

**ADDENDUM and ERRATA
DATED AUGUST 1, 2008**

TO THE MARRIOTT RESIDENCE INN and HOLLISTER CENTER PROJECT
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (07-MND-003)
CASE NO. 07-007-OA, -DP, -TPM and 07-167-DP AM;
6300 HOLLISTER AVENUE; APN 073-050-020

**ADDENDUM and ERRATA
DATED AUGUST 1, 2008
TO THE MARRIOTT RESIDENCE INN and HOLLISTER CENTER PROJECT
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (07-MND-003)
CASE NO. 07-007-OA, -DP, -TPM and 07-167-DP AM;
6300 HOLLISTER AVENUE; APN 073-050-020**

A. LOCATION

The Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center Project site is located at 6300 Hollister Avenue (APN 073-050-020). The property includes 10.95 acres (gross) situated on Hollister Avenue, between Robin Hill Road and La Patera Lane.

B. BACKGROUND

Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center Project MND

A Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (Draft MND) was prepared for the proposed project by the City of Goleta. The Draft MND was circulated for public review between December 14, 2007 and January 13, 2008. A Final MND was prepared and was released on April 18, 2008. The Planning Commission heard the project on April 28, 2008 and May 12, 2008. No final action was taken and the project has been revised to delete requested General Plan Amendments to Land Use Element Table 2-3 and to revise the Marriott Residence Inn building footprint. The revised project is reviewed in this addendum to the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration as per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15164. 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.

C. ADDENDUM

Based on analysis contained herein, a Mitigated Negative Declaration 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. There are no new significant impacts (i.e. no new Class I or Class II impacts) or an increase in severity of previously identified impacts (i.e. a Class III impact has not become a Class II or Class I impact; a Class II impact has not become a Class I impact). State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 provides that an addendum need not be circulated for public review, but can be included in, or attached to, the Final MND. The Guidelines further provide that the Planning Commission and City Council must consider the addendum together with the Final MND prior to taking action to approve the project.

D. ERRATA

This document also corrects the following errors in the Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center Project Final MND (07-MND-003):

1. Page 52: Hydrology and Water Quality; Item "g" is shown as "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" in error; this item refers to residential development and is not applicable to the proposed project; therefore, the item is changed to "No Impact".
2. Page 57: Land Use and Planning; Last paragraph indicates that the Ordinance Amendment is also for purposes of allowing lot coverage in excess of 35%; this paragraph is deleted, as lot coverage would be 23.14% for the proposed hotel.
3. Page 72: Transportation/Traffic; Item "a" is shown as "Less than Significant Impact" in error; the Draft MND and Final MND text indicates a potentially significant but mitigable impact; therefore, this item is changed to be consistent with the text and is changed to "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated".
4. Page 80: Transportation/Traffic; Table 4 includes an error with regard to the Robin Hill/Hollister Avenue intersection; the data in the Draft MND and Final MND text indicate that the addition of 83 trips to an intersection that operates at LOS E exceeds the adopted traffic threshold; Table 4 is corrected to show "Yes" under Project Impact for this intersection.
5. Page 85: Transportation/Traffic; Table 6 shows a cumulatively significant impact at the Robin Hill/Hollister Avenue intersection; therefore, the Cumulative Impact statement is corrected to be consistent with the data in the Draft MND and Final MND to read as follows:

Cumulatively significant impacts would occur at the Hollister Avenue/Robin Hill Road intersection.
6. Page 90: Utilities and Service Systems; change line 5 reference under Project Specific Impacts: from "GWD" to "GSD".

E. REVISED PROJECT

The project has been revised as follows:

1. General Plan Amendment: the proposed General Plan Amendment (07-007-GPA) to Table 2-3 of the Land Use Element, regarding FAR and height limitations, has been deleted as a result of the City's adoption of these changes in June 2008 (Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Track 2 Amendments).
2. Development Plan: the proposed Development Plan has been revised to change the footprint associated with the new Marriott Residence Inn structure in order to minimize impacts on cultural/archaeological resources. The primary change includes the relocation of 15 rooms from the southeast (front) corner of the

building, to the northwest (rear) corner of the building. The revised project results in the following changes to the Marriott Residence Inn Development Plan:

	<u>Original Project</u>	<u>Revised Project</u>
Size	99,298 SF	99,824 SF
FAR	0.60	0.61
Lot Coverage	38,183 SF (23.14%)	38,174 SF (23.14%)
Landscaping	31.3%	32.5%
Stories	3	3
Average Height	35 feet	35 feet
Peak Height	39 – 40.4 feet	39 – 40.4 feet
Parking (Onsite/Offsite)	129/30 spaces	129/30 spaces
Grading	500 cubic yards cut 17,200 cubic yards fill	500 cubic yards cut 17,200 cubic yards fill

The revised Marriott Residence Inn project has also resulted in minor interior floor plan changes that affect room layout, public areas, and related design adjustments.

The revised project continues to include the following applications:

Ordinance Amendment (07-007-OA): A request to amend the Goleta Municipal Code, Chapter 35, Article III (Inland Zoning Ordinance) by adding Section 35-250F. This would provide for a zoning ordinance Hotel Overlay consistent with the Hotel Overlay included on this property in the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The proposed text of this Hotel Overlay has been amended to indicate that standards are “recommended” consistent with Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Track 2 General Plan Amendments that were adopted in June 2008.

Tentative Parcel Map (07-007-TPM): A request to divide 10.95 acres into two parcels of 7.16 acres (Parcel 1; existing research park building) and 3.79 acres (Parcel 2; proposed Marriott Residence Inn).

Development Plan (07-007-DP): A request to allow the construction of a 140-room Marriott Residence Inn of 99,824 square feet (SF), patio and pool area in the center courtyard of the hotel, 129 parking spaces around the perimeter of the site, access from Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road, frontage improvements along Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road, and MTD bus stop upgrade along Hollister Avenue.

