (Class III).* Like the Residences at Sandpiper project, the Haskell's Landing project would remove basking and patrolling Monarch butterfly habitat, an *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)* contribution to this cumulative, regional impact.

Impact BIO-14: *Increase in Impervious Surfaces, Increasing Pollutant Runoff Into Wetlands (Class II).* Like the Residences at Sandpiper project, the Haskell's Landing project would substantially contribute to cumulative increases the extent of impervious surfaces and potential non-point source runoff. The contribution would remain *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II).*

Impact BIO-15: *Introduction of Native, but Potentially not Indigenous Plant Material in the Riparian Corridor (Class II).* Like the Residences at Sandpiper project, the Haskell's Landing project VEP would provide native plant species in the Devereux Creek riparian corridor that could reduce genetic diversity of indigenous populations or species. The contribution would remain *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II).*

Impact BIO-16: *Vegetation Enhancement Plan (Class IV).* Like the Residences at Sandpiper project, the Haskell's Landing project VEP would provide overall increased habitat vitality *(Class IV).*

Impact BIO-17: *Reduction of City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE.2.2 b., Streamside Protection Areas Top of Bank Setback from 100 to 50 feet.* The proposed project provides for a minimum 50-foot development setback from the Devereux Creek top bank, a reduction from the existing 100-foot standard in Policy CE.2.2 b. The proposed project would be consistent with all other applicable General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Conservation Element Policies. In particular the Devereux Creek VEP and the 50-foot setback would ensure consistency with the following polices:

CE 1.6 Protection of ESHAs.
CE 1.7 Mitigation of Impacts to ESHAs.
CE 1.8 ESHA Buffers.
CE 1.9 Standards Applicable to Development Projects.
CE 1.10 Management of ESHAs
CE 2.3: Compatible land uses and activities in Streamside Protection Areas (SPAs).
CE 2.5: Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems.
CE 2.6 Restoration of Degraded Creeks**.**

A 50-foot development setback from the Devereux Creek top bank, in combination with the project's consistency with the above CE policies relative to compatible uses within the creek corridor, the corridor's revegetation and enhancement, and improvement of the creek's hydrological capacity, would ensure that impacts on biological resources would be *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Similarly, a reduction in the City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE.2.2 b., Streamside Protection Areas top of bank setback from 100 to 50 feet would be a less than significant impact on the community's biological resources, as the setback would provide for sufficient opportunities to achieve consistency with all other Conservation Element Policies such as CE 1.6-1.10, and CE 2.3, 2.5, and 2.6. The cumulative impact on biological resources would be *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II), and the project's contribution to this impact would also be *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

BIO-1 The applicant shall submit a final Vegetation Enhancement Plan (VEP) for Devereux Creek and adjacent wetland and native grassland habitat. For review and approval by City Planning & Environmental Services. The VEP shall include specific goals for habitat restoration and include performance criteria by which replanting success is measured; any

necessary stream channel and creek flow modifications to ensure restoration success; a planting plan including an irrigation plan; an exotic vegetation management plan; methods to protect the plantings until established; and a contingency plan in the event performance criteria are not met. The plan shall include provisions for maintaining and enhancing the native grassland areas onsite and provisions for salvaging and propagating the yard rush (*Juncus occidentalis*) plants from wetland site 4 and reestablishing the species in suitable locations within the wetland buffer areas. In addition, the plan shall specifically provide for redirection of the Creek from its current course along the DPRR tracks back to the original Devereux Creek channel crossing the property. This would potentially require excavation of the channel invert to remove accumulated sediment and to restore appropriate elevations. Construction and habitat improvement activities in the channel shall be limited to dry season (May 1 to October 31) unless otherwise stipulated in permits from the Army Corps of Engineers or CDFG (see BIO-5). It may also require contributing to the design and construction of a structural solution to ensure continued flow across the DPRR and onto the project property in cooperation with DPRR. The plan shall include details of planting and maintenance of barrier plantings identified in BIO-4 (below). **Plan Requirements:** The plan, including an agreement with DPRR to allow access to provide for redirection of the Creek from its current course along the DPRR tracks back to the original Devereux Creek channel crossing the property, shall be submitted with the Final Development Plan and Tract Map and shall be reviewed and approved by Planning & Environmental Services prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. **Timing:** Plantings shall be in place prior to occupancy. *(Addresses Impact BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-7, BIO-11*, *BIO-14, BIO-15)*

Monitoring: The VEP shall include monitoring by a City-approved biologist or restoration specialist to determine the success of mitigation.

BIO-2 An open space easement including the protected area and creek corridor of Devereux Creek shall be developed and approved by the City Council, so that the restoration area would remain in perpetuity. Within this approximately 2 -acre area, riparian habitat and adjacent wetland, native grassland, and related upland habitat shall be enhanced through eradication of invasive non-native plants and the planting of native species, according to a plan developed by a City-approved biologist. **Plan Requirements:** The terms and conditions of the easement to cover initial restoration and maintenance costs (trail, planting, fencing, etc.), ongoing habitat restoration, and limited public access shall be approved by the Planning & Environmental Services. The Homeowners association will be the party responsible for ongoing restoration and providing maintenance costs, including regular pick up of trash and litter and maintaining fences and barrier plantings. **Timing:** These components shall be addressed with the Final Development Plan and Tract Map prior to recordation of final map and prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. The applicant shall receive approval of the Board of Supervisors

and shall record the easement. *(Addresses Impact BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-7, BIO-11, BIO-14, BIO-15)*

Monitoring: The terms and conditions of the easement shall provide for Planning & Environmental Services or third-party evaluation by a City-approved biologist or restoration specialist of riparian enhancement measures and the effectiveness of controlled public access.

BIO-3 The final grading plan shall identify measures to minimize sedimentation into the protected area adjacent to the creek channel, and protected wetlands and native grassland. Grading in this area shall avoid the rainy season (November 1 to May 1) unless Planning & Environmental Services and a City-qualified biologist or restoration specialist determine that erosion and sediment control measures are sufficient to avoid impacts during the rainy season. Sediment control structures (e.g., straw bales, silt curtains/fences, sediment basins, etc.) shall be placed between graded areas and the protected area to direct runoff and remove silt. The structures shall remain in place and be / regularly maintained until all disturbed soils are stabilized by structures or vegetation. **Plan Requirements:** The erosion and sediment control structures shall be indicated on the final grading plan. **Timing:** The erosion and sediment control plan shall be reviewed and approved by Planning & Environmental Services and Community Development prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. *(Addresses Impact BIO-2, BIO-5, BIO-13)*

Monitoring: The structures shall be monitored by Planning & Environmental Services during construction, and recommendations for corrective actions reported to the Planning & Environmental Services immediately when maintenance is needed.

BIO-4 The final landscape plan shall include barrier plantings of native riparian shrub and understory species (e.g., blackberry, California rose, and other thorny species) on the existing margin of the protected area and the Devereux Creek channel combined with appropriate fencing to reduce encroachment into the area by humans and domestic pets. **Plan Requirements:** The vegetation barrier between the protected area and the development shall be identified on the final landscape plan submitted with the Final Development Plan and Tract Map. Details of its planting and maintenance shall be included in the Vegetation Enhancement Plan (BIO-1). **Timing:** The final landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by Planning & Environmental Services and Flood Control during processing of the Final Development Plan and Tract Map prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. *(Addresses Impact BIO-4, BIO-8, BIO-14, BIO-15)*

Monitoring: The performance of the barrier plantings shall be monitored by a County-approved biologist or restoration specialist to determine the success of mitigation (in conjunction with the monitoring of BIO-1). *(Addresses Impact BIO-4)*

BIO-5 The applicant shall obtain all required federal, state or local permits or authorizations including but not limited to: a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), a Section 401 Water Quality Certification or Waiver from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Copies shall be submitted to Planning & Environmental Services. **Plan Requirements**: Applicant shall submit necessary plans to CDFG and USACE with copies to Planning & Environmental Services. **Timing:** Prior to issuance of any LUP for the project *(Addresses Impact BIO-3, BIO-14)*

Monitoring: Planning & Environmental Services staff shall confirm receipt of permits and coordinate monitoring of permit compliance with CDFG and USACE.

BIO-6 Sedimentation, silt, and grease traps, or other storm water runoff treatment control measures shall be installed in paved areas to act as filters to minimize pollution reaching the Devereux Creek channel and downstream habitats. Appropriate measures shall address both short-term construct-ion and long-term operational impacts of runoff from the site. The measures shall be maintained in working order for the life of the project. Prior to receiving Coastal Development Permit approval for grading, the applicant shall submit grading and building plans that shown the detail of this requirement to Planning & Environmental Services for review and approval. Prior to and during grading installation and maintenance of appropriate sediment control measures shall be photo-documented and submitted by the applicant to Planning & Environmental Services. Similarly, prior to completion of the project, installation of the long term stormwater runoff treatment control measures shall be photo-documented and submitted by the applicant to Planning & Environmental Services. The Homeowners association (HOA) will be responsible for long-term operation and maintenance of the filters in working order. The City shall inspect and ensure filters are maintained and effectively mitigating impact.

Plan Requirements: Grading and building plans shall contain specifications. The applicant may be required to record an agreement for long-term maintenance of storm water control measures per Santa Barbara County Water Agency and Flood Control District conditions to ensure maintenance is completed over the life of the project. **Timing:** Specifications submitted prior to issuance of any LUP for the project for grading, implemented during construction and thereafter. *(Addresses Impact BIO-2, BIO-5, BIO-14)*

Monitoring: City shall monitor mitigation implementation prior to and throughout the construction period as well as throughout a minimum 3-year landscape establishment period.

BIO-7 Non-invasive landscape plants to be included in the landscape plan for the site shall be selected for their attractiveness to Monarch butterflies, and their capacity to provide nectar, basking and/or roosting habitat between the months of October and December. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Landscape plan submitted prior to issuance of any LUP for the project for grading. *(Addresses Impact BIO-6, BIO-13)*

Monitoring: City shall monitor mitigation implementation during landscape installation and throughout a minimum 3-year establishment period thereafter.

BIO-8 Night lighting in the vicinity and within the Devereux Creek channel and buffer area, including the native grassland, wetland, eucalyptus grove, and nature trail, shall be minimized. Lights on homes adjacent to the creek, and within the buffer, native grassland or wetland enhancement area shall be directed away from the protected area, be of low intensity, and shall be connected to timing devices that shut off after 10 PM. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** A lighting plan submitted prior to issuance of any LUP for the project for grading. *(Addresses Impact BIO-4, BIO-7, BIO-9)*

Monitoring: City shall confirm installation and shall respond to complaints.

