CITY OF GOLETA
INITIAL STUDY
2009

1. PROJECT TITLE:
Bacara Resort and Spa Completion Phase Project

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS:
City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:
David Stone, Contract Planner
Dudek 621 Chapala Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 963-0651 X 3525

4. APPLICANT:
Bacara Resort and Spa, HT Santa Barbara
8301 Hollister Avenue
Goleta, CA 93117

AGENT:
Tom Figg
Consulting Services.
204 Willowbrook Drive
Port Hueneme, CA 93041

5. PROJECT LOCATION:
8301 Hollister Avenue
APNs 079-200-012 & 013

6. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project site is within a portion of the 72.73-acre (gross and net) Bacara Resort and Spa located in western Goleta; it is south of the Union Pacific Railroad and US 101, west of the Venoco Oil and Gas Processing Facility, north of Haskell's Beach and the Pacific Ocean, and east of existing Resort and Spa facilities. Proposed development would occur within a 12.66-acre (gross and net) area called Lot 2, and would also include widening of the existing Hollister Avenue roadway site located within

a portion of Lot 1 immediately north of Lot 2. The project site has a Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan designation of Visitor-serving Commercial (C-V), and has an Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance designation of C-V, Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial.

The applicant is requesting approval of General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendments, Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Modifications for building height and front yard setback, a vesting tentative tract map, and a final development plan to develop 55 resort condominium hotel units as described below.

General Plan Amendments (05-034-GP)

The project proposes amendments to various Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies, figures and tables as initiated by the City Council on May 20, 2008, and to reflect further refinements in the language of amendments that the City is currently processing under what is commonly referred to as "Track 3" General Plan Amendments. In general, the amendments proposed by the applicant focus on: Open Space Element location, protection and management of public lateral and vertical access areas and open space area maps; Conservation Element special status species, environmentally sensitive habitat, protection and maintenance of streams, creeks and drainages. They are listed in their entirety in Table 1, below.

Table 1. Proposed General Plan Amendments

Policy ID #	Policy Text in Adopted General Plan	City Council Initiated Amendment (5/20/08)
OS 1.10	**OS 1.10 Management of Public Lateral Access Areas. [GP/CP]** The following criteria and standards shall apply to use and management of lateral shoreline access areas: a. Private commercial uses of public beach areas shall be limited to coastal-dependent recreational uses, including but not limited to surfing schools, ocean kayaking, and similar uses. All commercial uses of beach areas and other lateral accessways shall be subject to approval of a permit by the City. The number, size, duration, and other characteristics of commercial uses of beach areas may be limited in order to preserve opportunities for use and enjoyment of the beach area by the general public. For-profit commercial uses at the City-owned Santa Barbara Shores Park and Sperling Preserve (the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space and Habitat Management Plan [OSHMP] area) are prohibited (see related Policy OS 5).	**OS 1.10 Management of Public Lateral Access Areas. [GP/CP]** The following criteria and standards shall apply to use and management of lateral shoreline access areas: a. Private commercial uses of public beach areas shall be limited to coastal dependent recreational uses, including but not limited to surfing schools, ocean kayaking, and similar uses. All commercial uses of beach areas and other lateral accessways shall be subject to approval of a permit by the City. The number, size, duration, and other characteristics of commercial uses of beach areas may be limited in order to preserve opportunities for use and enjoyment of the beach area by the general public. For-profit commercial uses at the City-owned Santa Barbara Shores Park and Sperling Preserve (the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space and Habitat Management Plan OSHMP area) are prohibited (see related Policy OS 5).

	b. Temporary special events shall minimize impacts to public access and recreation along the shoreline. Coastal Development Permits shall be required for any temporary event that proposes to use a sandy beach area and involves a charge for admission or participation. c. Where sensitive habitat resources are present, limited or controlled methods of access and/or mitigation designed to eliminate or reduce impacts to ESHAs shall be implemented. d. The hours during which coastal access areas are available for public use shall be the maximum feasible while maintaining compatibility with nearby neighborhoods and land uses. The hours for public use shall be set forth in each individual coastal development permit. Unless specific hours are described within a permit, the access shall be deemed to be 24 hours per day and 7 days per week. e. In order to maximize public use and enjoyment, user fees for access to lateral beach and shoreline areas shall be prohibited. Activities and/or uses that would deter or obstruct public lateral access shall be prohibited. f. Overnight camping and use of motorized vehicles, except for public safety vehicles and vehicles associated with construction of access improvements and maintenance and restoration or enhancement activities, shall be prohibited in lateral shoreline access areas.	b. Temporary special events shall minimize impacts to public access and recreation along the shoreline. ~~Coastal Development Permits shall be required for any temporary event that proposes to use a sandy beach area and involves a charge for admission or participation.~~ c. Where sensitive habitat resources are present, limited or controlled methods of access and/or mitigation designed to eliminate or reduce impacts to ESHAs shall be implemented. d. The hours during which coastal access areas are available for public use shall be the maximum feasible while maintaining compatibility and ensuring public safety with nearby neighborhoods and land uses. The hours for public use shall be set forth in each individual coastal development permit. Unless specific hours are described within a permit, the access shall be deemed to be 24 hours per day and 7 days per week. e. In order to maximize public use and enjoyment, user fees for access to lateral beach and shoreline areas shall be prohibited. Activities and/or uses that would deter or obstruct public lateral access shall be prohibited. f. Overnight camping and use of motorized vehicles, except for public safety vehicles and vehicles associated with construction of access improvements and maintenance and restoration or enhancement activities, shall be prohibited in lateral shoreline access areas.
OS 2.3	**OS 2.3 Preservation of Existing Vertical Accessways. [GP/CP]** Vertical access to Goleta's Pacific shoreline was limited to two locations as of 2005. These include access to Haskell's Beach within the Bacara Resort property and access at the City-owned Santa Barbara Shores Park and Sperling Preserve properties. The latter includes numerous trails that provide access to the bluff tops, although access from the bluff top to Ellwood Beach is available at only two locations. Existing public vertical coastal access facilities shall be protected and preserved and shall be expanded or enhanced where feasible (see related Policies LU 9 and OS 4).	**OS 2.3 ~~Preservation~~ Protection of Existing Vertical Accessways. [GP/CP]** Vertical access to Goleta's Pacific shoreline was limited to two locations as of 2005. These include access to Haskell's Beach within the Bacara Resort property and access at the City owned Santa Barbara Shores Park and Sperling Preserve properties. The latter includes numerous trails that provide access to the bluff tops, although access from the bluff top to Ellwood Beach is available at only two locations. Existing public vertical coastal access facilities shall be protected ~~and preserved~~ and shall be expanded or enhanced where feasible (see related Policies LU 9 and OS 4). In the event an existing vertical accessway must be relocated, it shall be sited so as not to unreasonably diminish the public's right of access.

OS 2.8	**OS 2.8 Management of Vertical Accessways. [GP/CP]** The following standards shall apply to management of vertical accessways: a. Where sensitive habitat resources are present, limited or controlled methods of access and/or mitigation designed to eliminate or reduce impacts to ESHAs shall be required. b. The hours during which vertical coastal access areas are available for public use shall be the maximum feasible while maintaining compatibility with nearby neighborhoods and land uses. The hours for public use shall be set forth in each individual coastal development permit. Unless specific hours are described within a permit, the access shall be deemed to be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. c. In order to maximize public use and enjoyment, user fees for access to vertical beach and shoreline areas shall be prohibited. Activities and/or uses that would deter or obstruct public vertical access shall be prohibited. d. Private for-profit commercial use of vertical accessways shall be prohibited. e. Camping or other use of vertical accessways for overnight accommodations shall be prohibited. f. Motorized vehicles shall be prohibited on vertical accessways.	**OS 2.8 Management of Vertical Accessways. [GP/CP]** The following standards shall apply to management of vertical accessways: a. Where sensitive habitat resources are present, limited or controlled methods of access and/or mitigation designed to eliminate or reduce impacts to ESHAs shall be required. b. The hours during which vertical coastal access areas are available for public use shall be the maximum feasible while maintaining compatibility <u>and ensuring public safety</u> with nearby neighborhoods and land uses. The hours for public use shall be set forth in each individual coastal development permit. Unless specific hours are described within a permit, the access shall be deemed to be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. c. In order to maximize public use and enjoyment, user fees for access to vertical beach and shoreline areas shall be prohibited. Activities and/or uses that would deter or obstruct public vertical access shall be prohibited. d. Private for-profit commercial use of vertical accessways shall be prohibited. e. Camping or other use of vertical accessways for overnight accommodations shall be prohibited. f. Motorized vehicles, <u>except service, maintenance, and public safety vehicles,</u> shall be prohibited on vertical accessways.
OS 7.3	**OS 7.3 Open Space for Preservation of Natural Resources. [GP]** Goleta's natural resource lands include sandy beaches and dunes; rocky intertidal areas; coastal lagoons; coastal bluffs; eucalyptus groves and monarch butterfly aggregation sites; native grasslands; streams and associated riparian areas; wetlands, lakes, and ponds; and habitats for various protected plant and animal species. Figure 3-5 designates all ESHAs as protected open space. The following standards shall apply to these areas: a. The designated natural resource areas shall be managed by the City in accord with the policies described in the Conservation Element. b. The City may require dedication of open space easements as a condition of approval of development on sites that have open	**OS 7.3 Open Space for Preservation of Natural Resources. [GP]** Goleta's natural resource lands include sandy beaches and dunes, rocky intertidal areas, coastal lagoons, coastal bluffs, eucalyptus groves and monarch butterfly aggregation sites, native grasslands, streams and associated riparian areas, wetlands, lakes and ponds, and habitats for various protected plant and animal species. Figure 3-5 designates <u>areas that may be</u> ~~all~~ environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA) <u>and could be</u> ~~as~~ protected <u>as</u> open space <u>depending upon the findings of site-specific biological studies</u>. The following standards shall apply to these areas. a. The designated natural resource areas shall be managed by the City in accord with the policies described in the Conservation Element.