The project includes a proposed sewer lateral connection from the property to the north, through the central portion of the site (beneath the hotel), continuing to Hollister Avenue to connect to existing Goleta Sanitary District lines. An existing lift station located along

Hollister Avenue is planned to be relocated eastward on Hollister Avenue by the GSD in December 2008. Water service would be provided by the Goleta Water District. The following modifications are requested:

- A modification from the required offstreet parking area setbacks to allow encroachments into front yard setbacks along Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road (Section 35-262.a).
- A modification to allow a reduction in required parking spaces from 144 spaces to 129 spaces (Section 35-258).
- A modification to allow encroachment of the trash enclosure into the front yard setback of Robin Hill Road (Section 35-233.9.1.a).

Development Plan Amendment (07-167-DP AM): The Development Plan Amendment for the existing research park building would document the proposed parcel map that divides the property and results in the existing building on Parcel 1 (7.16 acres), would allow for the proposed reciprocal parking agreement, and would allow the request for modification of the following zoning ordinance standards to account for existing as-built non-conforming conditions:

- A modification from the required offstreet parking area setbacks to allow encroachments into front yard setbacks along Hollister Avenue and La Patera Lane (Section 35-262.a).
- A modification of landscape coverage requirements from 30% coverage to approximately 10% coverage (35-233.13.1).

F. IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES ASSOCIATED WITH THE REVISED PROJECT

1. Aesthetics/Visual Resources

The following discussion updates the aesthetics/visual description in the MND:

There are no structural changes associated with the existing research park building on proposed Parcel 1.

The proposed Marriott Residence Inn building on proposed Parcel 2 would be a 99,824 SF, 140-room, extended stay hotel. The proposed hotel would be in a U-shape configuration around a patio/pool area, framed by three building wings, each three stories in height. The main entrance would be oriented toward Hollister Avenue with access from both Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. The proposed architecture is characterized as contemporary Mediterranean with emphasis on smooth stucco finish, accent awnings, wood trellis, cornice moldings, and concrete roof tile. Average height would be 35 feet, with peak heights ranging from 39 – 40.4 feet at the top of certain roof ridges.

A total of 129 offstreet, surface parking spaces would be provided onsite and 30 additional spaces would be provided on the adjacent property through a reciprocal parking agreement between existing uses on proposed Parcel 1 and the proposed Marriott Residence Inn on proposed Parcel 2.

Frontage improvements would be provided along Hollister Avenue and Robin Hill Road. The final design of improvements along Hollister Avenue would be under the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Barbara. Proposed plans show a meandering 6-foot sidewalk and parkway and a landscaped center median. The existing MTD bus stop would be upgraded to include a pocket, shelter, bench, and trash can. Robin Hill Road improvements would include a 6-foot sidewalk and 4-foot parkway that includes street trees.

The landscape plan remains drought tolerant and native, or native in character, Mediterranean landscaping, with low intensity lighting. The plan includes trees along project frontages, at entry ways, in parking lots, and throughout the site. It also includes medium height screen shrubs, smaller shrubs, groundcover, vines, and biofiltration plants.

Earthwork volumes remain at 500 cubic yards of cut and 17,200 cubic yards of fill. Existing elevation on the property ranges from approximately 12 – 14 feet. The finished floor of the hotel structure would be at an elevation of approximately 18 feet (finished grading results in a minimum of 2 feet of fill and an average of 4.5 feet of fill on the property).

The revised project would result in the same aesthetics/visual resources impacts described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *The proposed project would result in intermittent interruption of scenic views from Hollister Avenue. (Class II)*
- b. *Substantial damage to scenic resources. (No Impact)*
- c. *The revised project could substantially degrade the existing visual character/quality of the site and its surroundings as a result of proposed structural development. (Class II)*
- d. *The revised project would create a new source of substantial light/glare. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

- | | |
|-------|---------------------|
| MM 1: | DESIGN REVIEW BOARD |
| MM 2: | HEIGHT SURVEY |
| MM 3: | SIGNS |

- MM 4: LANDSCAPE PLAN
- MM 5: LANDSCAPE AGREEMENT
- MM 6: LIGHTING
- MM 7: CONSTRUCTION TRASH CONTAINMENT
- MM 8: TRASH ENCLOSURE
- MM 9: MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT
- MM 10: UTILITY SERVICE CONNECTIONS/EQUIPMENT
- MM 11: UTILITY UNDERGROUNDING

Residual Impacts

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative aesthetic/visual resources impacts would be considered less than significant.

2. Agricultural Resources

The revised project would not result in any impacts on agricultural resources. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

3. Air Quality

The revised project would result in the same short-term and long-term air quality impacts that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a, b. *Conflict with the applicable air quality plan and violation of air quality standards regarding PM₁₀. (Class II)*
- c. *Contribution to an increase in criteria pollutants in the region, including NO_x and ROC. (Class III)*
- d. *Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (No Impact)*
- e. *Creation of objectionable odors as a result of construction of a new parking lot. (Class III)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND with regard to PM₁₀ (Class II), NO_x and ROC (Class III), and green house gases (Class III).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

- MM 1: DUST CONTROL

MM 2: VEGETATIVE COVER
MM 3: CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

The following mitigation measure is still recommended:

MM 1: ENERGY CONSERVING TECHNIQUES

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific as well as project contributions to cumulative air quality impacts would be considered less than significant.

4. Biological Resources

The revised project would result in the same impacts to biological resources that are described in the MND. The project drainage plan and analysis was updated to demonstrate that post-runoff flows would more closely match existing, non-developed conditions of the site.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Substantial adverse impact on candidate, sensitive or special status species. (No Impact)*
- b. *Substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. (Class II)*
- c. *Substantial adverse impact on federally protected wetlands. (Class II)*
- d. *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, wildlife corridors, or use of wildlife nursery sites. (No Impact)*
- e. *Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. (No Impact)*
- f. *Conflict with any habitat conservation plan. (No Impact)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

MM 1: STORMWATER QUALITY
MM 2: CONSTRUCTION WASH OUT

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on biological resources would be considered less than significant.