BIO-9 Improvements to the hydrology and water quality of Devereux Creek channel shall be effectuated. This shall be accomplished by grading and designing the site to facilitate runoff to riparian and wetland habitats rather than to the sewer system, as described below:

a. Include sediment and erosion control measures in the grading/drainage plan, and maintain these measures throughout the construction period. Install and maintain erosion control measures (such as jute netting or coir fabric/rolls) along the creek channel and in protected areas until native plants or landscaping is established.
b. Install native wetland plants (of known local geographic origin) that will filter or absorb runoff or pollutant materials that may enter the Devereux Creek channel.
c. Include pervious surfaces in the project design in key areas (adjacent to concrete walkways and impervious roads) so that runoff percolates into the ground to the maximum extent feasible.
d. Collect and filter all runoff prior to its discharge into the Devereux Creek channel.
e. Direct runoff from rooftops and large impervious areas to a filtering system and thence to the Devereux Creek channel to provide supplemental water to the riparian corridor and aquatic biota.

Plan Requirements and Timing: A revised grading and drainage plan, and water quality improvement plan shall be submitted prior to issuance

of any LUP for the project for grading. *(Addresses Impact BIO-2, BIO-5, BIO-7, BIO-14)*

Monitoring: City shall monitor mitigation implementation during construction.

BIO-10 The Enhancement Plan area shall contain indigenous native plant material only.

a. Where native plants are proposed in natural protected areas or in landscape plans, seed, cuttings or plants shall be obtained from known sources in the watershed or in the Goleta Valley. Local experts, Growing Solutions or the University of Santa Barbara Coal Oil Point Reserve, should be contacted to assist with verifying and contract growing plant stock from appropriate geographic origins.

b. Invasive non-natives shall be eradicated from the site. Invasive ornamentals (such as periwinkle, fountain grass, cape ivy, English ivy, Algerian ivy, bamboo, etc.) shall not be included in the landscape plan. The California Exotic Plant Pest Council (CaIEPPC) list of Exotic Invasive Species should also be consulted to ensure that species on this list are not introduced to the site.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The applicant shall verify the source of plant material prior to issuance of any LUP for the project for grading. Removal of exotic species from the Enhancement Plan area shall take place prior to implementation of the Enhancement Plan. Removal of exotic species shall be ongoing, as necessary. *(Addresses Impact BIO-1, BIO-11, BIO-15)*

Monitoring: City shall monitor mitigation implementation during construction and for the minimum three-year establishment period.

BIO-11 Sewer lateral extensions or other utility connections that must cross the Devereux Creek channel shall avoid the creek and adjacent buffer and protected areas. This shall be accomplished by directional drilling/boring or other technology. Exceptions to this measure include electrical conduit to light the pedestrian pathway that can be buried within the pathway (and cross Devereux Creek on the pedestrian bridge) and installation of the clean water drainage system identified in the Vegetation Enhancement Plan subsequent to its review and approval by the City. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** A revised grading and drainage plan, depicting construction methods for sewer and other utilities, shall be submitted prior to issuance of any LUP for the project for grading. *(Addresses Impact BIO-8, BIO-13)*

Monitoring: City shall monitor mitigation implementation during, and after construction.

BIO-12 During construction, washing of concrete, paint and equipment shall be designated where polluted water and materials can be contained for removal from the site. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Measure components shall be provided on project grading plans and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of grading permits. (*Addresses Impact BIO-2, -5, -14*)

Monitoring: City staff shall verify conformance with this measure on project building plans prior to issuance of any LUP for the project and shall verify installation in conformance prior to certificate of occupancy.

Residual Impacts

With incorporation of mitigation measures identified above, project-specific impacts and the project's contribution to cumulative biological impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

4. Cultural Resources

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II) on cultural resources, as the project site was considered potentially sensitive for the presence of archaeological resources. The Residences at Sandpiper Supplemental EIR identified *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II) on cultural resources as well.

Haskell's Landing Project

There would be no changes to potential impacts on cultural resources impacts described in the Residences at Sandpiper Supplemental EIR. Although the project site had been surveyed by a professional archaeologist in 1974, the results were considered less than reliable due to poor surface visibility. Therefore, an intensive Phase 1 archaeological survey was performed by a city-qualified archaeologist. No potentially significant prehistoric or historic archaeological resources were located during the investigation.

Consultation as required under Senate Bill 18 with California Native American Tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has been initiated. Also, a search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File was requested. The NAHC has responded (Katy Sanchez, November 4, 2008) that there are no Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. Consultation with Chumash individuals listed by the NAHC has been initiated.

Project-Specific Impacts

Impact CR-1: *Although not anticipated, project construction could result in disturbance of unknown potentially significant sub-surface cultural resources*

(Class II). The intensive Phase 1 archaeological re-investigation included shovel scrapes and inspected all exposed ground surfaces, including along the Devereux Creek bank. No potentially significant prehistoric or historic archaeological materials were identified. Although no documented sacred lands are located onsite, tribal entities including the Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians and Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation, along with other individual Chumash descendants with spiritual ties to the project vicinity, are concerned that there remains the potential for unrecorded archaeological resources to be encountered and disturbed during grading, given the fact that other archaeological sites are recorded within the Devereux Creek watershed, though over 300 feet away.

Cumulative Impacts

The potential for project impacts on unknown cultural resources project is low, given the negative Phase 1 results. Therefore, the project's cumulative impacts on archaeological resources would be *less than significant* (Class III).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would be required:

CR-1 A City-qualified archaeologist and local Chumash observer shall monitor the initial brushing of vegetation and earth removal activity of the first 1-foot of soils to ensure that any unknown, sparse prehistoric materials are identified and assessed consistent with City of Goleta Cultural Resources Guidelines. In the event that prehistoric cultural remains are identified, grading shall be temporarily redirected in this area. The archaeologist shall complete an assessment of the resource's extent and significance pursuant to the City's Cultural Resources Guidelines. If the resource is found to be significant, a Phase 3 Data Recovery Program shall be completed pursuant to the City's Cultural Resources Guidelines The findings of the archaeological investigations shall be submitted to the City Planning & Environmental Services Department and reviewed and approved prior continuing grading in the area of concern.

Plan Requirements and Timing: Measure components shall be provided on project grading plans and shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project for grading. (*Addresses Impact CR-1)*

Monitoring: City staff shall verify conformance with this measure on project building plans (review and approve the archaeological monitoring report) prior to issuance of LUPs and shall verify installation in conformance prior to certificate of occupancy.

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on cultural resources would be less than significant.

5. Energy

Previous Review

The 94-EIR-9 did not evaluate project impacts on energy, as the previous Goleta Community Plan EIR (91-EIR-13) identified *adverse, but less than significant impacts* on energy demand (Class III). The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR also identified impacts on Energy as *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Project-Specific and Cumulative Impacts

There are no components of the proposed project which would substantially increase the anticipated energy demand relative to previously assessed projects.

Mitigation Measures

Though proposed project impacts on energy would remain *adverse but less than significant,* the following measures would still be recommended to maximize consistency with City of Goleta General Plan Conservation Element Policy 13, Energy Conservation.

EG-I The following energy-conserving techniques shall be incorporated into project design unless the applicant demonstrates their infeasibility to the satisfaction of Planning & Environmental Services staff:

a. Installation of energy-efficient appliances; and
b. Installation of energy-efficient lighting.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The applicant shall incorporate the provisions in building and improvement plans or shall submit proof of unfeasibility prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. *(Addresses Impact EG-1)*

Monitoring: Building and Safety shall site inspect to ensure development is in accordance with approved plans prior to occupancy clearance. Planning staff shall verify landscape installation in accordance with approved landscape plans.

EG-2 The applicant shall install exterior motion sensitive light switches. **Plan Requirements:** Type of light switch shall be denoted on building plans. **Timing:** Motion sensitive light switches shall be installed prior to occupancy. *(Addresses Impact EG-1)*

Monitoring: Planning & Environmental Services shall inspect prior to occupancy.

EG-3 Landscaping in common areas shall be designed in a manner to shade buildings and vehicle parking areas to lessen demand for air conditioning. **Plan Requirements:** Landscaping plan and summer shade study shall be submitted for review and approval by Planning & Environmental Services staff and the City DRB prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. **Timing:** Landscaping shall be planted prior to occupancy clearance. *(Addresses Impact EG-1)*

Monitoring: P&D shall inspect prior to occupancy.

Residual Impacts

Project-specific and cumulative energy impacts would remain *adverse, but less than significant*.

6. Geological Processes

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II) on geologic processes related to potential sedimentation into Devereux Creek. Impacts related to seismic upset were adverse but less than significant (Class III). The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR also identified the same impacts on geological process, as well as *adverse, but less than significant* changes in topography and potential for slope failure (Class III).

Haskell's Landing Project

The proposed project would not result in changes to geologic impacts described in The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR.

Project-Specific Impacts

The proposed project would still result in the following impacts:

Impact GEO-1: *Project grading would result in a short-term increase in erosion and sedimentation* (Class II). The proposed grading plan is essentially the same as previously proposed though the amount of cut and fill would be increased from 77,958 c.y. of cut and 75,126 c.y. of fill to 105,610 c.y. of cut and 75,126 c.y. of fill. Previously approved, standard erosion control measures would be applied. Impacts on geological processes would remain *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Impact GEO-*2*: *Project grading would result in less than significant changes in topography (Class III).* The proposed grading plan is essentially the same as

previously proposed, though the maximum depth of cut and fill would be increased from 3 to 4 feet from surface.

***I*mpact GEO-3:** *Proposed cut and fill slopes would not be prone to slope failure. (Class III).* Proposed finished grades would remain gradual and not include substantial gradients.

Impact GEO-4: *Seismic event disturbances would be addressed by standard Uniform Building Code Seismic Zone standards (Class III).* No substantial changes in standard engineering approaches to earthquake resistant design have occurred since 2001.

Impact GR-5 *Damage to foundations, utilities and other facilities could result from expansive clay soils onsite (Class II).* No substantial changes in standard engineering approaches to address expansive soils have occurred since 2001.

Impact GR-6 *Damage to foundations, utilities and other facilities could result from compressible soils known to be present onsite.* (Class II). No substantial changes in standard engineering approaches to address compressible soil design have occurred since 2001.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts associated with accelerated erosion and sedimentation from cumulative development in the area would remain the same. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

GEO-1 The applicant shall submit grading and drainage plans with the Final Development Plan/Tract Map application and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

The mitigation measures listed below reflect established standards included in the Uniform Building Code and Cit Grading Ordinance applicable to the proposed project. Additional ordinance-required measures would be imposed on the project through the grading/building permit process.

a. Temporary berms and sedimentation traps shall be installed in association with project grading to minimize erosion of soils into Devereux Creek. The sedimentation basins shall be cleaned after large rain events, and as further directed by Permit Compliance staff, and the silt shall be removed and disposed of in a location approved by Community Services.

b. Revegetation or restoration shall be completed, including measures to minimize erosion and to reestablish soil structure and fertility. Revegetation shall include native, fast-growing, vined plants that shall quickly cover drainage features. Local native species shall be emphasized. A landscape revegetation plan shall be included as part of the Final Redevelopment Plan.

c. Graded areas shall be revegetated immediately after completion of installation of utilities with deep-rooted, native, drought-tolerant species, as specified in a landscape revegetation plan to minimize slope failure and erosion potential. Geotextile binding fabrics shall be used as necessary to hold soils until vegetation is established.

d. Drains shall be designed to cause exiting flow of water to enter sub-parallel downstream (60 degrees or less) to existing Devereux Creek stream flow to avoid eddy currents that would cause opposite bank erosion.

e. An energy dissipater or a similar device such as trash racks or baffles shall be installed at the base end of drainpipe outlets to minimize erosion during storm events. Pipes shall be covered to prevent children from entering the storm drain.

f. Storm drains shall be designed to minimize environmental damage and shall be shown on drainage plans.

g. With the exception of limited ground disturbance in association with construction of the proposed bridge and adjoining walkway, grading shall be prohibited within 25 feet of the Devereux Creek top-of-bank. Where possible, hand equipment shall be utilized during ground disturbances adjacent to the proposed bridge.

h. The applicant shall limit excavation and grading to the dry season of the year (i.e., April 15 to November 1) unless a Building & Safety approved erosion control plan is in place and all measures therein are in effect.

i. Temporary siltation protection devices such as silt fencing, straw bales, and sand bags shall be placed at the base of all cut and fill slopes and soil stockpile areas where potential erosion may occur. P&D staff shall determine these locations.