	space resources as shown in Figure 3-5. c. The City encourages the donation of easements or fee-simple interests in open space lands to the City or other appropriate nonprofit entity, such as a land trust.	b. The City may require dedication of open space easements as a condition of approval of development on sites that have open space resources as shown in Figure 3-5. c. The City encourages the donation of easements or fee-simple interests in open space lands to the City or other appropriate non-profit entity, such as a land trust.
Fig 3-1	**Figure 3-1, Open Space Element, Coastal Access Map**	Amend the Coastal Access Map, Figure 3-1, to depict one vertical access point that accommodates relocation of the existing access and proposed access and the removal of the proposed drop off point at the Bacara Resort.
Fig 3-5	**Figure 3-5, Open Space Element, Open Space Plan Map**	**Figure 3-5, Open Space Element, Open Space Plan Map** *Revise Figure 3-5 (APN 079-200-013) as follows:* -Relocate the Passive Parks/Open Space Area designation to match the realignment of the parking lot, vertical access, and snack bar, consistent with Figure 3-1. -Bacara to proceed with ESHA boundary adjustments per the process outlined in CE 1.5 *Add note to Figure 3-5 following tsunami run-up note as follows:* "The Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) designations on this map are consistent with the ESHAs identified in Conservation Element Figure 4-1. Corrections to the map of ESHAs are allowed pursuant to subpolicy CE 1.5."
CE Page 4-2	The following habitats occur within Goleta and are considered to be ESHAs: marine resources, beach and shoreline resources, coastal dunes, coastal bluff scrub, foredune, oak woodlands/savannah, dense stands of native grasslands, all wetlands such as vernal pools, riparian habitats, butterfly roosts, raptor roosts and nests, and habitats that support special-status plant and wildlife species, including western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*) habitat.	The following habitats occur within Goleta and ~~are considered to be~~ may be designated as ESHAs based upon site specific biological studies: marine resources, beach and shoreline resources, coastal dunes, coastal bluff scrub, foredune, oak woodlands/savannah, dense stands of native grasslands, all wetlands such as vernal pools, riparian habitats, butterfly roosts, raptor roosts and nests, and habitats that support special-status plant and wildlife species, including western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*) habitat. In addition to other relevant factors, ESHA designations determined by site-specific biological studies shall take into account historical site conditions, previous disturbance and degradation, sustainable vegetative values, and dependence by sensitive species.

CE 1.2	**CE 1.2 Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas. [GP/CP]** ESHAs in Goleta are generally shown in Figure 4-1, and Table 4-2 provides a summary of the ESHAs and examples of each. The provisions of this policy shall apply to all designated ESHAs. ESHAs include the following resources: a. Creek and riparian areas. b. Wetlands, such as vernal pools. c. Coastal dunes, lagoons or estuaries, and coastal bluffs. d. Beach and shoreline habitats. e. Marine habitats. f. Coastal sage scrub and chaparral. g. Native woodlands and savannahs, including oak woodlands. h. Native grassland. i. Monarch butterfly aggregation sites, including autumnal and winter roost sites, and related habitat areas. j. Beach and dune areas that are nesting and foraging locations for the western snowy plover. k. Nesting and roosting sites and related habitat areas for various species of raptors. l. Other habitat areas for species of wildlife or plants designated as rare, threatened, or endangered under state or federal law. m. Any other habitat areas that are rare or especially valuable from a local, regional, or statewide perspective.	**CE 1.2 Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas. [GP/CP]** Naturally occurring habitats which may be considered to be ESHAs in Goleta are generally shown in Figure 4-1~~, and~~ Table 4-2 provides a summary of habitats which may be considered ~~the~~ ESHAs and examples of each. The provisions of this policy shall apply to all ~~designated~~ ESHAs designated after a formal determination has been made by the City based upon site-specific environmental studies. ESHAs may include the following resources: a. Creek and riparian areas. b. Wetlands, such as vernal pools. c. Coastal dunes, lagoons or estuaries, and coastal bluffs. d. Beach and shoreline habitats. e. Marine habitats. f. Coastal sage scrub and chaparral. g. Native woodlands and savannahs, including oak woodlands. h. Native grassland. i. Monarch butterfly aggregation sites, including autumnal and winter roost sites, and related habitat areas. j. Beach and dune areas that are nesting and foraging locations for the western snowy plover. k. Nesting and roosting sites and related habitat areas for various species of raptors. l. Other habitat areas for species of wildlife or plants designated as rare, threatened, or endangered under state or federal law. m. Any other habitat areas that are rare or especially valuable from a local, regional, or statewide perspective.

CE 1.3	**CE 1.3 Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs. [GP/CP]** Any area not designated on the ESHA map in Figure 4-1 that meets the ESHA criteria for the resources specified in CE 1.1 shall be granted the same protections as if the area was shown on the map. Proposals for development on sites where ESHAs are shown on the map or where there is probable cause to believe that ESHAs may exist shall be required to provide the City with a site-specific biological study that includes the following information: a. A base map that delineates topographic lines, parcel boundaries, and adjacent roads. b. A vegetation map that identifies species that may be indicators of ESHAs. c. A soils map that delineates hydric and nonhydric soils, if applicable. d. A census of animal species that indicates the potential existence of ESHAs. e. A detailed map that shows the conclusions regarding the boundary, precise location and extent, or current status of the ESHA based on substantial evidence provided in the biological studies.	**CE 1.3 Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs. [GP/CP]** Any area not designated on the ESHA map in Figure 4-1 that meets the ESHA criteria for the resources specified in CE 1.1 may ~~shall~~ be granted the same protections as if the area was shown on the map if they are determined to be ESHA and function as ESHA based upon site-specific biological studies. Proposals for development on sites where ESHAs are shown on the map, or areas meeting the criteria in CE 1.1 ~~where there is probable cause to believe that ESHAs~~ may exist, shall be required to provide the City with a site-specific biological study that includes the following information: a. A base map that delineates topographic lines, parcel boundaries, and adjacent roads. b. A vegetation map that identifies all vegetation communities and sensitive plant species ~~species that may be indicators of ESHAs~~. c. A soils map that delineates hydric and nonhydric soils, if applicable. d. A census of animal species that utilize the area ~~indicates the potential existence of ESHAs~~. e. A detailed map that shows the conclusions regarding the proposed boundary, precise location and extent of the area proposed as ESHA, or current status of the ESHA based on substantial evidence provided in the biological studies. g. Information as to historical site conditions, previous disturbance and degradation, sustainable vegetative values and dependence by sensitive species.
CE 2.2	**CE 2.2 Streamside Protection Areas. [GP/CP]** A streamside protection area (SPA) is hereby established along both sides of the creeks identified in Figure 4-1. The purpose of the designation shall be to preserve the streamside protection area in a natural state in order to protect the associated riparian habitats and ecosystems. The streamside protection area shall include the creek channel, wetlands and/or riparian vegetation related to the creek hydrology, and an adjacent upland buffer area. The width of the streamside protection area shall be as follows: a. In areas where land has already been fully	**CE 2.2 Streamside Protection Areas. [GP/CP]** A streamside protection area (SPA) is hereby established along both sides of the creeks identified in Figure 4-1. The purpose of the designation shall be to preserve the streamside protection area in a natural state in order to protect the associated riparian habitats and ecosystems. The streamside protection area shall include the creek channel, wetlands and/or riparian vegetation related to the creek hydrology, and an adjacent upland buffer area. The width of the streamside protection area shall be as follows: a. In areas where land has already been fully