5. Cultural Resources

As a result of the revised project, there would continue to be potentially significant impacts on cultural resources. There would however, be no increase in the severity of impacts (i.e., no increase from Class II, significant but subject to mitigation; to Class I, significant and unavoidable). The following discussion updates and replaces the analysis in the Final MND.

Existing Setting

The Marriott Residence Inn site is located on the extreme southwest corner of a recorded site area known as CA-SBA-58. This was first documented by David Banks Rogers in the 1920s. Rogers reported substantial concentrations of shell fish, fish bone, and the remains of large land animals associated with a village that was occupied approximately between 5,000 and 300 years ago. The recorded site area was an elevated landform that was adjacent to marshy deposits of the Goleta Slough. Rogers identified and mapped two cemeteries within CA-SBA-58, with the southern cemetery located immediately north and outside of the proposed Marriott project site area, and the northern cemetery located approximately 295 feet north of the proposed project site area. These areas, like the other portions of CA-SBA-58 outside the Marriott Residence Inn project site, have been destroyed during previous urban development.

Modern, systematic investigations at CA-SBA-58 occurred in 1979 and 1980 by the Office of Public Archaeology, Social Process Research Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara (Drs. Mike Glassow and Pandora E. Snethkamp). This assessment was part of the Burroughs Plant Expansion addition project EIR (Earthmetrics), covering the same area as the currently proposed Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center Project. These included three backhoe trenches and 21 hand-excavated shovel test pits (STPs) associated with Extended Phase 1 excavations to define the horizontal extent of remaining CA-SBA-58 deposits. Also, five 1 X 1 meter (3.3 X 3.3 foot) unit Phase 2 significance assessment excavations were undertaken. The investigations identified the remaining intact, relatively undisturbed portions of CA-SBA-58 (Locus 1) that were considered significant cultural resources, as they retained their ability to help contribute to understanding past lifestyles. The excavations within the intact Locus 1 midden recovered large amounts of shellfish, animal bone, and a moderate number of artifacts (i.e. flaked stone tools used for hunting and butchering, ground stone tools used for seed and vegetable preparation). The archaeological site soils within the project site have been subject to a series of modifications including grading since 1960 to fill in lower lying marshy areas. Up to six feet of soils were removed on the northern portion of the property and some of this was used to fill between 1 and 2 feet of the western portion of the

project site. The eastern portion of the project area had been planted in vegetables and the soils compacted. Archaeological investigations concluded that imported soils with no cultural materials, or soils with previously disturbed artifactual material, existed from the ground surface to approximately 18 inches below the ground surface. The intact archaeological site deposit is generally 16 inches deep below the disturbed, insignificant soils. No human remains were recovered during any of the Extended Phase 1 or Phase 2 archaeological investigations. All available evidence indicates that no prehistoric cemeteries exist within the Marriott project site area. The findings of these technical reports were summarized in the 1980 Burroughs Plant Expansion EIR prepared by Earth Metrics.

A Supplemental Extended Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation was undertaken by Dudek in June, 2008 to evaluate the presence of any intact archaeological materials (Locus 1) in areas outside of those defined in 1979/1980 by UCSB. The scope of work was reviewed and discussed with several members of the Native American community prior to work proceeding on June 23, 2008. The field work included hand excavation of 20 shovel test pits (12-inches in diameter), 6 backhoe trenches, and 13 mechanical solid core borings (2-inches in diameter). The investigation determined the following:

1. Locus 1 deposits were identified north and west of the original boundary defined by UCSB. The approximate boundaries of Locus 1 deposits are considered as a worst case estimate, as the Extended Phase 1 investigation was limited in scope in order to minimize disturbance to Locus 1 soils (as requested by interested Chumash reviewing the Extended Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation scope of work). The 2008 Extended Phase 1 excavations were capable of identifying the presence of additional Locus 1 soils, but the precise extent of the intact cultural materials is most likely exaggerated. The thickness of the Locus 1 deposit also is apparently highly irregular due to differing degrees of past disturbance.
2. No evidence of human remains was identified in any of the Extended Phase 1 excavations. This is consistent with the findings of the UCSB 1979/1980 archaeological excavations. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that burials would be encountered during project construction activities.
3. Cultural materials recovered within Locus 1 deposits are almost exclusively shellfish fragments representing disposal of food remains. Only two formed artifacts, a shellfish bead and stone bowl fragment, were recovered. The analyzed Locus 1 materials are much less diverse than those recovered during the UCSB 1979 excavations, and appear to be very homogenous in representing the deposition of food refuse, rather than any specific prehistoric activity. Their potential significance as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3)(c) to "have yielded, and are likely to yield, information important in prehistory" is therefore more limited than Locus 1 deposits identified in 1979/1980 by UCSB, that included a wider range of artifacts including stone tool manufacturing waste flakes and animal bone.

4. When compared to project site topography that was mapped in 1960, before the area was leveled by cutting and filling, the thickness of the Locus 1 deposit areas identified by Dudek is generally thinnest at higher elevations of the project site and increases downslope, to the edge of the archaeological site above the former Goleta Slough. The depths are generally consistent with those previously defined for Locus 1 deposits by UCSB 1979 excavations.
5. Potentially deeply buried deposits below 5 feet from the existing ground surface were only found in the proposed detention basin area, in the southwest corner of the project site. These deposits are below the proposed depth of excavation, and would not be impacted.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Cultural Resources would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the environmental document checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City's Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual. The City's adopted thresholds indicate that a project would result in a significant impact on a cultural resource if it results in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of such a resource would be materially impaired.