Plan Requirements and Timing: Erosion control components shall be listed on the grading plan that shall be reviewed and approved by Planning & Environmental Services prior to issuance of any LUP for the project for grading. These measures shall be implemented prior to approval of LUPs for structural development. *(Addresses Impact GEO-1)*

Monitoring: Planning & Environmental Services shall verify as to plan in the field.

GEO-2 All grading and earthwork recommendations by Padre Associates (1999) or as subsequently revised and approved by Community Services shall be incorporated into the final project design, including the Final Grading

Plan. A Registered Civil Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist shall supervise all grading activities. These recommendations would include, but not be limited, to the following:

a. Within the footprint of proposed buildings and foundations, and extending to a minimum distance of 5 feet beyond the foundation footprint, soils should be overexcavated to a depth of 3 feet below existing grade, or 1 foot below bottom of foundation, whichever is deeper.
b. Foundations shall be constructed to compensate for consolidation settlement of 1 inch.
c. Where feasible, building areas shall be backfilled with nonplastic, low expansion soils to mitigate the potential effects of expansive soils. If highly expansive soil is placed within the upper 3 feet below buildings, measures recommended in Padre Associates (1999) or as subsequently revised and approved by Community Services, such as providing positive drainage away from slabs, presoaking soils prior to pouring slabs, and using post-tensioned slabs, perimeter moisture barriers, and grade beam foundation systems, shall be completed.

Plan Requirements and Timing: Earthwork components recommended by Padre Associates (1999) or as subsequently revised and approved by Community Services shall be listed on the grading plan to be reviewed and approved by Planning & Environmental Services prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. These measures shall be implemented during construction. *(Addresses Impact GEO-2 through GEO-6)*

Monitoring: Planning & Environmental Services shall verify as to plan in the field.

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, the residual project-specific and cumulative effect on geological resources would be *less than significant*.

7. Hazards

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II) on hazardous materials/risk of upset related to potential upsets associated with the Ellwood Processing Facility, and *adverse but less than significant* (Class III) impacts associated with exposure of future residents to electromagnetic fields generated by SCE transmission lines and the peaking station on Las Armas Road.

The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR identified the same *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II) on related to potential upsets associated with the

Ellwood Processing Facility. Project specific and cumulative impacts associated with exposure of future residents to electromagnetic fields generated by SCE transmission lines and the peaking station on Las Armas Road were considered *potentially significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

Haskell's Landing Project

The proposed project would not result in changes to hazardous materials/risk of upset impacts described in The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR.

As a result of the revised project, there would be no changes to impacts from exposure to electro-magnetic fields described in the Final EIR (Class III).

Project-Specific Impacts

The proposed project would still result in the following impacts:

Impact HAZ-1: *Continuous Operation of the Reliant Peaking Facility would expose residential receptors on the eastern property boundary to elevated ELF magnetic fields of 2 mG* (Class I). This *potentially significant, unavoidable* impact would only occur during energy emergencies and peak electrical use periods.

Impact HAZ-2: *The potential for encountering unknown historic hazardous materials during grading would be possible though unlikely* (Class II). Though no evidence of previous oil production facilities onsite exist, similar to the previous project, there is the possibility that unknown hazardous materials might be encountered during grading.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts from potential Reliant Peaking Facility use and changes to Southern California Edison (SCE) power lines in the area would be *potentially significant, and unavoidable* (Class I).

Recommended Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

HAZ-1 The applicant shall provide an EMF Disclosure Statement and an EMF Information Package containing a balanced range of EMF educational and information materials to potential buyers of units along the eastern property boundary. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The applicant shall provide this disclosure and Information Package as part of the project CCRs to the City Attorney and Planning & Environmental Services to verify the disclosure and Information Package is fair and adequate. The disclosure shall be reviewed and approved prior to recordation of the Final Map. (*Addresses Impact HAZ-1 and HAZ-3*)

Monitoring: City staff shall verify that the disclosure and Information Package has been incorporated into the CCRs prior to sale of homes and that an adequate EMF Information Package has been assembled by the applicant and has been made easily available for review by prospective buyers. Planning & Environmental Services shall review and approve the contents of the Package for objectivity, balance, and completeness.

HAZ-2 The applicant shall request that the California Department of Real Estate insert the following into the final Subdivision Public Report: "the subject property is located near power lines and a power substation. Purchasers should be aware that there is ongoing research on adverse health effects associated with long-term exposure to low-level magnetic fields. Although no causal link is established, there is sufficient evidence to require reasonable safety precautions. The buyer may wish to become informed on the issue before making a decision on a home purchase in this location." **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The applicant shall provide this disclosure request to the California Department of Real Estate for inclusion in the Subdivision Public Report. The disclosure shall be reviewed and approved prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. (*Addresses Impact HAZ-1 and HAZ-3*)

Monitoring: City staff shall verify that the California Department of Real Estate Subdivision Public Report contains this disclosure statement.

HAZ-3 The applicant shall underground all utility lines within the project site. **Plan Requirement**: Construction plans for these improvements shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Services Department prior to Coastal Development Permit approval. Timing: Improvements shall be implemented prior to occupancy (*Addresses Impact HAZ-1 and HAZ-3*).

Monitoring: Planning & Environmental Services shall verify as to plan in the field.

HAZ-4 In the unlikely event that hazardous materials are encountered during grading, excavation shall be temporarily suspended or redirected. The applicant shall prepare and implement a soil remediation plan for these areas. **Plan Requirement and Timing**: The remediation plan shall be reviewed and approved by County Fire PSD prior to continuing excavation. The applicant shall obtain a compliance letter from County Fire PSD prior to continuing grading in the affected area. Approval and implementation of all required specifications shall be completed prior to grading in the affected area.

Monitoring: County Fire PSD shall inspect remediation activities as to plan in the field.

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative impacts during continuous use of the Reliant Peaking Station would remains potentially *significant and unavoidable*. The unlikely event that hazardous materials are encountered during grading would be *less than significant*.

8. Noise

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II) on noise, both short-term during construction of the phased project, and long-term noise sources adjacent to the project site including US 101, the Union Pacific Railroad, and Hollister Avenue.

The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR identified the same *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II) on short-term during construction of the phased project. Long-term noise impacts associated with exposure of future residents to US 101, the Union Pacific Railroad, and Hollister Avenue traffic was considered *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

The City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR (City of Goleta 2006) identified *significant and unavoidable impacts* (Class I) on noise resulting from Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single Event and Nuisance Noise Sources, such as those related to a Fire Station.

Haskell's Landing Project

The proposed project would not result in changes to noise impacts described in The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR.

U.S. 101

U.S. 101 runs roughly parallel to the northern boundary of the proposed project site at a distance of approximately 500 feet. The existing topography (earthen berm) between U.S. Highway 101 and the site provides significant shielding of the site from U.S. 101 noise. Caltrans data from 2006 provided by ATE, indicated volumes on US 101 of 36,500 ADT in the vicinity of the project site (personal communication, Matthew Farrington, 2008). The U.S. 101 vehicle noise is experienced by sensitive receptors to the north of the site.

Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)

A single track of the Union Pacific Railroad runs parallel and immediately adjacent to the northern property line of the project site, at the base of an abrupt 20-foot drop in elevation. This topography provides significant shielding of the site from railroad noise. Approximately four freight trains and two passenger train

trips pass the site daily. The Amtrak's Pacific Surfliner currently travels north and southbound eight times daily. Train noise affects the sensitive receptors to the north of the site.

Hollister Avenue

Hollister Avenue, located directly south of the project site, is currently a 2-lane arterial roadway, with speeds of 45 miles per hour. Data provided by ATE (2008) for this project, and reviewed and approved by City Community Services, indicate that the existing volumes on Hollister Avenue are 5,750 ADT and 5,650 ADT west and east of the project site, respectively. Hollister Avenue vehicle noise affects sensitive receptors to the north and south of the road corridor.

Project-Specific Impacts

The proposed project would still be subject to the following impacts:

Impact NS-1: *Construction activity would impact residential and educational sensitive receptors within 1,600 feet of the project site (Class II).* As previously assessed the Ellwood School is within 1,300 feet of the project site to the east. The recently completed Ali D'Oro residential project to the southeast is 200 feet from the project boundary.

Table 5. Construction Equipment Noise Levels

Equipment Type	"Typical" Equipment dBA at 50 ft	"Quiet" [2] Equipment dBA at 50 ft
Air Compressor	81	71
Backhoe	85	80
Concrete Pump	82	80
Concrete Vibrator	76	70
Truck, Crane	88	80
Dozer	87	83
Generator	78	71
Loader	84	80
Pavers	88	80
Pneumatic Tools	85	75
Water Pump	76	71
Power Hand Saw	78	70
Shovel	82	80
Trucks	88	83

[1] Source: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
[2] Quieted Equipment: with enclosures, mufflers, or other noise-reducing features

Based on existing estimated short-term construction noise levels of up to 87 dBA measured 50 feet from the source, noise levels at the nearest residences would be 75 dBA, and would be would temporarily exceed the 65 dB CNEL significance threshold criteria. Potential noise levels at the western boundary of the Elwood

School would be between 48 to 60 dBA for "typical" equipment and between 42 to 55 dBA for "quiet" equipment Impacts would be *significant but feasibly mitigated*. (Class II)

Impact NS-2: *The proposed project would generate additional traffic on US 101 and Hollister Avenue. (Class II).* The project would generate traffic along existing roads in the area, including Hollister Avenue. Data provided by ATE (2008) and reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta indicate that the project would add 347 and 425 ADT to Hollister Avenue, east and west of the project site, respectively. The existing-plus-project and cumulative-plus-project noise level increase associated with the additional traffic volume is depicted in Table 6.