	subdivided and developed, the SPA shall not be less than 50 feet outward on both sides of the creek, measured from the top of the bank or the outer limit of wetlands and/or riparian vegetation, whichever is greater. Exceptions may be allowed in instances where existing permitted development on a subject parcel encroaches within the 50-foot buffer if: (1) there is no feasible alternative siting for the development that will avoid the SPA; (2) the new development will not extend into the ESHA, and the resulting buffer will not be less than 25 feet; and (3) the new development will not encroach further into the SPA than the existing development on the parcel. b. In all other instances, the SPA shall not be less than 100 feet outward on both sides of the creek, measured from the top of the bank or the outer limit of associated wetlands and/or riparian vegetation, whichever is greater. c. If the provisions above would result in any legal parcel created prior to the date of this plan being made unusable in its entirety for any purpose allowed by the land-use plan, exceptions to the foregoing may be made to allow a reasonable economic use of the parcel, subject to approval of a conditional use permit.	subdivided and developed, the SPA shall not be less than 50 feet outward on both sides of the creek, measured from the top of the bank or the outer limit of wetlands and/or riparian vegetation, whichever is greater. Exceptions may be allowed in instances where existing permitted development on a subject parcel encroaches within the 50-foot buffer if: (1) there is no feasible alternative siting for the development that will avoid the SPA; (2) the new development will not extend into the ESHA, and the resulting buffer will not be less than 25 feet; and (3) the new development will not encroach further into the SPA than the existing development on the parcel. b. In all other instances, the SPA shall not be less than 50 ~~100~~ feet outward on both sides of the creek, measured from the top of the bank or the outer limit of associated wetlands and/or riparian vegetation, whichever is greater. c. If the provisions above would result in any legal parcel created prior to the date of this plan being made unusable in its entirety for any purpose allowed by the land-use plan, exceptions to the foregoing may be made to allow a reasonable economic use of the parcel, subject to approval of a conditional use permit. d. Development setbacks for ESHAs determined by site-specific biological studies shall be established in the manner provided in CE 1.5 taking into account historical site conditions, previous disturbance and degradation, sustainable vegetative values, dependence by sensitive species, and other relevant factors.
CE 2.5	**CE 2.5 Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems. [GP/CP]** Creek banks, creek channels, and associated riparian areas shall be maintained or restored to their natural condition wherever such conditions or opportunities exist. Creeks carry a significant amount of Goleta's stormwater flows. The following standards shall apply: a. The capacity of natural drainage courses shall not be diminished by development or other activities. b. Drainage controls and improvements shall be accomplished with the minimum	**CE 2.5 Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems. [GP/CP]** Creek banks, creek channels, and associated riparian areas shall be maintained or restored to their natural condition wherever such conditions or opportunities exist. Creeks carry a significant amount of Goleta's stormwater flows. The following standards shall apply: a. The capacity of natural drainage courses shall not be diminished by development or other activities. b. Drainage controls and improvements shall be accomplished with the minimum

	vegetation removal and disruption of the creek and riparian ecosystem that is necessary to accomplish the drainage objective. c. Measures to stabilize creek banks, improve flow capacity, and reduce flooding are allowed but shall not include installation of new concrete channels, culverts, or pipes except at street crossings, unless it is demonstrated that there is no feasible alternative for improving capacity. d. Drainage controls in new development shall be required to minimize erosion, sedimentation, and flood impacts to creeks. Onsite treatment of stormwater through retention basins, infiltration, vegetated swales, and other best management practices (BMPs) shall be required in order to protect water quality and the biological functions of creek ecosystems. e. Alteration of creeks for the purpose of road or driveway crossings shall be prohibited except where the alteration is not substantial and there is no other feasible alternative to provide access to new development on an existing legal parcel. Creek crossings shall be accomplished by bridging and shall be designed to allow the passage of fish and wildlife. Bridge abutments or piers shall be located outside creek beds and banks.	vegetation removal and disruption of the creek and riparian ecosystem that is necessary to accomplish the drainage objective. c. Measures to stabilize creek banks, improve flow capacity, and reduce flooding are allowed but shall not include installation of new concrete channels, culverts, or pipes except at street crossings, unless it is demonstrated that there is no feasible alternative for improving capacity. d. Drainage controls in new development shall be required to minimize erosion, sedimentation, and flood impacts to creeks. Onsite treatment of stormwater through retention basins, infiltration, vegetated swales, and other best management practices (BMPs) shall be required in order to protect water quality and the biological functions of creek ecosystems. e. Alteration of creeks for the purpose of road or driveway crossings shall be prohibited except where the alteration is not substantial and there is no other feasible alternative to provide access to new development on an existing legal parcel. Creek crossings shall be accomplished by bridging and shall be designed to allow the passage of fish and wildlife. Bridge abutments or piers <u>should be</u> ~~shall~~ be located outside creek beds and banks<u>, where feasible</u>. <u>f. Take into account historical site conditions, previous disturbance and degradation, sustainable vegetative values, and dependence by sensitive species.</u>
CE 4.6	**CE 4.6 Standards Applicable to New Development Adjacent to Monarch ESHAs. [GP/CP]** The following standards shall apply to consideration of proposals for new development adjacent to monarch ESHAs or ESHA buffers: a. A site-specific biological study, prepared by an expert approved by the City who is qualified by virtue of education and experience in the study of monarch butterflies, shall be required to be submitted by the project proponent. b. The study shall include preparation of a Monarch Butterfly Habitat Protection Plan, which at a minimum shall include: 1) the mapped location of the cluster of trees where monarchs are known, or have been	**CE 4.6 Standards Applicable to New Development Adjacent to Monarch ESHAs. [GP/CP]** The following standards shall apply to consideration of proposals for new development adjacent to monarch ESHAs or ESHA buffers: a. A site-specific biological study, prepared by an expert approved by the City who is qualified by virtue of education and experience in the study of monarch butterflies, shall be required to be submitted by the project proponent. b. The study shall include preparation of a Monarch Butterfly Habitat Protection Plan, which at a minimum shall include: 1) the mapped location of the cluster of trees where monarchs are known, or have been

	known, to roost in both autumnal and over-wintering aggregations; 2) an estimate of the size of the population within the colony; 3) the mapped extent of the entire habitat area; and 4) the boundaries of the buffer zone around the habitat area. c. A temporary fence shall be installed along the outer boundary of the buffer zone prior to and during any grading and construction activities on the site. d. If an active roost or aggregation is present on the project site, any construction grading, or other development within 200 feet of the active roost, shall be prohibited between October 1 and March 1.	known, to roost in both autumnal and over-wintering aggregations; 2) an estimate of the size of the population within the colony; 3) the mapped extent of the entire habitat area; and 4) the boundaries of the buffer zone around the habitat area. c. A temporary fence shall be installed along the outer boundary of the buffer zone prior to and during any grading and construction activities on the site. d. If an active roost or aggregation is present on the project site, any construction grading, or other development within 200 feet of the active roost, shall be prohibited between October 1 and March 1, unless a biological study is provided which provides for biological monitoring and other measures to protect the roost or aggregation site.
CE 5.1	**CE 5.1 Designation of ESHAs.** [GP/CP] The following habitats, which are not specifically included in other policies, are hereby designated ESHAs: a. Native grasslands. b. Coastal sage scrub and chaparral.	**CE 5.1 Designation of ESHAs.** [GP/CP] Except as otherwise determined in connection with site-specific biological studies or as may be determined appropriate by the City on a case-by-case basis, tThe following habitats, which are not specifically included in other policies, are considered sensitive habitats and may be hereby designated as ESHAs taking into account whether the community is naturally occurring, whether it is or has been subject to disturbance and degradation, and use of the vegetation community by sensitive species: a. Native grasslands. b. Coastal sage scrub and chaparral.
CE 8.2	**CE 8.2 Protection of Habitat Areas. [GP/CP]** All development shall be located, designed, constructed, and managed to avoid disturbance of adverse impacts to special-status species and their habitats, including spawning, nesting, rearing, roosting, foraging, and other elements of the required habitats.	**CE 8.2 Protection of Habitat Areas. [GP/CP]** All development shall be located, designed, constructed, and managed to avoid disturbance or of adverse impacts to special-status species and their habitats, including spawning, nesting, rearing, roosting, foraging, and other elements of the required habitats. Buffers shall be provided around areas in which special status species habitats are determined to be present based upon site specific biological studies.
Fig 4-1	**Figure 4-1 Special-Status Species and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas**	Bacara to proceed with ESHA boundary adjustments per the process outlined in CE 1.5

NOTE: Shaded rows indicate policy amendments that overlap with Track 3.