Project Specific Impacts

- a. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5? (Class II)*

The intact (those areas not affected by modern landform disturbances) portions of CA-SBA-58 were identified as a significant cultural resource in the 1980 Burroughs Plant Expansion EIR, as they were characterized as containing information that could help scientists and the public better understand prehistoric Native American lifestyles. These characteristics are the same that make remaining intact cultural deposits an "historical resource" and meet the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3)(c) as they "have yielded, and are likely to yield, information important in prehistory." Previously disturbed archaeological soils above and outside the intact Locus 1 cultural materials do not retain the potential, as the relationship of artifacts and remains has been lost during their removal from their original context and redeposition elsewhere.

Direct impacts to the significant portions of CA-SBA-58 site area include the following:

1. Removal of the top 1.5 feet of soil, to be replaced with a minimum 2 feet of imported engineered fill (Robert Schmidt, project engineer 2008). The imported soils will then be mechanically compacted to 95 percent (Ben Hushmand, project soils engineer, 2008). Soil compaction would have the potential to damage fragile cultural materials, including shellfish.

Additionally, export of the overexcavation archaeological soils offsite has the potential to essentially create an artificial archaeological deposit elsewhere. Also, if exported soils are placed on an existing archeological site offsite, the integrity of the native cultural materials would be compromised.

2. Driving 207 solid piles, 12-inches square within Locus 1 areas, to depths well in excess of the intact cultural deposit. Grade beams will be supported by the piles and caps, but the beams will not extend below the engineered fill.
3. All utilities including electrical, water, gas, and cable would be placed within the minimum 2 feet of engineered fill soils. Construction of a detention basin in the southwest corner of the project site would require removal of soils up to 4.1 feet deep.
4. A sewer lateral extending approximately 86 feet long and placed up to 9 feet below the site surface will be directionally bored underneath the intact CA-SBA-58 Locus 1 deposit. Bore holes where the drill would enter and exit the ground surface would be located outside of the intact site boundary (Robert Schmidt, project engineer, 2008).
5. Planting of landscaping, including accent and evergreen trees (Preliminary Landscape Plan, Katie O'Reilly Rogers, Inc. 2008).
6. Pool construction, including a worst case excavations estimate of approximately 1,170 square feet of Locus 1 area.

Unavoidable direct impacts resulting from ground disturbances would equal approximately 4,790 square feet of the 39,810 square foot CA-SBA-58 Locus 1 deposit. This would represent impacts to approximately 12 percent of the of intact CA-SBA-58 deposit. This is considered a worst case estimate, because the Locus 1 soils identified are not continuous, and have been subject to varying degrees of previous disturbance during prior grading and leveling of the project site. The 2008 Supplemental Extended Phase 1 excavations were capable of identifying the presence of additional Locus 1 soils, but the precise extent of the intact cultural materials is most likely exaggerated. The thickness of the Locus 1 deposit also is apparently highly irregular due to differing degrees of past disturbance. Therefore, the total volume of site soils and the project's effects on them is not effectively estimated. In any event, it is important to note that this amount of disturbance is substantially less than a conventional continuous slab foundation would require, where scarification and recompaction would likely result in the complete destruction of the remaining site deposit.

These actions are considered potentially significant impacts on cultural resources, as they would result in the physical destruction of portions of CA-SBA-58, and loss of the characteristics that could yield information important in prehistory. The proposed design, would however, preserve approximately 90 percent of the site by capping.

Potential project indirect impacts on CA-SBA-58 include the following:

1. *Short-term Construction.* Typical indirect impacts affecting cultural resources during construction activity can include erosion of cut slopes causing further cultural deposit destruction, unauthorized artifact collecting by construction personnel, and vandalism of site areas during non-work periods.
2. *Long-term Operation.* Indirect impacts to the intact CA-SBA-58 midden would include the loss of access to the remaining portion of the intact cultural deposit for future archaeological research. This is considered an impact when the archaeological site in question has not been characterized completely, such that future researchers are not able to evaluate the way in which the deposits may help explore research topics that may not yet be defined.

These actions are considered potentially significant impacts on cultural resources, as they would result in both the physical removal of CA-SBA-58 artifacts, and loss of access to the remaining site areas that could yield information important in prehistory.

- b. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5? (Class II)*

CEQA Section 15064.5(c) states that if an archaeological site can be determined to be a "historical resource" as defined in Section 15064.5(a)(3)(c), the discussion under Item a) above relates to impacts on archaeological resources.

- c. *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (No Impact)*

Geological formations underlying the project site were evaluated during soils engineering testing to determine appropriate foundation designs (Hushmand Associates, Inc. 2007). Approximately one-third of soils under the project site are associated with the former Goleta Slough. Sands and clays are located below these sediments, as well as within all other areas of the site. These soils are associated with Quaternary age alluvial sediments. Though small marine fossils such as clams or invertebrates (snails, worms, etc.) can be found in these deposits, these are considered common and are not potentially significant paleontological resources. In contrast, potentially significant large vertebrate fossils are not associated with this geological formation. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project to impact significant paleontological resources.

- d. *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

The archaeological investigations undertaken by David Banks Rogers in the 1920s concluded that both CA-SBA-58 Native American cemeteries were located

outside of the proposed Marriott Residence Inn project area. Rogers excavated extensively within both cemeteries, and his map of CA-SBA-58 clearly indicated the extent of those cemeteries. No human remains were identified during systematic archaeological excavations in 1979 and 2008 within the proposed project area, including several shovel test pits excavated in the area of the project site closest to the location of the recorded cemeteries offsite, and isolated human burials outside of cemeteries are relatively uncommon within prehistoric sites within the Goleta Valley.