Table 6. Off-site Traffic Noise Increase

Street (Segment)	Existing ADT	Existing + Project ADT	CNEL Increase[1] (dB)	Cumulative + Project ADT	CNEL Increase[2] (dB)
Hollister Avenue: East of project site	5,650	5,997	<0.5	6,117	<0.5
Hollister Avenue: West of project site	5,750	6,175	<0.5	6,300	<0.5

The data in Table 6 indicate that additional project-generated traffic would increase the existing and cumulative vehicle noise level along Hollister Avenue by less than 0.5 dB CNEL. Therefore, the additional traffic volume would not substantially increase the existing and cumulative noise level in the project vicinity and the traffic noise level increase is considered *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Impact NS-3: *Long Term Noise Impacts Affecting the Project Site* (Class II). The principal contributors to the noise environment at the project site are the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) line and U.S. 101 to the North, Hollister Avenue to the South, and the future Cathedral Oaks overpass to the west of the project site.

The noise impacts affecting the proposed project upon occupancy were assumed to be approximately in year 2010. Noise exposure to the site was analyzed with an FHWA based Vehicle Noise Prediction Model (see Attachment 7). UPRR train operations noise levels that were monitored in an acoustical analysis prepared for the project applicant (Leighton 2001) were reviewed and added to US 101 noise levels to acquire the combined travel corridors' noise exposure along the northerly portion of the site.

Year 2010 Vehicle volumes for Hollister Avenue were obtained from Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE). Caltrans data for US Highway 101 from 2006 (the last year available) were used along with population growth rates identified in the Santa Barbara County Regional Growth Forecast (August 2007).

According to information provided by ATE, the Existing + Project volumes on Hollister Avenue at project occupancy would be 5,997 and 6,175 ADT east and west of the project site, respectively. The projected volumes on US 101 for Year 2010 would be 43,000 ADT.

The FHWA computer model used for this analysis of the noise exposure to the northerly side of the project, combines the US 101 and UPRR noise levels. The receiver locations were modeled to reflect a worse case situation, i.e., at the patios and balconies nearest to the UPRR, Hollister Avenue and the Cathedral Oaks Overpass. A printout of the FHWA model calculations is included in Attachment 7. The results of our future noise level analysis are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7. Year 2010 Exterior CNEL Noise Levels

Modeling Location		**Noise Source**	**Calculated CNEL**	
Orientation	*Receiver*		*Without Wall*	*With Wall*
North	1st Fl Patio	US Highway 101 + Union Pacific Railroad	69 CNEL	61 CNEL
North	2nd Fl Balcony	US Highway 101 + Union Pacific Railroad	69 CNEL	65 CNEL
South	1st Fl Patio	Hollister Avenue	64 CNEL	N/A
South	2nd Fl Balcony	Hollister Avenue	64 CNEL	N/A

The calculated noise exposure levels shown in Table 7 indicate that UPRR and Year 2010 vehicle noise levels would exceed the 65 CNEL exterior noise level significance threshold. The proposed 6-foot noise attenuation wall proposed along the northern property boundary would reduce those exterior noise levels of project receptors shielded by the barrier to 65 dBA CNEL or less. The current design of the proposed sound wall parallels the northern property boundary. Both proposed residential units in the northwest corner and northeast corner, however, would have 1st floor patios and second story balconies facing to the west and east respectively. Noise from the UPRR and U.S. 101 affecting these exterior living areas would not necessarily be fully attenuated by the presently proposed east-west sound wall. Therefore, exterior noise level impacts on these 1st floor patios and balconies would be *potentially significant, but feasibly mitigated* (Class II) (see Mitigation Measure NS-5).

The receiver locations selected for evaluation, and for which results are presented in Table 7, represent the "worst-case" locations with regard to exterior noise exposure from the transportation noise sources. The remainder of the buildings, outdoor living areas, recreation, and open space areas are expected to have lower than the modeled locations noise exposure levels from the U.S. 101, UPRR, and Hollister Avenue due to their larger distances to the noise source and noise shielding by on-site buildings and structures.

The exterior-to-interior noise attenuation provided by standard California residential building structures ranges between 12 to a minimum of 20 dBA for windows open and closed, respectively. Therefore, interior noise levels of units facing the UPRR and Hollister Avenue would range between 49 and 53 CNEL with windows open, and between 41 and 45 CNEL with windows closed. Consequently, occupants of units facing the UPRR and Hollister Avenue would need to be able to close the windows to reduce noise levels to less than the City's 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard. Units in buildings not immediately adjacent to the UPRR and Hollister Avenue would be subjected to interior noise levels below 45 dBA CNEL with windows open, due to their due to their larger distances to the noise source and noise shielding by on-site buildings and structures. Units with a "windows closed" condition would need to be provided with a mechanical ventilation/air conditioning system that meets UBC minimum ventilation requirements. The interior noise levels impacting the Haskell's Landing project would be below 45 dBA CNEL with windows closed conditions for units facing the UPRR and Hollister Avenue, and windows open for all other units. Consequently, the interior noise level impacts on project sensitive receptors would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Cumulative Impacts

Impact NS-4: *Related project buildout would cumulatively increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site* (Class II). The cumulative noise impacts on the proposed project would include vehicular traffic traveling on the completed Cathedral Oaks Overpass, and cumulative buildout identified by the City of Goleta, and Year 2020 traffic volumes on US 101.

Future Cathedral Oaks Overpass

The Cathedral Oaks Overpass project is planned for the U.S. 101/Hollister Avenue interchange. The project includes the relocation and construction of a new freeway and railroad overcrossing that would form the south leg off the intersection of Calle Real at Cathedral Oaks Road. Data provided by ATE (2008) indicates Year 2020 traffic volumes on the Cathedral Oaks Overpass to be approximately 6,000 ADT. The Cathedral Oaks Overpass would be located approximately 300 feet west of Haskell's Landing residences, and the overpass vehicle noise would potentially affect the westerly elevations of the westerly residences on site.

The year 2020 noise exposure to the site was analyzed with an FHWA based Vehicle Noise Prediction Model. Monitored UPRR train operations noise levels in the Acoustical Analysis Report #1136 for "The Sandpiper Residential Project", by George E. Leighton, dated 11-20-01 were reviewed and added to the US Highway 101 noise levels to acquire the combined travel corridors' noise exposure along the Northerly portion of the site.

The cumulative + Project vehicular volumes on Hollister Avenue were obtained from ATE (2008). The Year 2020 vehicular volumes for US 101 were projected

using growth SBCAG Regional Growth Forecast (2007) growth rates. The cumulative traffic volumes on the analyzed roads are:

- US Highway 101: 55,000 ADT
- Hollister Avenue: 6,300 and 6,117 ADT west and east of the project site.
- Cathedral Oaks Overpass: 6,000 ADT

The FHWA computer model used for this analysis of the noise exposure to the northerly side of the project, combines the US 101 and UPRR noise levels. The receiver locations were modeled to reflect a worse case situation, i.e., at the patios and balconies nearest to the UPRR, Hollister Avenue and the Cathedral Oaks Overpass. A printout of the FHWA model calculations is included in Attachment 7. The results of future noise level analysis are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Year 2020 Exterior CNEL Noise Levels

Modeling Location		**Noise Source**	**Calculated CNEL**	
Orientation	*Receiver*		*Without Wall*	*With Wall*
North	1st Fl Patio	US Highway 101 + UPRR	69 CNEL	61 CNEL
North	2nd Fl Balcony	US Highway 101 + UPRR	69 CNEL	65 CNEL
South	1st Fl Patio	Hollister Avenue	64 CNEL	N/A
South	2nd Fl Balcony	Hollister Avenue	64 CNEL	N/A
West	1st Fl Patio	Cathedral Oaks Overpass	50 CNEL	N/A
West	2nd Fl Balcony	Cathedral Oaks Overpass	52 CNEL	N/A

The calculated cumulative noise exposure levels shown in Table 8 indicate that UPRR and year 2020 vehicle exterior noise levels would exceed 65 dBA CNEL. Impacts would be *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (Class II) (see Mitigation Measure NS-5).

Impact NS-5: *Construction of a County Fire Station No. 11 adjacent and west of the project site would not substantially increase cumulative continuous ambient noise levels (CNEL) in the vicinity of the project site, but could result in single-event, nuisance noise* (Class I). The intensity of continuous, operation vehicular trips associated with a proposed County Fire Station 10 west of the proposed project site would be extremely low, given the low number of employee and delivery trips throughout the day. Single-event, nuisance noise such as sirens would be expected to occur, however. Consistent with the assessment of such single-event nuisance noises in the City's General Plan EIR Impact 3.11-1, (City of Goleta, 2006), it is possible that there would be "occasional instances where practical limitation will preclude reducing noise to a less than significant level. This impact is therefore considered to be *significant and unavoidable*" (Class I).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

NS-1 Noise generating construction activity for site preparation and for future development shall be limited to the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and no construction shall occur on State holidays (e.g. Christmas, Thanksgiving, Memorial Day, 4th of July, Labor Day). Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (in the event of an emergency, for example) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Director of Planning & Environmental Services. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions. Prior to commencement of activities such as pile driving operations, neighbors within the vicinity of the site shall be notified not less than 72 hours in advance of commencement. Said notice shall provide neighbors with the anticipated time and duration of such activities and shall be reissued if there is a substantial change in scheduling. **Plan Requirements**: Two signs stating these restrictions shall be provided by the applicant and posted on site prior to commencement of construction. **Timing**: The signs shall be in place prior to beginning of and throughout all grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits. *(Addresses Impact NOI-1)*

Monitoring: City staff shall spot check to verify compliance and/or respond to complaints.

NS-2 Stationary construction equipment that generates noise that exceeds 65 dBA at the project boundaries shall be shielded with the most modern and effective noise control devices, i.e., mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures to City staff's satisfaction and shall be located at a minimum of 200 feet from occupied residences and other noise sensitive uses as far as possible from the eastern property line of the project site. All equipment shall be properly maintained to ensure that no additional noise, due to worn or improperly maintained parts, would be generated. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The equipment area with appropriate acoustic shielding shall be designated on building and grading plans. Equipment and shielding shall remain in the designated location throughout construction activities. *(Addresses Impact NOI-1)*

Monitoring: City staff shall perform site inspections to ensure compliance.

NS-3 Temporary noise barriers shall be used and relocated as needed to block line-of-sight between project construction equipment and the eastern property boundary (Ellwood Elementary School) and southeastern property boundary (Ali D'Oro residential development) to reduce effects of construction noise on these sensitive receptors below 65 dBA CNEL. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The sound walls shall be included on

the grading plan, and reviewed and approved by City staff prior to approval of any LUP for the project. The measure shall be implemented during construction. *(Addresses Impact NOI-1)*

Monitoring: City staff shall verify as to plan in the field during construction.

NS-4 The project applicants shall notify the sensitive noise receptors in advance of any and all construction activities. The construction manager's (or representative's) telephone number shall also be provided with the notification so that community concerns can be communicated. **Plan Requirements:** This notification clause shall be included on the grading plan, and reviewed and approved by City staff prior to approval of any LUP for the project. **Timing:** The measure shall be implemented prior to and during construction. *(Addresses Impact NOI-1)*

Monitoring: City staff shall verify as to plan in the field during construction.