Ordinance Amendment (05-034-OA):

The proposal includes a request to amend the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance (GGMO) to exempt the project from its provisions. As proposed, the applicant considers that the proposed project would provide substantial community benefit including: 1) a substantial increase in annual transient occupancy tax revenue to the City; 2) a substantial increase in annual property tax and sales tax revenue to the City; 3) enhancing coastal access opportunities for the public; 4) it would not cause any new impacts on schools; and 5) it would not cause any substantial increase in the number of hotel employees.

Requested Modifications

The applicant is requesting the following modifications per the provisions of §35-174.8(1), Article II of the City Code (Coastal Zoning Ordinance, or CZO):

- Reduction of the Hollister Avenue front yard setback requirement (20 ft. from road right-of-way or 50 ft. from centerline) to accommodate on-site amenities and facilities including the proposed subterranean parking structure to be located on proposed Lot 2 as shown on Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (05-034-TPM).
- Modification of the building height requirement (35 ft. from existing grade) to allow for building construction not to exceed 35 ft. from finished grade, with up to an additional 6 feet for chimneys and raised roof extensions.

Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (05-034-TPM)

The applicant requests a two-lot subdivision of the 72.73-acre Bacara Resort and Spa project area that is comprised of APNs 079-200-012 & -013. Lot 1, totaling 60.07 acres (gross and net), would include the existing Bacara Resort and Spa, existing and proposed Hollister Avenue widening corridor, and an open space eastern terrace area. Lot 2, totaling 12.66 acres, would include all other proposed project site improvements.

Final Development Plan (05-DP-034)

The Final Development Plan would provide for construction of a 55-unit condominium hotel development and ancillary facilities. The proposed 55-unit condominium hotel development would be located within the Lot 2 12.66-acre area commonly referred to as the "Valley Floor" of the Bacara property, located directly southeast of the initial phase of the Bacara Resort and Spa facilities. Widening of Hollister Avenue would occur from the proposed improvements east to the Bacara Resort and Spa property boundary. Proposed improvements include nine (9) two and three story buildings, an entrance/ arrivals building, a pool, with pool cabanas (pool cabanas are constructed in a wooden post and beam lattice like shape, open to the sky) resort operational support facilities and guest parking. To accommodate the proposed improvements, the existing tennis facility and maintenance building, four (4) tennis courts, a 50-space public parking lot,

and a vertical beach access trail would be relocated. An existing beach house and public restrooms located adjacent to the beach on the southern slope of the Valley Floor would remain.

Table 2 summarizes proposed Completion Phase project buildout. All development would occur in proposed Lot 2, with the exception of Hollister Avenue Road widening, occurring in the Lot 1 portion of APN 79-200-013. Individual building and parking structure footprints are provided in Table 3 (see pages 13 and 14).

Table 2. Project & Site Statistics

	Existing	Proposed	Net Change
Lot Area	72.73 acres (gross/net) APN 79-200-012: 30.93 acres APN 79-200-013: 41.8 acres	APN 79-200-012: 30.93 acres APN 79-200-013: Partial Lot 1 - 29.14 acres (gross/net) Lot 2 - 12.66 acres (gross/net)[1]	NA
Building Floor Area	8,145 s.f.	190,222 s.f. (aboveground) 53,562 s.f. (underground) -7,145 (demo) 236,639 s.f. total	+228,494 s.f.
Coverage			
Building Footprint	9,216 s.f.	90,677 s.f.	+81,461 s.f.
Impermeable Surfaces	160,564.86 s.f.	137,538 s.f.	- 23,026.86s.f.
Open Space (including Landscaping)	1,651,869 s.f.	323,368sq. ft.	-1,328,501s.f.
Parking			
Resort	10 spaces	113 spaces	+103
Public	50 spaces	61 spaces	+11

Note: The Coastal Zoning Ordinance defines Lot area, Net as follows: The gross lot area minus any area lying within a public street, such public street being defined as a permanently reserved right-of-way which has been dedicated to the City of Goleta. As this does not occur within the project site, gross and net lot areas are the same

Project Components

The following description and project statistics are current as of March 12, 2009. Further refinements are anticipated as the project moves through City's design review and entitlement process, which are underway.

Resort Facilities

Resort Suites

The project includes construction of 55 resort condominium hotel units (keys or suites), ranging in size from approximately 2,300 s.f. to 2,900 s.f., constructed within a total of nine (9) buildings, with a building height of 35 feet from finished grade for Buildings 1-6 and a building height of 23 feet from finished grade for Buildings 7-9, plus up to an additional 6 feet for chimneys and raised roof extensions. Each of the proposed 55 resort condominium suites would be available for purchase and subject to management and maintenance easements plus occupancy restrictions, including limits to owner occupancy of the individual unit of 90 days per year and making the unit available to the general public through the resort's reservation system for a minimum 275 days per year. Management and maintenance easements would require the project to be managed and maintained by the resort's management company.

Table 3: Completion Phase Building & Parking Square Footage and Footprint

BUILDING	UNITS	FLOOR AREA (S.F.)[1]	FOOTPRINT[2]
#1	6	20,467	7,863
#2	6	20,235	7,894
#3	6	20,235	7,894
#4	6	20,235	7,894
#5	6	20,235	7,894
#6	9	29,218	11,344
#7	6	19,577	12,277
#8	6	19,577	12,277
#9	4	15,316	10,213
Cabanas	14	1,610	1,610
Tennis Club House	1	1,909	1,909
Arrivals Building (In Courtyard)	1	1,608	1,608
Total		**190,222**	**90,677**
Tennis Courts	4	23,760	23,760
Maintenance Yard	1	2,447	2,447

Parking Public	61 spaces		
UNDERGROUND FACILITIES[3]			
Parking [4]	113 spaces	51,325	*Underground
Mechanical area	1	7,149	*Underground
Maintenance area	1	5,088	*Underground
Restroom Areas for Pool	1	625	*Underground
Staff lounge	1	1,357	*Underground
Parking/Charging station[4]	1	2,483	*Underground
Storage	3	15,826	*Underground
House keeping	2	20,575	*Underground
Pool equipment room	1	2,942	*Underground
Total		**107,370**	
REMOVED/RELOCATED FACILITIES			
Tennis Clubhouse & Maintenance Building	1	-7,145	-7,145
Tennis Courts	4	-23,760	-23,760
Parking – Maintenance	-10 spaces		-10 spaces
Parking – Public	-50 spaces		-50 spaces

Notes:
1) Represents Gross Floor Area, including Stairs and Circulation Spaces between Hotel Condominium Units on each floor. Terrace areas are not included.
2) Represents Gross Building Footprint Area inclusive of Stairs, Ground Floor Terraces and Circulation area on the Ground Floor.
3) Underground refers to those areas that are below the proposed finished grade of the entrance courtyard, public access parking, tennis courts, and a portion of the hotel condominium buildings.
4) These areas excluded from calculation of gross floor area.

Tennis Facility and Tennis Courts

The existing 7,147 square foot (s.f.) tennis facility and maintenance facility located in the northernmost portion of the Valley Floor is proposed to be reconfigured and partially relocated from the existing footprint. A new tennis facility and maintenance facility would consist of a 1,909 s.f. tennis facility, a 5,088 sq. ft. maintenance facility within the below grade support spaces (as described below), and a 2,447 s.f. maintenance yard. The existing four (4) adjacent tennis courts, located generally south of the existing tennis facility, are proposed to be shifted north to the location of the existing public parking lot, which would be relocated as described in the *Parking and Circulation* and *Public Improvements* sections below.

Maintenance Building

As described above, the existing maintenance building would be removed as part of the reconfigured tennis facility. Portions of the existing building slab-on-grade would be re-used as an exterior maintenance yard located adjacent to the new tennis facility situated above. Maintenance services are proposed to be contained within the proposed underground support services area and parking structure.

Ancillary Buildings

The majority of onsite resort amenities are presently provided within the adjacent Bacara Resort and Spa. A new resort swimming pool and cabana pool deck for guest use is proposed within the suite buildings layout (between buildings 7 and 8). A small valet station would be located next to a new entrance court to serve guests who are staying in this area of the resort.

Parking and Circulation

Currently, one paved parking lot is located on the Valley Floor that consists of 50 public parking spaces that support access to Haskell's Beach, and 10 parking spaces that support resort maintenance operations and hotel and spa guests utilizing the tennis facility. The 50 public parking spaces would be expanded to 61 spaces, and would be relocated just east of its existing location. The new 61-space parking lot would be dedicated and available for public use in its entirety. The existing parking lot area would be redeveloped to accommodate the resort parking and resort operational support, with the relocated tennis courts as described above.