There remains the potential, although extremely limited, for isolated human remains to have been interred outside of the two formal CA-SBA-58 cemeteries, or for isolated human remains to have been redistributed throughout areas of CA-SBA-58 during previous land form modifications, including areas that archaeological investigation has determined to be disturbed within the top approximately 36" of soil on the project site. In the event that these isolated human remains were encountered during construction excavations, their disturbance would be subject to State law (Public Resources Code sections 5097.97 and 5097.98) requiring that local Chumash individuals representing the most likely descendants of these prehistoric inhabitants be provided disposition over the remains, including their appropriate relocation in an area not subject to future disturbance. Driving of 207 piles, 12-inches square, although each relatively small in area, would also have some extremely limited potential to result in disturbing unknown isolated remains. Therefore, the proposed project has a very limited potential to disturb human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries. In the highly unlikely event human remains would be encountered, this would be a potentially significant impact on cultural resources.

Cumulative Impacts

It has been estimated that more than 80 percent of all prehistoric archaeological sites in Santa Barbara County have been destroyed. City of Goleta and County of Santa Barbara General Plan Conservation Element Policies, and Local Coastal Plan Policies require that project design avoid impacts to significant cultural resources to the extent feasible. In addition to site designs that place cultural deposits in open space where they can be completely preserved, this has resulted in a variety of construction techniques and designs, such as raised construction footings, pilings, use of geotextile fabric and engineered fill, to minimize potential disturbances to cultural deposits. Increased human activity in the vicinity of cultural resources during construction and potential loss of access to sites for their research potential are other indirect cumulative effects. Although avoidance of archaeological site deposits at projects in the project vicinity, to the extent feasible, have resulted in substantial reductions to impacts on cultural resources, cumulative impacts on archaeological resources caused by past, present and future probable projects in the vicinity are considered significant.

The proposed project site design would result in the loss of approximately 12 percent of the remaining CA-SBA-58 intact archaeological site deposit. However, this amount of disturbance is substantially less than a conventional continuous slab foundation would require that would likely result in the complete destruction of the remaining site deposit. Similar to other recent development projects affecting cultural resources, the proposed project would substantially

reduce the degree to which impacts on cultural resources would occur (in this case, preserving approximately 90 percent of the remaining archaeological deposit). The preserved area of the site would be capped and not be subject to any further disturbances. The proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts on cultural resources would be mitigated by project design and by other standard feasible mitigation measures identified below to less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are required and have been revised or added, based on the June 2008 Supplemental Extended Phase I field archaeological study and in recognition of the refined building methodology using pilings to support the foundation.

Direct Impacts

The direct impacts to a worst case estimate of approximately 12 percent of the intact CA-SBA-58 midden from cut-and-fill of the top 0.45 meters (1.5 feet) of soil and installation of 207 foundation piles can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following standard archaeological procedures:

1. **PHASE 3 DATA RECOVERY.** The applicant, at its sole expense, shall retain a City-qualified archaeologist to undertake a Phase 3 data recovery program for the Parcel 2 project encompassing the following components:
 - a. Twenty-five 0.5 X 0.5 meter (1.65 X 1.65 foot) units shall be located between approximately every 10 and 15 meters (35 and 50 feet) within the intact CA-SBA-58 midden, with the higher number of units located in the portion of the site containing the highest diversity of prehistoric remains. A backhoe shall be used to remove the soil that has been determined to be previously disturbed and, therefore, not intact; no analysis of these soils shall occur. Excavation units within the intact midden shall be excavated by hand, in 20-centimeter (8-inch) levels. Excavated soil shall be water-screened in the field through 1/8-inch wire mesh. Excavated soil shall be water-screened in the field through 1/8-inch wire mesh. Within this collected material, however, 25 percent of the excavated soil shall be screened through 1/16-inch mesh to allow for more specific analyses of food remains and recovering very small artifacts.
 - b. An additional 25 percent of piling locations (44 presently estimated) shall be hand-excavated in 20-centimeter (8-inch) levels to recover (if present) a representative sample of larger prehistoric artifacts (besides the shellfish food remains addressed in 1.a., above). The Locus 1 soils shall be screened through 1/8-inch mesh for the presence of finished artifacts, and analyzed as a part of the Phase 3 data recovery program analysis and report. Locus 2 soils overlaying the intact Locus 1 deposits within each

piling location shall be excavated by a mechanical auger and the soils observed but not screened.

- c. The remaining piling locations within Locus 1 shall be excavated by mechanical auger under the supervision of an archaeologist and Chumash observer. Excavated soils shall be inspected to ensure that any unexpected culturally significant materials are noted and characterized. If recovered, these cultural materials shall be integrated in the Phase 3 data recovery program analysis and report.
- d. A Chumash Native American most likely descendant shall be retained as an observer during all excavations. The observer shall satisfy the requirement as a most likely descendant of any human remains identified within CA-SBA-58, as required by the Native American Heritage Commission.
- e. Sewer Lateral Excavation Bore Pits. No impact is associated with the presumed northerly bore pit. A deep core shall be excavated in the proposed southerly bore pit to ensure the absence of deeply buried Locus 1 deposits. If deposits are identified, an expanded excavation unit (i.e., 1 X 1 meter or larger, as appropriate) will be excavated.
- f. In order to confirm the dating of the prehistoric occupation at CA-SBA-58, up to eight radiocarbon dates shall be collected if suitable organic material is recovered from reliable stratigraphic contexts. Additionally, four obsidian hydration dates shall be taken if suitable stone tool flake samples are recovered. Additionally, up to eight obsidian hydration dates shall be taken if suitable stone tool flake samples are recovered.
- g. Following analysis, all of the cultural materials shall be curated at either the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History or the Repository for Archaeological and Ethnographic Collections at UCSB.
- h. The Phase 3 Data Recovery proposal shall include a research design that guides preparation of laboratory research about coastal Chumash environments and interpret intra-site as well as inter-site patterning of artifacts and activities at CA-SBA-58, including food remains, chipped stone tools, macrobotanical remains, etc. The Phase 3 report shall document the final results of the excavations and laboratory activities. It shall include all necessary artifact photographs, excavation unit profiles, tabulated data, and artifact catalog. The Phase 3 report shall address the research questions identified in the Phase 3 Data Recovery proposal.