NS-5 The proposed 6-feet high sound wall to be constructed along the project's northerly property line shall be extended approximately 50 feet southward along the northwest and northeast property boundaries, in order to ensure that 1st floor patios and second story balconies on the northwest and northeast project site corners are properly attenuated (see Figure 18). The 6-feet sound wall height shall be measured from the 1st floor building elevation. The sound wall shall be constructed of any masonry or other material, such as wood or earthen berm, with a surface density of at least 4 pounds per square foot. The sound wall shall present a solid surface and have no openings or cracks. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The sound wall location, construction material, base elevation and overall height shall be incorporated on building plans and reviewed and approved by a City staff and DRB prior to final map recordation. *(Addresses Impact NOI-3)*

Monitoring: City staff shall perform plan and site inspection to ensure compliance prior to occupancy clearance.

The following measure would be required to ensure that second story residential interior living areas are attenuated to 45 or less dBA CNEL under cumulative development scenarios.

NS-6 Second story structure windows adjacent to Hollister Avenue shall be double-glazed or incorporated with other suitable noise-attenuating design to reduce interior noise exposure to 45 dBA CNEL or below. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Noise attenuation design for second-floor window designs for structures adjacent to Hollister Avenue shall be developed by a City-approved acoustic engineer and designated on the building plan. City staff shall review and approve the building plan prior to land use clearance. *(Addresses Impact NOI-3)*

Monitoring: Building Inspectors shall inspect in the field to ensure compliance prior to occupancy clearance.

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual impacts on noise would be less than significant. The potential for single-event, nuisance noise associated with a future County Fire Station No. 11 west of the project site would be remain *significant and unavoidable*.

9. Public Services

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified *significant and unavoidable* impacts (Class I) on the Ellwood Elementary School capacity associated with project buildout, and adverse, but less than significant impact son Goleta Valley Junior High School and Dos Pueblos High School. Impacts on solid waste were *significant and unavoidable* impacts (Class I).

The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR identified the *adverse, but less than significant* impacts (Class II) on all public services.

The City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR (City of Goleta 2006) identified *significant but feasibly mitigated impacts* (Class II) on fire protection (Impact 3.12-2) on fire protection resulting from adoption of Policies PF 3 (Public Safety Services and Facilities), PF 9 (Coordination of Facilities with Future Development), and SE 7 (Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards).

Haskell's Landing Project

The proposed project would not result in changes to public services impacts described in The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR.

Project-Specific Impacts

The hotel component of the Specific Plan would still result in the following impacts:

Impact PF-1: *The proposed project would contribute to demands on police protection services (Class III).* Less than significant impacts of 101 residential units on police protection would be reduced from those of the 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project.

Impact PF-2: *The proposed project would contribute to demands on schools (Class III).* Less than significant impacts of 101 residential units on local school enrollment would be reduced from those of the 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project.

Impact PF-3: *The proposed project short-term construction would contribute to demands on solid waste disposal (Class II).* Significant, but feasibly mitigated impacts of the 101 residential unit project construction related to solid waste disposal would be reduced from those of the 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project.

Impact PF-4: *The proposed project would contribute to demands on solid waste disposal Class II).* Operational, long-term significant, but feasibly mitigated impacts on solid waste disposal associated with occupation of 101 residential units would be reduced from those of the 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project.

Impact PF-5: *The proposed project wastewater demand would contribute to the Goleta West Sanitary District flows to the wastewater treatment plant, but the extension of service would not be growth-inducing* (Class III). Operational, long-term wastewater treatment impacts associated with occupation of 101 residential units would be reduced from those of the 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project.

Impact PF-6: *Identification of a County Fire Station No. 10 adjacent to the project site would ensure adequate fire protection to the project site and the western Hollister Avenue area (Class IV).* The Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR (City of Goleta 2006) identified an existing deficiency in fire protection services in Goleta area. Specifically, the City would not meet acceptable ratios for: overall firefighters to residents (the 1:4,000 ratio is exceeded: 1:4,909); 4-person engine crews to residents (1:16,000 ratio is not met: the two existing stations each have 3-person crews); and 5-minute response time (the western edge of the Goleta area exceeds this standard). Therefore, any new development in the project site vicinity would contribute to a significant, adverse impact on fire protection. Identification of the parcel directly west of the project site for the future County Fire Station No. 10, and the proposed Ordinance Amendment and Development Agreement that would construct the station and provide for infrastructure, would provide for this regional fire protection facility, and would ensure consistency with Public Safety and Services Facility Policy 3.2. Project specific impacts on fire protection would be less than significant; the contribution to regional fire protection services would be *beneficial* (Class IV).

Cumulative Impacts

Impact PF-7: *The proposed project would contribute incrementally to regional demands on schools (Class I).* The project's contribution resulting from occupation of 101 residential units on local school enrollment would be reduced from those of the 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project.

Impact PF-8: *The proposed project would contribute incrementally to regional demands on solid waste disposal (Class I).* The project's contribution resulting

from occupation of 101 residential units on solid waste generation would be reduced from those of the 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be required:

PF-1 Demolition and/or excess construction materials shall be recycled where applicable (i.e., wood, cardboard, concrete, and asphalt). The applicant shall submit a Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Applicant shall submit a Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan for review and approval by City staff with submittal of LUPs.

Monitoring: City staff shall review and approve Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

PF-2 The applicant/permittee and all future tenants shall develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Program, including designated storage areas for recyclable materials, provision of recycling bins at the construction site, separation of construction materials, and composting of lawn clippings and other landscape materials. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Applicant shall submit a Solid Waste Management Plan for review and approval by City staff with submittal of LUPs.

Monitoring: City staff shall review and approve Solid Waste Management Plan prior to approval of any LUP for the project.

PF-3 The applicant shall notify the Goleta Union School District and Santa Barbara High School District of the expected buildout date of the project to allow the Districts to plan in advance for new students. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: A copy of the notice shall be sent to the City prior to submittal of LUPs.

Monitoring: City staff shall review and approve Solid Waste Reduction Plan prior to approval of any LUP for the project.

PF-4 A Can and Will Serve ("CAWS) letter from GWSD shall be provided indicating that adequate water treatment capacity is available to serve the project upon demand and without exception (or equivalent guarantee). Based on the final construction drawings, the applicant shall pay the following fees as determined by GWSD: (i) sewer connection fees; and (ii) mitigation fees to offset the difference between allocated capacity to the site and projected volumes attributable to the proposed hotel, if any. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: A CAWS shall be forwarded to the City of Goleta prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: A connection permit issued by GWSD, along with evidence that sewer connection and mitigation fees have been paid, shall be submitted to the City prior to and as a condition precedent to approval of any LUP for the project. City staff shall withhold occupancy until all necessary permanent or temporary measures have been taken to accommodate effluent from the hotel to the satisfaction of GWSD.

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, project-specific impacts from increased generation of solid waste and wastewater would be *less than significant*. Project contributions to cumulative impacts on schools and solid waste would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

10. Recreation

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified project contributions to cumulative impacts on recreational opportunities resulting from increased population as *significant and unavoidable* (Class I). The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR identified *significant and unavoidable* impacts on the demand on existing recreational trails in the area. Project-specific and contributions to cumulative impacts on recreational facilities were *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Haskell's Landing Project

Project-Specific Impacts

The proposed project would not result in changes to recreation impacts described in The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR.

Impact REC-1: *The proposed project would increase demands on adjacent coastal trails and beaches.* (Class I) The project's contribution to impacts on existing trails and beaches resulting from occupation of 101 residential units on local school enrollment would be reduced from those of the 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project. The project population would be reduced from 357 to 303 residents. The project-specific contribution would remain *significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

Impact REC-2: *The proposed project would increase demands on regional recreational facilities.* (Class II) The project's contribution to impacts on regional recreational facilities resulting from occupation of 101 residential units on local school enrollment would be reduced from those of the 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project. The project population would be reduced from 357 to 303 residents. The project's impact would remain *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Cumulative Impacts

Impact REC-3: *The proposed project would increase demands on regional recreational facilities.* (Class II) The project's contribution to cumulative impacts on regional recreational facilities resulting from occupation of 101 residential units on local school enrollment would be reduced from those of the 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project. The project's contribution would remain *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be required:

REC-1 The applicant shall provide for a pedestrian controlled signalized crosswalk at the comer of Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Road to provide a safe pedestrian crossing to the adjacent Santa Barbara Shores County Park. **Plan Requirements:** Construction plans for this improvement shall be reviewed and approved by City staff with submittal of LUPs. **Timing:** Improvements shall be implemented prior to occupancy. *(Addresses Impact REC-1)*

Monitoring: Community Services shall verify implementation of improvements pursuant to approved plans.

REC-2 Recreational facilities such as play structures shall be developed within common open space areas. **Plan Requirements:** Design of the facilities shall be submitted for review and approval by City staff. Provisions for maintenance shall be discussed in the project CC&R's to be reviewed and approved by the City staff. **Timing:** Plans shall be submitted prior to LUP approval. Recreational facilities shall be installed prior to occupancy clearance*. (Addresses Impacts RES-1, RES-2, and RES-3)*

Monitoring: City staff shall review plans prior to Coastal Development clearance.

Residual Impacts

The residual effect of Impact REC-1 would remain *significant and unavoidable.* Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual Impacts REC-2 and REC-3 would be *less than significant.*

11. Traffic and Circulation

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified impacts on short-term impacts transportation and circulation during the construction of U.S. 101/Hollister Avenue interchange improvements as significant and unavoidable. All operational, long-term impacts were considered *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class I). The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR identified *significant and unavoidable* impacts on the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection. All other impacts on intersections were adverse, but less than significant (Class III).

Haskell's Landing Project

Associated Transportation Engineers (ITE) prepared a recent traffic study (April 2008) that has been peer reviewed by the City of Goleta (the study is included as Attachment 8). The study assesses the proposed project relative to the existing roadway network setting. This study finds that no new significant traffic impacts would result from proposed project development and operations.

Existing A.M. and P.M. peak hour volumes for the study-area were derived from traffic counts completed by the City of Goleta in February of 2008 (traffic count data is contained in the Technical Attachment for reference). (Existing A.M. and P.M. peak hour traffic volumes for the study-area intersections are shown on Attachment 8, Figures 4 and 5). Levels of service for the signalized study-area intersections were calculated based on the "Intersection Capacity Utilization" (ICU) methodology. Levels of service were calculated for unsignalized intersections using the methodology outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)4 and are based on the average weighted delay for the stop-sign controlled movements. Table 9 lists the existing intersection levels of service (calculation worksheets are contained in Attachment 8).

The data presented in Table 9 shows that all of the study-area intersections currently operate at LOS C or better during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours. These levels of service are considered acceptable based on the City of Goleta's LOS C operating standard for intersections.

[4] 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, 2000.