Access to the project site would continue to occur from Hollister Avenue; however, a new entrance to the resort area would be provided east of the current tennis facility and public parking lot entrance (the public parking lot entrance would be relocated as well). An additional entrance would be provided to the new public parking lot just east of the existing fire access road. The existing landscape median would be reconfigured to allow for new median breaks and an expanded left turn deceleration lane to serve the resort and public parking lot entrances. The tennis facility and public parking lot entrance would remain and provide access to the Completion Phase valet parking area and support services. The existing emergency access road and fire department turnaround would be reconfigured concurrent with the new public parking lot entrance.

Guests arriving at the proposed resort would first proceed to the existing resort's Main Reception building for check-in. Guests staying in the Completion Phase resort area would proceed to their suites either via jitney service through the existing resort, or by driving their car to the Completion Phase valet parking area. An underground parking garage with 113 spaces is proposed to accommodate hotel guest parking. Garage access for guests would be provided through either convenience stairs, or through an internal elevator connection located within the entrance court area. The parking

structure also includes space for resort jitney carts, mechanical space, general storage areas, house keeping services, pool systems and equipment storage, and a staff lounge.

Public Improvements

Public Parking and Beach Access

An existing 50-space public parking lot and 810-foot vertical beach accessway to Haskell's Beach are located in the proposed project area; these are proposed to be relocated to provide an enlarged and separate parking facility to accommodate certain elements of the project. As such, the project includes a new at-grade, 61-space public parking lot that would be located just east of the existing parking lot. The proposed lot would provide entirely separate parking from the resort facilities and would be dedicated exclusively for use by the public. In addition, the project includes a new approximately 600-foot, ADA compliant, vertical beach accessway from the public parking lot to Haskell's Beach. The relocated coastal accessway would access the beach just to the east of the existing beach house located adjacent to the beach on the southern slope of the Valley Floor. The existing beach house containing public restrooms, a snack shop and showers would not be affected by the project.

Emergency Access

A reconfigured emergency access road is proposed within the Completion Phase project site on proposed Lot 2 adjacent to the new/relocated vertical beach access trail. The emergency access road would be available for emergency responders to access the coast during emergency situations. The emergency access road would terminate with a fire department turnaround and staging area adjacent to the beach. The staging area would provide for the launch of amphibious emergency vehicles, which would be the only location in the City where this operation could occur. All internal jitney paths within the Completion Phase have also been designed to accommodate emergency response vehicles.

Hollister Avenue Road Improvements

Access to the Completion Phase project site would continue to occur from Hollister Avenue and a new entrance to the resort area would be provided east of the current tennis facility and public parking lot entrance, which would be relocated as well. An additional entrance would be provided to the new public parking lot just east of the existing fire access road. The existing landscape median of Hollister Avenue would be reconfigured to allow for additional median breaks, and an expanded left turn deceleration lane to serve the resort and public parking lot entrances. To accommodate the expanded left turn deceleration lane, portions of Hollister Avenue would be widened to a maximum of approximately 25 feet within Lot 1 on APN 079-200-013 for

approximately 670 feet along the northern road right-of-way opposite the project site. A retaining wall and concrete swale would be constructed along the widened road section opposite the project site and new curb and gutter would be installed on both sides of Hollister Avenue adjacent to the project site. The reconfigured road median is proposed to be planted with a mix of indigenous plantings and is designed to function as a vegetated bio-retention strip to treat stormwater runoff from the roadway.

Grading and Drainage

Completion Phase project grading consists of approximately 35,100 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 21,400 cy of fill based on existing grades at the completion of the original improvements (see Section 9. Environmental Setting, below). Shrinkage, overexcavation and compaction of cut materials would result in an overall balance and preclude the need for off-site import or export according to the engineering earthwork calculations (see Figure 9). These earthwork improvements would facilitate the construction of a total of nine (9) two- and three- story suite buildings, a guest swimming pool and cabana pool deck, entry and circulation improvements, and an underground parking and support facility structure. The underground (below finished grade) parking and support facility structure is proposed primarily in shallow cut areas, with a number of the suite buildings (Buildings 2-5), the entrance court, tennis facility and a portion of the public parking lot constructed above the structure. Buildings 1 & 6 are proposed to be constructed on fill soils above existing grade. A portion of the public parking lot is planned to be constructed on fill materials, above the existing topography.

The project design is intended to reduce the amount of excavation of the additional fill materials temporarily placed on the Valley Floor during the construction of the Initial Phase improvements, as well as protecting the approximately two feet of yellow identification sand and a Geo-Tech fabric placed prior to the fill at the commencement of the Initial improvements. The pool and cabana pool deck is proposed at an elevation and in an area with an existing elevation that would allow the majority of the fill in that location to remain, with minimum foundations extending below the existing grades. The applicant intends for no proposed pool or cabana pool deck foundations to extend into native soils, as extensive fill soils were placed in these areas during the Initial phase improvements.

As identified elsewhere in this document, the objective of the proposed project, relative to archaeological resources, is to: 1) avoid the placement of buildings within recorded archaeological site boundaries; 2) place proposed structural foundations at an elevation and in an area with an existing elevation that would allow the majority of the fill in that location to remain with minimum foundations extending below the existing grades; and 3) where portions of the pool and pool cabana structures would be located within the boundary of recorded archaeological sites, ensure that proposed foundations would not penetrate native soils and would instead rest above soils brought in during Initial Phase construction, including the yellow sand placed above the protective geotech fabric.

The proposed storm drain system would employ numerous storm water quality facilities such as vegetated bioswales and bioretention basins to filter stormwater prior to discharge from the site. Two existing storm drain outlets in Tecolote Creek and one on the beach would be utilized by the project so that no additional outlets would need to be constructed.

Utilities

The project area is currently and would continue to be served by the Goleta Water District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Southern California Edison, and Southern California Gas Company. Waste and recycling services are provided by Marborg Industries. The Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department and Santa Barbara County Fire Department provide police and fire protection services, respectively. All proposed structures would include fire sprinklers.

Potable water would be supplied to the project by an existing 10-inch PVC water main on the site and reclaimed water would be provided via an existing 12 inch PVC water main, also onsite, for Completion Phase landscape irrigation. Sewage disposal would be accommodated by an onsite 8'' sewer force main.

Architecture

The project design is based on the existing resort's village-like community within a wider landscape context, drawing from colors and forms of the natural landscape and with reference to the ocean-influenced Sandpiper golf course to the east and the Spanish Colonial influence of the existing Bacara Resort, overlooking the site to the west. The nine (9) suite buildings are arranged on the site in a broken double arc pattern with two tiers. The first tier (south group closest to the ocean) consists of three (3) two-story buildings (Buildings 7-9) situated on either side of the guest pool. The rear tier (north group closest to Hollister Avenue) consists of six (6) three-story structures (Buildings 1-6). The elevation of the buildings arc is modulated to reduce the horizontality of the building elevations, with the maximum building height proposed at 35 feet above finished grade.

Project design materials and colors include rustic stone structure bases with smooth, ashlar-bonded limestone above, and repeating elements of window frames balcony rails and roofing in pale bronze. The project also includes elements to achieve a sustainable design including photovoltaic installations on raised roof areas of seven suite buildings (Buildings 1-6 and 9), vegetated roof areas (grasses) on the first tier of suite buildings (Buildings 7-9), and bioretention basins incorporated into the site plan, surface parking areas, and the median of Hollister Avenue. The project applicant seeks to achieve one of the highest LEED certification levels and fire ratings for a project of this nature.

Landscape and Lighting

Landscape

The preliminary landscape palette consists of indigenous plants, shrubs and specimen trees. The project site landscaping has been divided into four zones reflecting the differing conditions present across the site.

Tecolote Creek Area

The Tecolote Creek corridor (roughly delineated on the project plans by a 100 foot setback from the creek centerline) would remain as-is to protect the existing natural plant species and habitat within the corridor.

Beachfront Area

Plant species native to California and, preferable to the region, that are tolerable of the marine environment would be used in the beachfront area. Plantings would include species of the local coastal scrub plant communities and, if possible, plants listed as rare in the wild would be used. Non-hybridizing and non-invasive species are proposed. To aid water conservation, all plants would have low water requirements, and, once established would not be irrigated. Native soil stabilizing plants would be used where appropriate to control erosion with vegetation rather than engineering. Wildlife habitat diversification would be encouraged on the lesser used perimeter areas of the site.

Central Resort Area

This area would feature only California native species. To further aid in water conservation, all plants chosen would have low irrigation requirements. No invasive plants would be used. Fire retardant species would be used in the vicinity of the buildings to provide the required 30’ fire buffer retardant zones.

Hollister Avenue Frontage

Indigenous woodland trees with shrub understory planting would be planted to screen the site improvements from the road. The comparatively sheltered position downwind of the buildings would allow a wider range of plants to be chosen, increasing bio-diversity and visual amenity.