Plan Requirements and Timing: A detailed work Phase 3 Data Recovery Program proposal, including identification of the City-qualified

archeologist and Chumash Native American most likely descendant monitor, shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall periodically perform site inspections to verify compliance with the approved Phase 3 work program.

2. **PRE-CONSTRUCTION CONTROLLED PILING EXCAVATIONS.** Subsequent to conclusion of the Phase 3 archaeological data recovery program excavations, the applicant, at its sole expense, shall retain a City-qualified archeologist and Chumash Native American most likely descendant observer to excavate all Locus 1 piling locations by hand or by mechanical auger not evaluated during the Phase 3 data recovery program. The remaining 12-inch square piling locations shall be excavated until the depth of CA-SBA-58 site deposits are exceeded, as determined by the project archeologist. The soils shall be dry-screened in 1/8-inch mesh in the field to identify any unknown, but potential isolated prehistoric human remains. The City-qualified archeologist and Chumash Native American most likely descendant observer shall have the authority to temporarily halt excavation if any potentially significant discovery is identified, to allow for adequate Phase 3 data recovery recordation, evaluation, and mitigation, as described in Mitigation Measure 3.e., below.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The Pre-Construction Controlled Piling Excavations work plan shall be submitted as a component of the Phase 3 Data Recovery Program proposal, including identification of the City-qualified archeologist and Chumash Native American most likely descendant observer. It shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall periodically perform site inspections to verify compliance.

3. **CONSTRUCTION MONITORING PLAN.** The applicant, at its sole expense, shall retain a City-qualified archeologist and Chumash Native American most likely descendant observer to monitor all ground disturbing construction activities until the depth of CA-SBA-58 site deposits are exceeded, as determined by the project archeologist. A Construction Monitoring Treatment Plan shall be developed and implemented to ensure that any new discoveries are adequately recorded, evaluated, and, if significant, mitigated. The Construction Monitoring Treatment Plan shall describe the following:
 - a. specifications that all ground disturbances within the documented CA-SBA-58 site boundary shall be monitored by a City-qualified archeologist and a Chumash Native American most likely descendant observer;
 - b. qualifications and organization of monitoring personnel;

- c. procedures for notifying the City and other involved or interested parties in case of a new discovery;
- d. procedures that would be used to record, evaluate, and mitigate new discoveries with a minimum of delay; and
- e. procedures that would be followed in case of discovery of disturbed as well as intact human burials and burial-associated artifacts. The City-qualified archaeologist and Chumash Native American most likely descendant observer shall have the authority to temporarily halt or redirect construction in the vicinity of any potentially significant discovery to allow for adequate Phase 3 data recovery recordation, evaluation, and mitigation. Evaluation and mitigation could require additional archaeological testing and data recovery. In the highly unlikely event that isolated human remains are encountered, consultation with the most likely Native American descendant, pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 5097.97 and 5097.98, would apply.
- f. Results of the monitoring program shall be documented in a short report after completion of all ground disturbing activities.

Plan Requirements and Timing: A contract for the Constructing Monitoring Plan, including identification of the City-qualified archeologist and Chumash Native American most likely descendant observer, shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall periodically perform site inspections to verify compliance.

- 4. **PRE-CONSTRUCTION WORKSHOP.** A pre-construction workshop shall be conducted by a City-qualified archaeologist and a Chumash Native American most likely descendant observer. Attendees shall include the applicant, City staff, construction supervisors, and equipment operators to ensure that all parties understand the monitoring program and their respective roles and responsibilities. All construction personnel who would work during any phase of ground disturbance within the documented site boundary of CA-SBA-58 shall be required to attend. The names of all personnel who attend the workshop shall be recorded. The workshop shall:
 - a. explain why monitoring is required and identify monitoring procedures;
 - b. describe what would temporarily stop construction and for how long;
 - c. describe a reasonable "worst case" new discovery scenario such as the discovery of intact human remains or a substantial midden deposit;

- d. explain reporting requirements and responsibilities of the construction supervisor;
- e. discuss prohibited activities including unauthorized collecting of artifacts; and
- f. identify the types of archeological materials that may be uncovered and provide examples of common artifacts to examine.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The minutes and attendance sheet from the Preconstruction Workshop shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for grading for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure completion of the workshop in compliance with the above criteria.

- 5. **FILL PLACEMENT.** The process for placing engineered fill soils after overexcavation shall include the placement of geotextile fabric over the native archaeological ground surface, and then using sand for the first 12 inches of fill placed. The plan shall be prepared by a qualified soils engineer and shall demonstrate that the resulting compression of intact Locus 1 soils shall be substantially reduced.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The Engineered Fill Soils Placement Plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for grading for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall periodically site inspect in order to ensure completion according to plan.

- 6. **SOIL EXPORT.** The construction contractor shall identify the location where any soils excavated and exported are deposited. The location shall be reviewed and approved by a City-qualified archaeologist and Chumash observer to ensure that no native archaeological remains are buried by the export soils. The exported soils shall not be placed within any recorded archaeological site. An archaeologist and Chumash observer shall map the location of the exported soils, and shall document this location on a California Department of Parks and Recreation Redeposited Site Form. The form shall be filed with the Central Coast Information Center, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The Archaeological Export Soils Notification Plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to issuance of any LUP for grading for the project.

Monitoring: City staff shall periodically site inspect in order to ensure completion according to plan.