Table 9. Existing Intersection Levels of Service

Intersection	Control	A.M. Peak		P.M. Peak	
		ICU/Delay	LOS	ICU/Delay	LOS
Hollister Ave/Calle Real(a)	Stop	19.2 sec.	C	13.1 sec.	B
Cathedral Oaks Road/Calle Real(a)	Stop	10.5 sec.	B	9.5 sec.	A
Winchester Cyn Rd/Calle Real-U.S. 101 NB (a)	Stop	8.0 sec.	A	8.3 sec.	A
Hollister Ave/U.S. 101 NB On-Ramp(a)	-	8.7 sec.	A	8.4 sec.	A
Hollister Avenue/U.S. 101 SB Ramps(a)	Stop	11.6 sec.	B	9.6 sec	A
Hollister Avenue/Sandpiper-Bacara Driveway	Stop	10.3 sec.	B	10.8 sec.	B
U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Storke Road	Signal	0.66	B	0.65	B
U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road	Signal	0.71	C	0.73	C
Hollister Avenue/Storke Road	Signal	0.63	B	0.77	C

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts on transportation would still apply to the proposed project.

Impact TR-1. *Short-term construction traffic would potentially impact local roadways and intersections (Class II).* Heavy equipment traffic on local roadways would affect local signalized intersections. Impacts would be *significant but feasibly mitigated*.

Impact TR-2. *Long-term project residency would generate adverse, but less than significant additional traffic volumes on adjacent roadways (Class III).* Trip generation estimates were calculated for the project based on the rates presented in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual.[5] The rates for Single Family Housing (Land Use Code 210) and Town home/Condominiums (Land Use Code 230) were used to forecast project traffic. Table 10 presents the average daily and peak hour trip generation forecasts for the Project.

[5] Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 7th edition, 2003.

Table 10. Project Trip Generation

Land Use	Size	Average Daily		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips
Single Family Dwelling	47 Units	9.57	450	0.75	35	1.01	47
Condominiums	55 Units	5.86	322	0.44	24	0.52	29
Total			**772**		**59**		**76**

The average daily, A.M. and P.M. peak hour trips generated by the project were distributed onto the study-area street network based on the percentages shown in Table 11 and on Figure 6, Attachment 8. Trip distribution percentages were developed based on previous documents prepared for the project as well as input from City of Goleta staff. Figure 7, Attachment 8 presents the project-added traffic volumes.

Table 11. Project Trip Distribution

Origin/Destination	Direction	Percentage
U.S. 101 - Via Hollister Avenue - Via Storke Road	East West East	45% 5% 5%
Hollister Avenue	East of Storke Road	10%
Storke Road	South of Hollister Avenue	15%
Cathedral Oaks Road	East	5%
Local	Shopping Centers / Schools	15%
	Total	**100%**

Table 12 lists the Existing + Project roadway volumes and identifies the impacts of the traffic additions based on the City of Goleta's capacity thresholds. Existing + Project ADT volumes are presented on Figure 8, Attachment 8.

Table 12. Existing + Project Roadway Volumes

Roadway Segment	Acceptable Capacity	Existing ADT	Project Added ADT	% Change	Impact?
Hollister Avenue w/o Project Site	14,300	5,750	425 ADT	7.4%	No
Hollister Avenue e/o Project Site	34,000	5,650	347 ADT	6.1%	No
Storke Road n/o Hollister Ave.	34,000	**35,850**	39 ADT	0.1%	No

Bolded Items exceed the Acceptable Capacity.

The data presented in Table 12 show that the project would generate *adverse, but less than significant impacts* (Class III) on the study-area roadways based on the City's capacity thresholds.

Impact TR-3: *The proposed project would generate additional traffic that would have adverse, but less than significant impacts on project area intersections (Class III).* Levels of service for the study-area intersections were re-calculated with the project-added traffic. Tables 13 and 14 compare the A.M. and P.M. Existing and Existing + Project levels of service, respectively, and identify project-specific impacts based on the City's thresholds. Existing + Project traffic volumes are presented on Figures 9 and 10, Attachment 8.

Tables 13 and 14 indicate that study-area intersections are forecast to operate at LOS C or better under the Existing + Project scenario. The project would have adverse, but less than significant impacts on all study-area intersections based on the City's project-specific thresholds.

Table 13. Existing + Project A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service

Intersection	Existing		Existing+Project		Project-Added Trips	Impact?
	ICU/Delay	LOS	ICU/Delay	LOS		
Hollister Avenue/Calle Real (a)	19.2 sec.	C	19.7 sec.	C	9	No
Cathedral Oaks Road/Calle Real (a)	10.5 sec.	B	10.5 sec.	B	9	No
Winchester Cyn Road/Calle Real-U.S. 101 NB (a)	8.0 sec.	A	8.1 sec.	A	6	No
Hollister Ave./U.S. 101 NB On-Ramp(a)	8.7 sec.	A	8.7 sec.	A	11	No
Hollister Ave./U.S. 101 SB Ramps (a)	11.6 sec.	B	11.8 sec.	B	33	No
Hollister Ave./Sandpiper-Bacara Dwy.	10.3 sec.	B	10.4 sec.	B	33	No
U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Storke Road	0.66	B	0.66	B	1	No
U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road	0.71	C	0.71	C	3	No
Hollister Avenue/Storke Road	0.63	B	0.63	B	18	No

(a) Unsignalized intersection LOS based on average weighted control delay per vehicle in seconds.

Table 14. Existing + Project P.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service

Intersection	Existing		Existing+Project		Project-Added Trips	Impact?
	ICU/Delay	LOS	ICU/Delay	LOS		
Hollister Avenue/Calle Real (a)	13.1 sec.	B	13.7 sec.	B	26	No
Cathedral Oaks Road/Calle Real (a)	9.5 sec.	A	9.7 sec.	A	26	No
Winchester Cyn Road/Calle Real-U.S. 101 NB (a)	8.3 sec.	A	8.4 sec.	A	22	No
Hollister Ave./U.S. 101 NB On-Ramp(a)	8.4 sec.	A	8.4 sec.	A	27	No
Hollister Ave./U.S. 101 SB Ramps (a)	9.6 sec	A	9.7 sec	A	43	No
Hollister Ave./Sandpiper-Bacara Dwy.	10.8 sec.	B	11.1 sec.	B	43	No
U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Storke Road	0.65	B	0.65	B	2	No
U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road	0.73	C	0.73	C	3	No
Hollister Avenue/Storke Road	0.77	C	0.77	C	22	No

(a) Unsignalized intersection LOS based on average weighted control delay per vehicle in seconds.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative traffic analysis was completed assuming two scenarios. The first scenario assumes that no future roadway or intersection improvements would be made within the project study-area. The second scenario assumes that the future improvements programmed for the Cathedral Oaks Road/Hollister Avenue interchange at U.S. 101 are constructed and fully operational. The planned improvements assumed for the cumulative analysis are outlined in the following section.

Programmed Improvements

The City of Goleta has programmed several improvements for roadways and intersections located in the project study-area. These improvements include constructing a new freeway overcrossing at Cathedral Oaks Road that would connect to Hollister Avenue south of the U.S. 101 Freeway, forming a "T"' intersection. The existing Hollister Avenue overcrossing would be removed and a

new interchange would be constructed at the Cathedral Oaks overcrossing providing access to/from southbound U.S. 101. Access to and from northbound U.S. 101 would be provided via the existing on-ramp located at Calle Real and the existing off-ramp located at Winchester Canyon Road. It is anticipated that this improvement will meet current and future traffic needs, as well as improve traffic flow through the project area. It is noted that the future traffic controls and intersection lane geometries were reviewed with City staff prior to completing the cumulative operations analysis. (A figure illustrating the proposed traffic controls and lane geometries for the Cathedral Oaks Road overpass is contained in the Attachment 8 for reference. Attachment 8, Figure 11 illustrates the configuration of the future Cathedral Oaks Road overcrossing.)

Cumulative Traffic Volumes

TR-4: *The proposed project would generate less than significant contributions to cumulative traffic volumes on adjacent roadways (Class III).* Cumulative traffic volume forecasts were provided by City staff and include traffic generated by approved and pending projects proposed within the Goleta area (a list summarizing the approved and pending projects is contained in Attachment 8 for reference). Cumulative average daily traffic and Cumulative + Project volumes are presented on Attachment 8, Figure 12 and 13, respectively. The planned improvements would alter existing traffic patterns at the study-area intersections, but would not affect the cumulative ADT for the study-area roadways. Cumulative peak hour traffic volumes for Scenario 1 are presented on Attachment 8, Figures 14 and 15. Cumulative peak hour traffic volumes for Scenario 2 are presented on Attachment 8, Figure 16.

Table 15 lists the Cumulative and Cumulative + Project roadway volumes and identifies the impacts of the traffic additions based on the City of Goleta's capacity thresholds**.**

The data presented in Table 15 indicate that the project would have an *adverse, but less than significant* impact (Class III) on the study-area roadways based on the City's 1.0% increase threshold.

Table 15. Cumulative and Cumulative + Project Roadway Volumes

Roadway Segment	Acceptable Capacity	Cumulative ADT	Project Added ADT	% Change	Impact?
Hollister Avenue w/o Project Site	14,300	5,870	425 ADT	7.2%	No
Hollister Avenue e/o Project Site	34,000	5,770	347 ADT	6.0%	No
Storke Road n/o Hollister Ave.	34,000	**44,720**	39 ADT	0.09%	No

Bolded Items exceed the Acceptable Capacity.

TR-4: *The proposed project would generate less than significant contributions to cumulative traffic volumes on adjacent roadways* (Class III).

Levels of service for the study-area intersections were recalculated assuming the Cumulative and Cumulative + Project volumes. Tables 16 and 17 compare the Cumulative and Cumulative + Project levels of service for the study-area intersections. (Cumulative + Project (Scenario 1) peak hour traffic volumes are shown in Attachment 8, Figures 17 and 18.)

The data presented in Tables 16 and 17 indicate that the U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection is forecast to operate at LOS D during the A.M. and P.M. peak periods and the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection is forecast to operate at LOS E during the P.M. peak hour period with Cumulative traffic volumes. The project would have an *adverse, but less than significant* impact (Class III) on the study-area intersections, based on the City's cumulative impact thresholds.

Table 16. Cumulative and Cumulative +Project A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service – Scenario 1

Intersection	Cumulative		Cumulative+ Project		Project V/C Change	Impact?
	ICU/Delay	LOS	ICU/Delay	LOS		
Hollister Avenue/Calle Real (a)	20.8 sec.	C	21.4 sec.	C	-	No
Cathedral Oaks Road/Calle Real (a)	10.6 sec.	B	10.7 sec.	B	-	No
Winchester Cyn Road/Calle Real-U.S. 101 NB (a)	8.1 sec.	A	8.1 sec.	A	-	No
Hollister Ave./U.S. 101 NB On-Ramp(a)	8.8 sec.	A	8.8 sec.	A	-	No
Hollister Ave./U.S. 101 SB Ramps (a)	11.9 sec	B	12.2 sec	B	-	No
Hollister Ave./Sandpiper-Bacara Dwy.	10.7 sec.	B	10.8 sec.	B	-	No
U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Storke Road	0.73	C	0.73	C	0.00	No
U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road	**0.83**	**D**	**0.83**	**D**	0.001	No
Hollister Avenue/Storke Road	0.80	C	0.80	C	0.001	No

(a) Unsignalized intersection LOS based on average weighted control delay per vehicle in seconds.
Bolded Items exceed City's LOS C Standard.