Green Roofs

The lower two-story units would have partially vegetated roofs, to slow down rainwater run-off and increase biodiversity. Plants would be chosen from indigenous coastal scrub/dune species.

Hardscape Strategy

Impervious paving surfaces would be limited in vehicle routes to reduce rainwater runoff volumes and improve groundwater quality. Porous paving materials would be thoroughly investigated and may be used wherever soil conditions allow, minimizing the impact of the development on the existing hydrological conditions. Materials for the motor court, jitney and portions of the pedestrian paths may consist of interlocking stones to allow for rainwater infiltration while maintaining a reliable and long-lasting wearing surface.

Retaining Walls

Retaining walls would be clad in dry stone and stepped where possible to allow for greater planting areas and to soften the visual aspect of the walls. All retaining walls would be planted with indigenous cascading shrubs and screened where possible by small trees.

Lighting

Lighting is proposed to meet the operational and security requirements of the development, without resulting in unnecessary levels of light pollution. Minimal-impact lighting techniques are proposed, and artificial lighting would be shielded to prevent the disruption of the night sky, and the disturbance of wildlife. Upward pointing lights would be avoided, and lights would be directed downwards onto matt surfaces to avoid unnecessary reflectance. All lighting would comply with California Title 24 and would maximize energy efficiency.

Resort Operations

The proposed project does not include any residential component. All proposed development would be resort/hotel condominiums and associated infrastructure and amenities, public beach access and amenities, and support facilities including the new parking and support facility structure.

The proposed Completion Phase project operations would not require a substantial increase in the existing resort and spa Full Time Equivalents (“FTEs”) and it is anticipated that the existing employee base would be sufficient to draw from to fill the additional FTE’s needed. As the existing resort infrastructure, service areas, ancillary support areas and amenities were sized to accommodate the original plan of 524 keys, the management employee base and the service capacity of those areas would not change. The additional FTE’s required to service the Completion Phase would consist primarily of hourly support staff in the areas of Valet & Bellman Services (historically coming from students at UCSB) and Housekeeping. In addition, any FTE count above the existing base would be retained at times when the existing facility is operating at or

near capacity (e.g., it can be anticipated that there will be a natural displacement of guests who book suites in the Completion Phase who will be serviced by the same FTE base that would otherwise provide those services at the existing facility). Historically, the existing 360 key facility visitation data indicates that above 100 percent occupancy occurs on average approximately 12-15 days per year, such that the anticipated additional Completion Phase FTE employee requirements would be minimal. At full existing Resort and Spa facility occupancy, it is estimated that 35-50 additional full time equivalent (FTE) resort employees would be retained to support Completion Phase guests, but only for those temporary periods when overall occupancy (both the Initial Phase and the Completion Phase) demands.

Guests check-in at the Completion Phase condominium hotel development would occur at the existing resort's Main Reception. Guests staying in the Completion Phase resort area would proceed to their suites either via jitney service through the existing resort or by driving their car to the Completion Phase valet parking area. An underground parking structure with 113 spaces is proposed to accommodate hotel guest parking.

Project Construction

Site preparation and grading would involve an estimated 35,100 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 21,400 cy. of fill based on the current design and existing grades at the completion of the Initial Phase improvements. Shrinkage, overexcavation and compaction of cut materials would result in an overall site balance and preclude the need for off-site import or export according to the engineering earthwork calculations. Construction of the proposed project would occur with a single construction effort over a 14- to 16-month period and would be developed as follows: 1) the existing public parking lot would be demolished and constructed in its new location concurrent with the proposed (relocated) vertical beach access trail; 2) the underground resort support facilities and guest parking areas would be constructed in the location of the existing parking lot and four (4) new/relocated tennis courts constructed above; 3) the flat areas above the support facility areas and parking would be prepared with the remainder of the site area for construction of the proposed resort development; 4) the site utilities, infrastructure and building pads would be installed/constructed; and 5) the buildings would be constructed in one phase positioned as shown on the site plan. Construction activities would involve typical construction equipment including trenching equipment, concrete trucks, and semi trucks for material delivery. Staging, equipment, and materials storage would all occur on the site in developed or disturbed areas in close proximity to project construction areas. Temporary parking for construction workers would be provided at an off-site lot located on Hollister Avenue adjacent to Ellwood School, and workers would be shuttled to and from the site.

7. APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:

California Coastal Commission

Please note, since the proposed project lies within the Coastal Zone of the City, and the City has no Coastal Commission certified Local Coastal Program (LCP), required Coastal Development Permits (CDP) under the Coastal Act can only be issued by the Coastal Commission. Therefore, the City's review authority for any future Coastal Development Permits for development associated with the proposed Vesting Tentative Parcel Map, Final Development Plan, etc. would be limited to local review in-concept of the discretionary Development Plan application. Before any development associated with the proposed Vesting Tentative Parcel Map, Final Development Plan, etc. can occur, the applicant would have to obtain Coastal Development Permit(s) from the Coastal Commission. The City would then issue a follow up Land Use Permit (LUP) to complete the permitting process.

8. SITE INFORMATION:

Site Information	
Existing General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Designation	Commercial Visitor-Serving
Zoning Ordinance, Zone District	C-V (Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial)
Site Size	The entire Bacara Resort and Spa project area is 72.73 -acres (gross and net); APN 79-200-012: 31.2 acres/ APN 79-200-013: 41.8 acres The proposed project site is within APN 79-200-013, and includes all 12.66 acres of Lot 2, and a 29.14 acre portion of Lot 1. See Table 2 herein.
Present Use and Development	Bacara Resort & Spa; Public Access & Recreation
Surrounding Uses/Zoning	North: Union Pacific Rail Road/US Highway 101/Rancho Embarcadero South: Haskell's Beach/Pacific Ocean East: Venoco Processing Facility/Sandpiper Golf Course West: Bacara Resort & Spa/ Vacant Agriculturally Zoned Land
Access	Existing: Calle Real via US Highway 101 and/or Hollister Avenue Proposed: Calle Real via US Highway 101 and/or Hollister Avenue

Site Information	
Utilities & Public Services	Water Supply: Goleta Water District Sewage: Goleta West Sanitary District Power: Southern California Edison Natural Gas: Southern California Gas Company Cable: Cox Communications Telephone: Verizon Fire: Santa Barbara County Fire Department Police: Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department School Districts: Goleta Union/Santa Barbara High School Solid Waste Collection: Marborg Industries

9. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following Environmental Setting description includes both aspects of the entire 72.73-acre Bacara Resort and Spa property, and the proposed Completion Phase Lot 2 project site. The former project vicinity discussion provides context for understanding the relationship of the proposed Completion Phase project to the previously permitted and approved Initial Phase Resort and Spa.

Slope, Topography, Soils & Seismology

The project area is located on the western edge of the Goleta Valley, situated on an uplifted marine terrace between the Santa Ynez Mountains to the north and the Pacific shoreline to the south. The Bacara Resort and Spa property ranges in elevation from sea level to approximately 104 feet above mean sea level, and consists of five primary topographic features commonly referred to the Valley Floor, the Eastern Terrace, the riparian corridor of Tecolote Creek (directly west of the proposed Completion Phase project site), and the Haskell's Beach shoreline that includes sandy beach area and coastal bluffs. A grading plan was prepared for the Initial Phase of the resort which covered the entire 72.73 acre property. As a part of the initial phase of the resort, approvals that were granted for the Initial Phase of the resort and as required by the cultural resources study that was undertaken for the entire 72.73 acre site, certain improvements were completed within the area known as the Valley Floor or Lot 2 as designated in the proposed Vesting Tentative Map to protect cultural resources. First, a layer of geo-tech fabric was laid over the majority of the Valley Floor. Then, approximately two feet of yellow sand was placed above this membrane as an identification marker. Following the yellow sand, new layers of soil were placed above the majority of the Valley Floor, ranging from three to fifteen feet in height. Areas of the Valley Floor below the existing maintenance building, and parking lots were placed in compacted lifts, suitable for building and/or parking support. At the conclusion of the initial phase improvements and rough grading of the Valley Floor, there was an additional approximately 65,000 cubic yards of fill material gathered within the southern area of the Valley Floor from the initial phase improvements. This additional fill material was distributed within the southern portion of the Valley Floor,

south of the tennis courts and parking area in anticipation of its' potential use within the Completion Phase improvements.

Slopes on the project site range from relatively level (less than 3%) with locally confined slopes approaching 25% along the Valley Floor, within the Tecolote Riparian Corridor, and along the shoreline, with nearly level terrain at the summit of the Eastern Terrace that gives way to steep slopes of 40-70% where the terrace descends approximately 75 feet to the Valley Floor, and near vertical slopes at the 85 foot coastal bluff at the southernmost portion of terrace (adjacent and east of the Completion Phase project site).