Residual Impact

Proposed project design would preserve an estimated worst case estimate of approximately 90 percent of the remaining undisturbed CA-SBA-58 materials in the impact area. Although not left in open space, the use of pilings and supported beams would substantially minimize impacts on the CA-SBA-58 archaeological site, compared to a conventional slab. The majority of CA-SBA-58 would be preserved in place and would maintain the relationship between the artifacts and their archaeological context. This would achieve the same level of preservation as incorporating the site in open space, as there would not be any potential for any future development or use of the capped deposits that might otherwise adversely impact these resources. The capping of the preserved cultural resources would be consistent with professional standards maintained by archaeologists and Native American considerations. The proposed Data Recovery plan would provide a substantial sample of materials within Locus 1 for detailed study, while ensuring that all proposed pile locations were evaluated for the presence of finished artifacts. The very unlikely potential for encountering human remains in these areas would also be assessed.

Implementation of cultural resources mitigation measure 1.a. through 1.h. would provide a reasonable level of data recovery to characterize the research values associated with the CA-SBA-58 deposit.

Implementation of cultural resources mitigation measure 2 would ensure that any potential impacts on the archaeological deposit resulting from foundation piling driving would be evaluated and properly assessed by a professional archaeologist and Chumash Native American observer.

Implementation of cultural resources mitigation measure 3 would ensure that any unknown cultural resources of potential importance encountered throughout the entire CA-SBA-58 deposit, even if within previously disturbed contexts, would be properly addressed by a professional archaeologist and Chumash Native American most likely descendant observer.

Implementation of cultural resources mitigation measure 4 and 5 would ensure that the potential effects of compaction on top of undisturbed Locus 1 soils would be substantially minimized, and that export of any archaeological soils offsite would also be properly documented.

Indirect impacts related to unauthorized artifact collecting can be mitigated to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measure 1. Since the Phase 3 Data Recovery Mitigation using standard hand-excavated units of 1 X 1 meter size or larger would collect a sufficient sample to characterize the intact midden and address questions about the past, the indirect impact associated with loss of access would be less than significant.

The implementation of Phase 3 Data Recovery Mitigation, Pre-Construction Controlled Piling Excavations, Construction Monitoring Treatment Plan Mitigation, and Pre-construction Workshop Mitigation would reduce the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts resulting from loss of future access to archaeological resources to less than significant.

Though not specifically identified as an environmental impact under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 significance criteria or the City's Environmental Checklist, both intact Locus 1 and disturbed Locus 2 soils are considered sensitive heritage resources to contemporary Chumash. Consultation with interested Chumash regarding proposed project mitigation measures has reflected a concern for impacts resulting from pile driving activities on those cultural materials not otherwise excavated and analyzed during Phase 3 Data Recovery investigations listed in Mitigation Measure 1. Chumash consultation participants have defined the following measure for addressing impacts of pile driving on their heritage values.

All piling locations not previously subject to Extended Phase 1 excavations, and those otherwise evaluated as part of the Phase 3 Data Recovery investigations within Locus 1 and Locus 2 identified in mitigation measure 1.a. and 1.b. (approximately 130 pilings within Locus 1 areas, and 85 pilings outside of Locus 1 areas, totaling 215 pilings) shall be excavated by hand under the supervision of an archaeologist and Chumash observer, and screened through 1/8-inch mesh for the presence of finished artifacts.

Conclusion: With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual impacts on cultural/archaeological resources would be less than significant.

6. Geology and Soils

The revised project would result in the same geology/soils impacts described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Rupture of known earthquake fault.* (Class III)
- b. *Strong seismic ground shaking.* (Class III)
- c. *Seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction.* (Class II)
- d. *Landslides.* (No Impact)
- e. *Substantial erosion or loss of topsoil.* (Class II)
- f. *Location on an unstable geologic unit or soil.* (Class II)
- g. *Expansive soils.* (Class III)
- h. *Soils not suitable for a wastewater disposal system.* (No Impact)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND regarding erosion (Class II) and all other geologic processes (Class III).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would still be required:

MM 1: SITE AND STRUCTURAL DESIGN

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on geology and soils would be considered less than significant.

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The revised project would result in the same impacts to hazards and hazardous materials that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Significant hazard to the public or the environment through transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.. (No Impact)*
- b. *Significant hazard to the public or the environment through upset and accident conditions. (Class II)*
- c. *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a school.. (No Impact)*
- d. *Located on a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. (No Impact)*
- e. *Airport safety hazard for people residing or working in the area. (Class II)*
- f. *Private airstrip hazard for people residing or working in the area. (No Impact)*
- g. *Impair implementation of or interfere with an emergency plan. (No Impact)*
- h. *Exposure of people or structures to significant risk associated with wildland fires. (No Impact)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

- MM 1: SITE ASSESSMENT
- MM 2: WORKER PROTECTIONS
- MM 3: FAA FORM 7460-1
- MM 4: VEGETATIVE MATERIALS

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on hazards and hazardous materials would be considered less than significant.

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

Existing slopes across the property are approximately 2 percent and drainage is presently conveyed in a southerly direction. Drainage conveyance on proposed Parcel 1 (existing research park building) would remain unchanged. The preliminary drainage plan for proposed Parcel 2 (Marriott Residence Inn) includes continued conveyance of drainage in a primarily southerly direction through new onsite storm drains that outlet into a bioswale/detention basin feature along the Hollister Avenue frontage and eventual connection into the existing storm drain system.

The revised project would result in the same impacts to hydrology and water quality that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.*, (No Impact)
- b. *Substantial impact on groundwater supplies.* (No Impact)
- c. *Substantially alter an existing drainage pattern resulting in erosion or siltation.* (Class II)
- d. *Substantially alter an existing drainage pattern resulting in flooding.* (Class II)
- e. *Results in runoff which exceeds the capacity of drainage systems or results in substantial new polluted runoff.* (Class II)
- f. *Substantially degrade water quality.* (Class II)

- g. *Placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. (No Impact)*
- h. *Placement of structures which would impede or redirect 100-year flood flows. (Class II)*
- i. *Expose people or structures to risks associated with failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)*
- j. *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (Class III)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

- MM 1: FIRST FLOOR ELEVATION ADJUSTMENT
- MM 2: EROSION CONTROL PLAN

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality would be considered less than significant.