Table 17.Cumulative and Cumulative + Project
P.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service – Scenario 1

Intersection	Cumulative		Cumulative+ Project		Project V/C Change	Impact?
	ICU/Delay	LOS	ICU/Delay	LOS		
Hollister Avenue/Calle Real (a)	12.2 sec.	B	12.7 sec.	B	-	No
Cathedral Oaks Road/Calle Real (a)	8.6 sec.	A	8.7 sec.	A	-	No
Winchester Cyn Road/Calle Real-U.S. 101 NB (a)	8.5 sec.	A	8.6 sec.	A	-	No
Hollister Ave./U.S. 101 NB On-Ramp(a)	8.0 sec.	A	8.0 sec.	A	-	No
Hollister Ave./U.S. 101 SB Ramps (a)	11.3 sec	B	11.6 sec	B	-	No
Hollister Ave./Sandpiper-Bacara Dwy.	11.6 sec.	B	12.1 sec.	B	-	No
U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Storke Road	0.75	C	0.75	C	0.00	No
U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road	**0.89**	**D**	**0.89**	**D**	0.00	No
Hollister Avenue/Storke Road	**0.95**	**E**	**0.96**	**E**	0.001	No

(a) Unsignalized intersection LOS based on average weighted control delay per vehicle in seconds.
Bolded Items exceed City=s LOS C Standard.

Scenario 2 assumes completion of the Cathedral Oaks Road overcrossing and interchange improvements. Levels of service for the study-area intersections are shown on Tables 18 and 19.

Table 18. Cumulative and Cumulative + Project
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service - Scenario 2

Intersection	Cumulative		Cumulative + Project		Impact?
	ICU/Delay	LOS	ICU/Delay	LOS	
U.S. 101 NB Ramp/Calle Real	7.5 sec.	A	7.5 sec.	A	No
Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real	17.9 sec.	C	18.5 sec.	C	No
Cathedral Oaks /U.S. 101 SB Ramps	11.0 sec	B	11.1 sec	B	No
Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Ave.	11.0 sec.	B	11.4 sec.	B	No

Table 19. Cumulative and Cumulative + Project P.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service - Scenario 2

Intersection	Cumulative		Cumulative+ Project		Impact?
	ICU/Delay	LOS	ICU/Delay	LOS	
U.S. 101 NB Ramp/Calle Real	7.5 sec.	A	7.5 sec.	A	No
Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real	12.3 sec.	B	13.1 sec.	B	No
Cathedral Oaks /U.S. 101 SB Ramps	10.7 sec	B	11.5 sec	B	No
Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Ave.	10.0 sec.	A	10.4 sec.	B	No

The data presented in Tables 18 and 19 indicate that the study-area intersections would operate at LOS C or better with Cumulative + Project traffic volumes assuming the programmed improvements. The project would have an *adverse, but less than significant* impact (Class III) on the study-area intersections, based on the City's cumulative impact thresholds.

Site Access and Circulation

Access to the site would be provided via a new connection to Hollister Avenue and a connection via Las Armas Road (see Figure 2 and 3). Parking for the project would be provided in two-car garages (market rate single family and Town home units), one-car garages, and uncovered parking (affordable Town home units), as well as 20 visitor parking spaces located throughout the site.

Las Armas Road: The section of Las Armas Road adjacent to the project site is 16-feet wide and unimproved, with parking on the dirt shoulder area. The project would be required to construct half-street improvements from Hollister Avenue to Road "C" along the project frontage. These improvements to Las Armas Drive would provide the required sight distance for vehicles entering or exiting from the site. Project impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Left-turn Storage: The project would generate 12 P.M. peak hour left-turns from Hollister Avenue to the Hollister Avenue driveway and 15 P.M. peak hour left-turns from Hollister Avenue to Las Armas Road. These left-turns volumes would be accommodated by left-turn lanes on to Hollister Avenue, which would be completed as part of the project frontage improvements. Project impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Driveway Operations: Levels of service were calculated for the two proposed access points using the Cumulative + Project peak hour driveway volumes (see Attachment 8, Figure 20). The project driveway on Hollister Avenue is forecast to operate at LOS B (11.0 sec.) during the A.M. peak hour and at LOS A (9.9 sec.) during the P.M. peak hour. The Las Armas Road/Hollister Avenue is forecast to operate at LOS B (11.0 sec.) during the A.M. peak hour and at LOS B (10.1 sec.) during the P.M. peak hour under the Cumulative + Project scenario. These operations show that the driveways would adequately accommodate project

traffic, such that project impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Internal Street System: The project site plan shows a circular internal street system with 28-foot street widths. Given the 28-foot width, it is recommended that on-street parking be prohibited on one side of the road.

Parking: On-site parking is provided in accordance with the City's Zoning Ordinance parking requirements. The Zoning Ordinance requires the project to provide a total of 218 parking spaces (198 Resident/20 Visitor). The project provides a total of 258 parking spaces. These include 218 Resident spaces and 40 visitor spaces of which 173 are enclosed, 40 driveway guest, and 45 on-street. The spaces meet the Zoning Ordinance requirement and providing a reserve of 40 on-site spaces. An additional 59 additional parking spaces would be available within the longer driveways that serve a portion of the residential units. An additional estimated 20 parking spaces would also become available on Las Armas Road as a result of the improvements mentioned above.

School Safety: Potential project traffic impacts to the operation of the Ellwood School were also evaluated. It is estimated that the project would add 24 vehicles in front of the school on Hollister Avenue during the A.M. peak hour, 5 westbound and 19 eastbound. The addition of trips (one car every 2 2 minutes) of this magnitude during the A.M. peak hour would not significantly impact the operations of the school, given the traffic signal which has been installed at the school entrance/exit.

The project description includes widening Hollister Avenue adjacent to the site, providing curb, gutter, sidewalk, and bicycle facilities. Additionally, a pedestrian path would be constructed within the City right-of-way along the north side of Hollister Avenue, extending from the project site eastward to Ellwood Elementary School in order to ensure safe pedestrian access between the two sites. Project impacts would be *adverse but less than significant* (Class III).

Proposed General Plan Policy TE 13.4 language would not allow for any proposed development to occur until demonstrated funding were available to support necessary Capital Improvement Projects. No impacts on transportation result from this proposed change.

Congestion Management Program (CMP)

The Storke Rd/U.S. 101 NB Ramps, Storke Road/U.S. 101 SB Ramps, and Storke Road /Hollister Avenue intersections are located within the CMP network.

Project Specific Impacts

The CMP intersections are forecast to operate at LOS C or better with Existing + Project traffic volumes (see Attachment 8, Tables 6 and 7). Project impacts on the CMP system would be *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Cumulative Impacts

The Storke Road/U.S. 101 SB Ramps intersection is forecast to operate at LOS D, and the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection is forecast to operate at LOS E during the P.M. peak hour under Cumulative + Project conditions (see Attachment 8, Table 10). The project would add less than 20 trips to the Storke Road/U.S. 101 SB Ramps intersection; therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts on the Storke Road/U.S. 101 SB Ramps intersection would *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III). The project would add more than 10 trips at the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection, exceeding the CMP criteria.

The CMP requires that deficiency plans be prepared when an intersection reaches LOS E. The City of Goleta has adopted LOS C as the acceptable operating standard for intersections, with the exception of the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection, in which case LOS D is acceptable. The City of Goleta has programmed improvements for the Storke Road corridor, which would return service levels at the U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection to LOS C, and return service levels at the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection to LOS D. These improvements would meet City standards and remain consistent with the CMP criteria. The proposed project would be required to contribute traffic fees to the Goleta Transportation Improvement Program (GTIP) for implementation of the planned improvements. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts on the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection would be *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Potential Freeway Impacts

The minimum CMP impact threshold for freeway segments is 50 peak hour trips. The proposed project would generate add 32 A.M. peak hour and 40 P.M. peak hour trips to U.S. 101. Based on CMP criteria, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on freeway segments would *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are required:

TR-I The applicant shall prepare a Construction Transportation Plan that designates heavy equipment routes, schedules, and the need for any special flag persons to direct traffic during peak volume periods, with special attention to Ellwood School drop-off and pick-up activity. **Plan Requirement and Timing**: The Construction Transportation Plan shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of any LUP for the project*. (Addresses Impact TR-I).*

Monitoring: City staff will monitor during construction for compliance with the approved plan.

T-2 The project applicant shall pay impact mitigation fees toward the Goleta Transportation Improvement Program (GTIP). **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The applicant shall pay GTIP fees in the amount, time and manner prescribed by Ordinance or Resolution of the City of Goleta.

Monitoring: City shall verify compliance with this mitigation measure prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

T-3 Detailed improvement plans for the proposed project shall be prepared for review and approval by the City's Community Services Department. The drawings and specifications shall substantially conform to the Preliminary Development Plans and incorporate Community Service Department required improvements for the proposed driveways (on Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Road), and frontage improvements along both Hollister Avenue and Las Armas Road. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The project plans shall be revised, as appropriate, for review and approval by the City's Community Services Department prior to and as a condition precedent to issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: Community Services Department shall verify compliance with the requirement for submittal of final plans. City staff shall inspect and approve the completed street improvements prior to any occupancy clearance.

TR-4 The street system shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department and designed to provide adequate access and circulation for emergency vehicles. **Plan Requirement and Timing:** Review by the Fire Department shall be verified by the Community Services Department prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. *(Addresses Impact TR-4)*

Monitoring: Community Services Department shall verify implementation of improvements pursuant to approved plans.

TR-5 The project shall be responsible for widening Hollister Avenue adjacent to the site frontage. This widening shall be completed according to the County's arterial standards and include curb, gutter and sidewalk. The improvements shall provide the required sight distance for vehicles entering or exiting the site. **Plan Requirement:** Construction plans for these improvements shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Services Department prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. **Timing:** Improvements shall be implemented prior to occupancy, or as directed by the Community Services Department. *(Addresses Impact TR-4)*

Monitoring: Community Services Department shall verify implementation of improvements pursuant to approved plans.

TR-6 The project shall construct half-street improvements on Las Armas Road from Hollister Avenue to Campasino Drive along the project frontage. The improvements shall provide the required sight distance for vehicles entering or exiting from the site. **Plan Requirement:** Construction plans for these improvements shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Services Department prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. **Timing:** Improvements shall be implemented prior to occupancy. *(Addresses Impact TR-4)*

Monitoring: Community Services Department shall verify implementation of improvements pursuant to approved plans.