Monterey shale rocks forms the majority of the Eastern Terrace which is capped by older alluvium. Younger alluvium is found in the Tecolote Creek corridor, as well as on the Valley Floor which also consists largely of artificial fill. Dune sand makes up the predominant geologic materials of the beach area.

Soils of the Eastern Terrace consist primarily of fine sandy loams underlain by loam and clay subsoil, and other loamy and gravelly material. Soils in the Valley Floor and Tecolote Creek corridor consists of recent alluvium layered with sandy loam, loam and loamy sand; however, soils on the Valley Floor have been modified substantially by fill grading associated with the previous oil and gas facilities, and engineered fill later provided for protection of environmentally sensitive resources.

The project area is a seismically active area but no known faults have been identified on the project site. The Moore Ranch Fault, classified as an active fault, is located approximately 1000 feet to the southeast of the site.

Fauna, Flora & Surface Water Bodies

The Tecolote Creek and associated riparian habitat (located west of the proposed Completion Phase project site on Lot 1), beach and dune habitat, coastal sage scrub and chaparral, and tree habitat potentially supporting monarch butterfly and/or raptor roost sites are identified as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) in the City General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

Archaeological Sites

Historically, the Valley Floor is within an archaeological sensitive area due to the presence of recorded prehistoric archaeological sites. Based on the 84-EIR-4, 87-EIR-11, 87-EIR-19 and the 91-EIR-13 and subsequent revisions as enumerated in the entitlement history below, the Valley Floor area has been analyzed and impacts mitigated, consistent with Initial Phase Conditions of Approval. A cultural resource management plan was developed to monitor and report the progress and completion of all required mitigations. All archaeologically sensitive areas noted in the EIR within the

Valley Floor were capped or filled with a protective geo-tech membrane, an identifiable two-foot layer of yellow sand and fill materials from three to twenty feet in height.

Prior to the installation of the geo-tech membrane and site capping, the local Chumash Native American Community, under the direction and monitoring of Jon Erlandson, PhD, a City-qualified archaeologist, performed a Phase II significance assessment and Phase III data recovery program. Non-burial remains and a collection of artifacts were recovered from these Phase III and II programs. The artifacts have been analyzed and curated at UC Santa Barbara.

Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located on the western boundary of the City of Goleta. The site is surrounded by a range of land uses. Land uses to the immediate east of the site consist of the Venoco Oil and Gas processing facility, the Sandpiper Golf Course, and generally residential and commercial uses along the Hollister Avenue corridor. Land uses to the north of the site include the Union Pacific Railroad, US Highway 101, and farther north, the 248-acre Rancho Embarcadero residential subdivision located in Tecolote Canyon. Land uses directly west and adjacent to the project consist of the Initial Phase Bacara Resort and Spa and associated improvements, with land farther west consisting of rural agricultural uses. Haskell's Beach and the Pacific Ocean occur immediate south of the site. The Ellwood Pier is located approximately 150 feet to the west of the Bacara Resort.

Existing Development/Historic Site Uses

The Valley Floor project site is currently developed with a tennis facility and maintenance building, four (4) tennis courts, maintained landscaping, a public parking lot and vertical beach access trail to the beach, and beach house (snack bar and public restrooms), all associated with and developed concurrent with the Initial Phase Bacara Resort and Spa adjacent parcel to the west.

The project site was formerly used for petroleum drilling, storage and processing facilities that were abandoned in the1950s. Subsequent to the abandonment of the oil and gas facilities, the site was considered and analyzed for potential residential development (Embarcadero Residential Development, 79-EIR-16), and later for resort/visitor serving commercial facilities associated with the Hyatt Resort and Hotel (84-EIR-4) which ultimately resulted in permitting and development of the existing Bacara Resort and Spa (see a detailed discussion in *Permitting and Entitlement Background* below).

Permitting and Entitlement Background:

In 1983, Wallover Inc. (with Hyatt Corporation as the future proposed manager) filed a Preliminary Development Plan application with the County of Santa Barbara for

development of the site as a resort hotel and conference center. As the County Local Coastal Program was not certified for the property a General Plan Application and a Rezone Application were also submitted to effectuate the land use and zoning designation as directed by the Coastal Commission. The initial project included a 574-room resort and conference center complex consisting of 46 buildings; 24 villa units and a tennis facility. Total building area proposed as part of the initial project was approximately 574,300 square feet (s.f.): 480,400 s.f. in the main complex; 54,400 s.f. in the villa units; and 39,500 s.f. in the tennis facility. The tennis facility was proposed on a 19-acre parcel north of the freeway but, along with 50 rooms, was eventually eliminated from the project. The revised project was considered in a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP; 83-GP-12, 83-RZ-15 and 84-EIR-4) and for which 159 conditions of approval have been satisfied during the construction of the Initial Improvements. The Bacara Resort & Spa was subsequently contemplated, analyzed and conditioned in conjunction with the review and approval of the project's PDP which identified 500 hotel rooms, 24 villas and associated onsite amenities in two distinct phases; herein described as the Initial Phase and Completion Phase. The project ultimately approved included 400 rooms for the Initial Phase portion, with a Completion Phase comprised of the additional 100 rooms and 24 villas. An EIR was certified in September 1984 (a supplement and addendum to the EIR were certified the same month) and the necessary land use designation and zoning were approved in June 1985. In December 1985, the Coastal Commission unanimously (11-0) approved a coastal development permit with conditions.

A Final Development Plan for the 400-room Initial Phase project (which was modified by ownership to 360 keys) was conditionally approved by the County Planning Commission in February 1988. The approval was appealed to the Board of Supervisors and ultimately upheld in August 1988. A revision to the Final Development Plan to allow construction of a bridge across Bell Canyon Creek was approved by the Planning Commission in November 1988. The 400-Room Initial Phase of the Bacara Resort and Spa located adjacent and west of the proposed project site Lot 2 was approved by the County of Santa Barbara (86-DP-046, 97-LUS-544 GO) and California Coastal Commission (CDP 4-85-343-A1-A3; 97-CDP-078) on the 72.73-acre property as a traditional 400-unit resort hotel and spa with associated infrastructure and amenities. The existing resort facilities were constructed primarily on a parcel immediately adjacent to the Completion Phase project site (APN 079-200-012), with the exception of the resort's tennis facility and maintenance facility, the existing public parking lot, vertical beach access trail, and the beach house which were constructed on the project site (APN 079-200-013).

A one-year time extension to the Final Development Plan (86-DP-046TE01) was granted by the Board of Supervisors in January 1997. Construction of the resort began in 1997 in compliance with permit timelines and conditions. Numerous onsite monitors (e.g., biological, archaeological, Native American and environmental) ensured that construction occurred in compliance with project conditions of approval. On September 1, 2000, the resort opened in phases to the public. Post-approval

monitoring was satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the conditions of approval.

Environmental Review Chronology

- *Embarcadero Residential Development, 79-EIR-16*
  The project proposed a 153-unit condominium housing development on 64 acres, on which Bacara now sits. This project was abandoned due to conflicts between the County's (residential) and the state coastal commission's (visitor serving commercial) vision for the site.

- *August 1984. 84-EIR-4*
  This EIR analyzed a resort hotel and conference center on the 73-acre site on which Bacara is located and a 19-acre property to the north of the freeway. The 19-acre site was eventually eliminated from the project. The EIR evaluated impacts from a 574- unit resort and conference center complex consisting of 46 buildings; 500 hotel rooms and 24 villa units; a tennis facility and 50 tennis units (the portion of the project ultimately eliminated). Building area totaled about 574,300 square feet: 480,400 in the main hotel complex; 54,400 s.f. in the hotel villa units and 39,500 s.f. for the tennis facility. Total site coverage was approximately 25 acres with 54 acres proposed for landscaping and open space. Significant unavoidable impacts (Class I) were identified in these categories: Visual Aspects, Archaeology, Ethnic Concerns, Transportation, Water Resources, Air Quality, Biology, and Construction Air Quality. Significant mitigable impact (Class II)) included: Housing, Geology and Soils, Water Quality, Energy, Fire Protection, Safety and Hazards, Sewer Service, Noise, and Transportation (onsite parking). Adverse but not significant impacts included: Police Services, Schools, Solid Waste, Electricity and Natural Gas Service, and Growth Inducement. Finally, beneficial impacts (Class IV) included Employment and Recreation. The EIR also analyzed a no-project alternative, a high density residential project on the 73-acre site, a low density conference center on the 73-acre site, and the project ultimately approved.