9. Land Use and Planning

The proposed General Plan Amendment to Table 2-3 of the Land Use Element, regarding FAR and height limitations, has been deleted as a result of the City's adoption of these changes in June 2008 (Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Track 2 Amendments). Table 2-3 now includes recommended building intensity standards (including for FAR and height limitations) and allows these standards to be exceeded based on a "good cause" finding. The revised project includes an FAR of 0.60 (as compared to the recommended FAR of 0.50) and heights of 35 feet average and peaks ranging from 39.25 – 40.4 feet (as compared to the recommended peak height of 35 feet).

The revised project would result in the same land use and planning impacts described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Physically divide an established community. (No Impact)*
- b. *Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Class II)*

- c. *Conflict with any conservation plan. (No Impact)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would still be required:

MM 1: SITE DESIGN MODIFICATION

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on land use and planning would be considered less than significant.

10. Mineral Resources

The revised project would not result in any impacts on mineral resources. There would be no change to the analysis in the MND.

11. Noise

The revised project would result in the same impacts to noise that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Exposure to noise levels in excess of applicable standards. (No Impact)*
- b. *Exposure to excessive groundborne vibrations or noise levels. (No Impact)*
- c. *Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. (No Impact)*
- d. *Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. (Class II)*
- e. *Exposure to excessive airport-related noise levels. (Class III)*
- f. *Exposure to excessive private airstrip-related noise levels. (No Impact)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

- MM 1: CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES (LIMITS ON HOURS)
- MM 2: CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES (LIMITS ON EQUIPMENT)

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on noise would be considered less than significant.

12. Population and Housing

The revised project would result in the same impacts to noise that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Induce substantial population growth.* (Class III)
- b. *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing..* (No Impact)
- c. *Displace substantial numbers of people.* (No Impact)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impacts

Residual impacts on population growth and the area's housing supply, as well as the project's contribution to such cumulative impacts would be less than significant (population) or non-existent (housing).

13. Public Services

The revised project would result in the same impacts to public services that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Fire protection.* (Class II)
- b. *Police protection.* (Class III)
- c. *Schools.* (Class III)
- d. *Parks.* (Class III)
- e. *Other public facilities.* (Class III)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

- MM 1: DESIGN MODIFICATIONS
- MM 2: FIRE PROTECTION PLAN
- MM 3: OCCUPANCY LIMITATIONS

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant. All other residual project specific and project contributions to cumulative impacts on public services would be less than significant.

14. Recreation

The revised project would result in the same impacts to recreation that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Increase in parks and/or recreational facilities use that would lead to substantial physical deterioration.* (Class III)
- b. *Inclusion of recreational facilities that would have an adverse physical effect on the environment.* (No Impact)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required or recommended.

Residual Impacts

Residual demand for parks and recreational facilities generated by the proposed project would be considered adverse but less than significant.

15. Transportation/Traffic

Parking information is updated as follows: zoning ordinance requirements would be 144 spaces for the Marriott Residence Inn and 213 spaces for the existing research park building (combined total of 357 spaces); actual peak demand is calculated at 144 spaces for the Marriott Residence Inn and 302 spaces for the existing research park building (combined total of 446 spaces); the site plan provides for 129 spaces for the Marriott Residence Inn and 350 spaces for the existing research park building (combined total of 479 spaces). A reciprocal parking agreement between the two properties is still proposed.

The revised project would result in the same impacts to transportation/traffic that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial relative to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. (Class II)*
- b. *Exceed a congestion management agency level of service standard (Class III)*
- c. *Results in a change in air traffic patterns that results in a substantial safety risk. (No Impact)*
- d. *Substantial increase in hazards due to design or incompatible uses. (Class II)*
- e. *Results in inadequate emergency access. (Class II)*
- f. *Results in inadequate parking capacity. (Class II)*
- g. *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. (Class II)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would occur at the Hollister Avenue/Robin Hill Road intersection. (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

- MM 1: STREET DESIGN MODIFICATIONS
- MM 2: SITE DESIGN MODIFICATIONS
- MM 3: TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS
- MM 4: SHARED PARKING

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on transportation/traffic would be considered less than significant. Mitigation to address deficiencies in emergency vehicle access is identified under the discussion of Public Services.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

The revised project would result in the same impacts to utilities and service systems that are described in the MND.

Project-Specific Impacts

The following impacts would remain unchanged:

- a. *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB. (No Impact)*
- b. *Construction of new water or wastewater facilities that would result in significant environmental effects. (Class II)*
- c. *Require new storm water facilities that would result in significant environmental effects. (No Impact)*
- d. *Sufficient water supplies or new water supplies. (Class II)*
- e. *Sufficient wastewater treatment capacity. (Class II)*
- f. *Sufficient landfill capacity. (Class III)*
- g. *Compliance with federal, state, and local statutes/regulations regarding solid waste. (No Impact)*

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would remain as described in the MND. (Class III)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would still be required:

MM 1:	WASTEWATER CAPACITY
MM 2:	WATER SERVICE COMMITMENT
MM 3:	WATER CONSERVATION
MM 4:	SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
MM 5:	CONSTRUCTION WASTE RECYCLING

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on transportation/traffic would be considered less than significant. Mitigation to address deficiencies in emergency vehicle access is identified under the discussion of Public Services.

G. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Mandatory Findings of Significance would remain the same as described in the MND.

H. 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. The current project meets the conditions for the application of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 and preparation of a new EIR or ND is not required. The Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center Project MND (07-MND-003) is hereby amended by this 15164 addendum for the revised Marriott Residence Inn and Hollister Center Project.