TR-7 The project shall provide for a striped left-turn pocket at the Road A and Las Armas Road intersections with Hollister Avenue throughout the construction of probable future projects along the western Hollister Avenue corridor. **Plan Requirement:** A Hollister Avenue striping plan including this improvement shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Services Department prior to issuance of any LUP for the project. **Timing:** Improvements shall be implemented prior to occupancy. *(Addresses Impact TR-5)*

Monitoring: Community Services Department shall verify implementation of improvements pursuant to approved plans.

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project specific and cumulative traffic impacts would be *less than significant*.

12. Water Resources

Water Supply

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified *adverse but less than significant* impacts (Class III) on water resources related to internal and external residential demand. The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR also identified the same project specific and contributions to cumulative impacts on water resources, as *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Haskell's Landing Project

The proposed project would not result in changes to water impacts described in The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR.

Project-Specific Impact

The proposed project would still contribute to the following impacts:

Impact WR-1: *Proposed residential development would Increase the demand on local water supplies, but would be less than significant (Class III).* As previously stated for the larger 119-unit Residences at Sandpiper project, additional water service granted by the Goleta Water District does not have the potential to cause or contribute to groundwater basin overdraft due to the GWD's compliance with the Wright Judgment. Impacts would remain *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Cumulative Impact

Impact WR-2: *The proposed residential development's contribution to cumulative impacts on regional water supply demand would be less than significant (Class III).* All projects seeking water service from the Goleta Water District would not have the potential to cause or contribute to groundwater basin overdraft due to the GWD's compliance with the Wright Judgment. Cumulative impacts would remain *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III).

Mitigation Measures

The following measure is recommended to maximize the project's consistency with Goleta General Plan Conservation Element 15.3, Water Conservation for New Development.

WR-1 Outdoor water use shall be limited through the following measures: (i) landscaping shall be primarily with native and/or drought tolerant species; (ii) drip irrigation or other water-conserving methods shall be used; (iii) plant material shall be grouped by water needs; (iv) extensive mulching shall be used to improve water holding capacity of the soil by reducing evaporation and soil compaction; (v) soil moisture sensing devices shall be installed to prevent un-necessary irrigation; and reclaimed water shall be used for all common area exterior landscaping as feasible. Indoor water use shall be limited through the following measures: (i) all hot water lines shall be insulated; (ii) recirculating, point-of-use, on-demand or other energy efficient water heaters shall be installed; (iii) water efficient clothes washers and dishwashers shall be installed; and (iv) lavatories and drinking fountains shall be equipped with self-closing valves. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The outdoor water conserving measures shall be incorporated into the final landscape plan that is submitted for review and approval by DRB. Documentation shall be provided verifying the efforts made to procure reclaimed water for irrigation purposes. If available, irrigation plans shall identify the necessary fixtures and separate plumbing systems to allow for this use. The indoor water-conserving measures shall be graphically depicted on building plans and approved prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall inspect and verify installation of all water conserving measures prior to occupancy clearance.

Residual Impacts

Incorporation of this measure would minimize less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts on water supply.

Surface Water Quality and Flooding

Previous Review

The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9) identified *significant but feasibly mitigated* impacts (Class II) on surface water quality and flooding. The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR also identified the same project specific and contributions to cumulative impacts on water resources, as *significant but feasibly mitigated* (Class II).

Haskell's Landing Project

The proposed project would not result in changes to water impacts described in The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR.

Project-Specific Impacts

Impact WR-3: *Increased runoff from increased impervious surfaces could result in sedimentation and therefore decreased water quality in Devereux Slough (Class II).*

Impact WR-3 *Increased runoff could also potentially result in decreased water quality in Devereux Creek due to runoff of oil and grease from the parking lots and runoff of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers from landscaped areas (Class II).*

Impact WR-4 *Siltation of the UPRR culvert, located immediately north of the project site along Devereux Creek, would continue to result in divergence of normal creek flow away from the project site (Class II).*

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would still contribute to the following cumulative impacts:

Impact WR-5 *The proposed project increased runoff would potentially contribute to cumulative decreased water quality in Devereux Creek and watershed (Class II).*

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required.

WR-2 To reduce and filter stormwater runoff leaving the project site, the project plans shall incorporate BMPs in compliance with the City's Stormwater Management Program Ordinance and draft NPDES permit (and component Stormwater Management Plan) including, but not limited to: installation of an on-site fossil filter to pre-treat surface water before entering into storm drain system and Devereux Creek , erosion control and sediment discharge measures during construction, and development of bioswales on-site. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Design details of the bioswales and other operational features shall be submitted to DRB and City staff for review and approval prior and as a condition precedent to issuance of any LUP for the project. Erosion control and sediment discharge measures shall be specified on a separate sheet attached to the grading and building plans. These measures shall be implemented during and after project construction, as appropriate after installation, the applicant shall be responsible for on-going maintenance of all on-site storm water pollution control devices in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.

Monitoring: City staff shall perform periodic site inspections to verify compliance as well as contact the designated monitor as necessary to ensure compliance with maintenance requirements.

WR-3 A pesticide, herbicide and fertilizer maintenance plan shall be prepared that minimizes their use, particularly during the rainy season. Biodegradable pesticides and herbicides shall be maximized. Grasses not generally susceptible to pest disease shall be planted in turf areas. **Plan Requirement and Timing**: The landscape plan shall include this maintenance plan component, which shall be reviewed and approved by DRB and City staff prior to issuance of LUPs.

Monitoring: City staff shall periodically inspect and verify compliance with the approved maintenance plan.

WR-4 To ensure adequate design and sizing of drainage conveyance infrastructure (drop inlets, outlet pipes, connections to existing infrastructure, flood water retention areas, etc.) and positive drainage from north of the project site southward through Devereux Creek, final grading and drainage plans shall be reviewed and approved by Community Services, Caltrans, and UPRR staff prior to Land Use Permits to prevent on- and off-site flooding (in particular, to ensure effective drainage from the UPRR culvert north of the project site) and to ensure compliance with the Stormwater Management Program. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Detailed final grading and drainage plans shall be submitted to Community Services and Planning & Environmental Services staff for review and approval prior to and as a condition precedent to issuance of any LUP for the project. After installation, the applicant shall be responsible for on-going maintenance of drainage infrastructure.

Monitoring: City staff shall review plans to ensure appropriate grading and drainage design prior to issuance of LUPs and shall perform periodic site inspections to verify installation according to approved grading an drainage plan as well to verify on-going maintenance.

WR-5 Dog waste pollution shall be minimized in the vicinity of Devereux Creek. Mutt-mitt dispensers shall be installed on both sides of the creek. **Plan Requirement and Timing**: The location of Mutt-mitt dispensers shall be included on the landscaping plan, which shall be reviewed and approved by DRB and City staff prior to issuance of LUPs.

Monitoring: City staff shall periodically inspect and verify compliance with the approved landscaping plan.

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual impacts associated with project-specific and cumulative water supply and water quality impacts would be less than significant.

F. FINDINGS

It is the finding of the Planning and Environmental Services Department that the previous environmental document as herein amended may be used to fulfill the environmental review requirements of the current project. Because the current project meets the conditions for the application of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, preparation of a new EIR is not required. CEQA Section 15164 allows an Addendum to be prepared when only minor technical changes or changes that do not create new significant impacts would result. The Aradon EIR (94-EIR-9), the Sandpiper Residences Supplemental EIR, and Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR are hereby amended by this 15164 letter for the Haskell's Landing Project.

G. REFERENCES

California State Lands Commission. 2007. *Venoco Ellwood Marine Terminal Lease Renewal EIR (CSLC EIR No. 743).* Prepared by Marine Research Specialists and SAIC.

California Air Resources Board. June 2005*. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective.* http://www.arb.ca.gov/chlhandbook.pdf (CARB, 2005)

California Air Resources Board. December 1, 2006. *Public Workshop to Discuss Establishing the 1990 Emissions Level and the California 2020 Limit and Developing Regulations to Require Reporting of Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, Sacramento, CA, (CARB, 2006)

California Air Resources Board. 2007. *California 1990 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Level and 2020 Emissions Limit.*(CARB, 2007a)

California Air Resources Board. 2007. *Climate Change: Information Regarding ARB's Climate Change Program Pursuant to 2006 Assembly Bill 32,* (web page), last updated July 17, 2007, http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/cc.htm, accessed July 24, 2007. (CARB 2007b)

California Air Resources Board. 2008. *Ambient Air Quality Standards*. http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf (CARB, 2008)

California Environmental Protection Agency, April 3, 2006. *Final 2006 Climate Action Team Report to the Governor and Legislature*. Sacramento, CA.

California Governor's Office. 2005. "Executive Order S-3-05," http://gov.ca.gov/index.php?/executive-order/1861/

California Office of Planning & Research (OPR). July 2008. *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review* Technical Advisory, http://www.opr.ca.gov.

California State Lands Commission (CSLC). 2008. Venoco Ellwood Oil Development and Pipeline (Full Field Development) Project Draft Environmental Impact Report. CSLC EIR No. 738, SCH 2006061146. Prepared by Marine Research Specialists and Science Application International Corporation. June.

City of Goleta. 2006. *General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan EIR*. Jones & Stokes.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.2007. *"Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis, Summary for Policymakers,"* http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/docs/ WG1AR4_SPM_PlenaryApproved.pdf

Harwayne, Erin. 2008. *Native Grassland Habitat Within the Haskell's Landing Project Site – 2008 Survey Results.* Letter to Chuck Lande, Chadmar Group. Denise Duffy & Associates, Inc.

Institute of Transportation Engineers. 2003. *Trip Generation*, 7th Edition.

Leighton, George E. 2001. *Acoustical Analysis Report #1136, "The Sandpiper Residential Project"*. November 20.

National Academy of Sciences. October 2005. *Understanding and Responding to Climate Change: Highlights of National Academies Reports*. http://dels.nas.edu/dels/rpt_briefs/climate-change-final.pdf

National Climatic Data Center. 2008. *Global Warming Frequently Asked Questions.* Asheville, N.C. http://lwf.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/globalwarming.html

Sanchez, Katy. 2008. Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands File Search Results for the Haskell's Landing Project. November 4.

Santa Barbara County. 2007. *Regional Growth Forecast, 2005-2040*. Santa Barbara County Association of Governments.

Snyder, Terry Snyder. 2008. Personal communication.

Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, 2000. *Highway Capacity Manual.*

United States Department of Energy, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center. *Global Fossil Fuel CO_2 Emissions*, http://cdiac@ornl.gov

United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA). 2008. "Glossary of Climate Change Terms," http://www.epa.gov /climatechange/glossary.html#Climate_change

ATTACHMENTS

1. 94-EIR-9 Summary Impact Tables

2. The Residences at Sandpiper SEIR Summary Impact Tables

3. Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR Summary Impact Table Excerpts

4. Proposed General Plan Amendments Text

5. Air Quality

6. Biological Resources

7. Noise

8. Traffic