- *September 1984. Supplement to EIR 84-EIR-4*
  The project analyzed in this EIR was the project alternative with resort and conference center development sited only on the southern 73-acre site. The northern 19-acre property was excluded. The project was revised to include a total of 524 hotel units (500 hotel rooms and 24 villa units), 534,800 s.f. of building area, 16.5 acres of site coverage and 43.5 acres of landscaping and open space.

- *September 1984. Addendum to EIR 84-EIR-4*
  This addendum lists the beneficial impacts of the resort project.

- *November 1987. 87-EIR-ll (SEIR to 84-EIR-4)*

This EIR was also a supplement to the 1984 EIR (84-EIR-4) prepared for the project. The Preliminary Development Plan was approved in 1985. A Final Development Plan was also required. The Final Development Plan contained specific design details not included in the Preliminary Development Plan. The purpose of the November 1987 supplemental EIR {SEIR) was to address environmental impacts associated with changes to the 1984 project. As described in the EIR, the "changes are relatively minor, and the environmental impacts associated with them are minimal." Secondly, the SEIR addressed changes to the site conditions since the project was approved in 1985, namely: onsite hazardous materials; cumulative conditions for traffic circulation and air quality; and wastewater treatment and disposal. The project was broken into two phases: Initial Phase included 400 hotel rooms, a conference center, swimming pools, a spa facility, three restaurants, tennis courts, maintenance building, associated equipment storage and parking, public/ staff parking lot, access roads and bridges, utilities, landscaping and habitat restoration, as well as mitigation measures addressing the entire 73 acres. Completion Phase of the project is described as "an additional 100 hotel rooms and 24 villa units." In addition, both phases of the project were analyzed and mitigated in conjunction with Environmental Impact Report (84-EIR-4) which was prepared for the PDP. The Initial Phase was carried out through the approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP; 86-DP-046, 86-DP-046TE01

- *November 1987. Addendum to 87-EIR-ll*
  This addendum corrected vehicle trip data from 87-EIR-ll and included more information on monarch butterfly roosting sites.

- *January 1988. 87-EIR-19 (SEIR to 84-EIR-4 & 87-EIR-l1)*
  This EIR considered two primary issues. First, it addressed new information about the existing environmental setting specifically related to biology and cultural resources. Second, it looked at a realigned access road. The overall project (Initial Phase: 400 hotel rooms and resort, a conference center, swimming pools, a spa facility, three restaurants, tennis courts, maintenance building, associated equipment storage and parking, public/ staff parking lot, access roads and bridges, utilities, landscaping and habitat restoration, as well as mitigation measures addressing the entire 73 acres; Completion Phase: 100 additional hotel rooms and 24 villa units) did not change.

- *December 1988. Addendum to 87-EIR-19*
  This addendum analyzed impacts associated with a vehicle access bridge across Bell Canyon Creek.

- August 1996. Hotel Time Extension, 91-EIR-13 (Addendum) and Errata
  The addendum and errata clarified environmental impacts resulting from the project. (See Attachment A, Conditions of Approval.)

The mitigation measures and ensuing conditions of approval that have been implemented as a result previous approval and permitting activities are considered elements of the environmental setting and are characterized as appropriate in the CEQA analysis summarized below.

City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendments

The City of Goleta has initiated the study and environmental review of a number of City-wide General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendments (GPAs) (see Attachment B, City of Goleta Tract 3 GPAs), as identified in the City Council Staff GPA Initiation report dated January 20, 2009). Some of these parallel the proposed project's Amendments that if approved, would allow the proposed project to be found consistent with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

10. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist and analysis on the following pages.

■ Aesthetics
☐ Agricultural Resources
■ Air Quality
■ Biological Resources
■ Cultural Resources
■ Geology/Soils
■ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
■ Hydrology/Water Quality
■ Land Use/Planning
☐ Mineral Resources
■ Noise
☐ Population/Housing
☐ Public Services
■ Recreation
■ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Utilities/Service Systems
■ Mandatory Findings of Significance

11. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

■ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier environmental document, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project and that a subsequent document containing updated and/or site specific information should be prepared pursuant to CEQA Sections 15162/15163/15164.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier environmental document, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

David Stone

David Stone, Contract Planner Project EIR Manager

March 13, 2009

Date

12. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

(a) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including project specific, cumulative, construction, operational, onsite, offsite, direct, and indirect impacts. The explanation of each issue should identify the existing setting, any applicable threshold of significance, impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impact statement.

(b) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact". The discussion must be supported by appropriate information sources. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to requests such as the proposed project.

(c) The checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is: Potentially Significant, Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated, Less than Significant, or No Impact.

(d) A "Potentially Significant" response is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant" entries when the determination is made, then an EIR is required.

(e) A "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" response is appropriate where such incorporation of mitigation would reduce a potentially significant impact to a less than significant level. If there are one or more "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" entries when the determination is made, then a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared.

(f) Supporting Information Sources: References and sources should be attached, including but not limited to, reference documents, special studies, other environmental documents, and/or individuals contacted.

13. ISSUE AREAS:

AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Docu-ment
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	✓				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	✓				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	✓				
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		✓			

Existing Setting

- The project site is located in a semi-rural area of Santa Barbara County in the City of Goleta.
- There are five distinct visual areas experienced from public viewing areas including Hollister Avenue (a private road with a public easement used by the public) , the Rail Road right-of-way, and public beach access easements through the site and along Haskell's Beach that are both on the completion phase site, as well as within areas of the property to the east, north and west, that have been developed during the initial phase of the resort and infrastructure completion; 1) the Rail Road right-of-way, which runs in an easterly-westerly alignment across and adjacent to the northern portion of the parcel, has been landscaped with a fairly dense row of eucalyptus trees; 2) Tecolote Creek that flows south into the ocean is located west of the Completion Phase project site; the associated riparian corridor is characterized by marshy vegetation and trees; this portion of the Resort and Spa property serves as a visual separator from the westerly adjacent site that is developed with the Initial Phase of the Bacara Resort and Spa and the easterly adjacent "Valley Floor"; 3) the "Valley Floor" portion of the site is relatively flat and the upper portion is developed with 4 tennis courts, a parking lot and a maintenance building, all of which are landscaped with trees, shrubs, ornamentals, mulch and the undeveloped areas have low shrubs and ground cover; as the area opens up toward the ocean, there is a very gentle and slow undulation; a vertical beach access begins at the parking lot and serves as a trail to the beach house/snack bar and the ocean; an emergency beach access road also meanders through the site towards the beach on the eastern portion of the site; 4) the eastern terrace adjacent to the project site rises above the "Valley Floor" and has a mixture of grasses, shrubs and trees; and 5) the beach front which consists of low and sparse vegetation, a rocky area and then sand; the main visual element along the beach is the ocean.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant Aesthetic impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* instructs the project evaluator to assess visual/aesthetic impacts through a two step process. First, the visual resources of the project site must be evaluated including the physical attributes of the site, its visual uniqueness, and its relative visibility from public viewing areas. Of particular concern are visibility from coastal and mountain areas, as well as its visibility from the urban fringe and travel corridors. Secondly, the potential impact of a project on visual resources located onsite and on views in the project vicinity which may be partially or wholly obstructed views must be determined. This step includes an evaluation of the project's consistency with City and State policies on the protection of visual resources.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a. – c.)

- The proposed project has the potential to substantially affect beachfront visual resources experienced from the dedicated public accessways through the site and the adjacent Haskell's Beach.
- The proposed project has the potential to substantially affect one ocean view corridor experienced from Hollister Avenue that exists at the northern terminus of the existing emergency access road.
- The proposed project has the potential to substantially affect scenic visual resources as viewed from the adjacent Rail Road right-of-way.
- Further analysis of this issue area is required, thus this section will be evaluated in greater detail in the EIR.

(d.)

- Lighting is proposed to meet the operational and security requirements of the development, without resulting in unnecessary levels of light pollution.
- Minimal-impact lighting techniques are proposed, and artificial lighting would be shielded to prevent the disruption of the night sky, and the disturbance of wildlife.
- Upward pointing lights would be avoided, and lights would be directed downwards onto matte surfaces to avoid unnecessary reflectance.

Cumulative Impacts

- Substantial modification of oceanfront visual resources experienced from public view corridors including Santa Barbara Ranch

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- To be determined.

Residual Impact

- Unknown, potentially significant; to be determined in EIR.

EIR Scope of Work

- Describe and characterize existing visual resources as experienced from public view corridors.
- Evaluate computer visual simulations of existing and proposed views from Pacific Ocean, and public accessways to and along Haskell's Beach, and Hollister Avenue.
- Assess proposed landscaping ability to contribute to ameliorating the change in important visual resources as seen from public view corridors.
- Assess potential visual impacts associated with project night lighting.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				✓	
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?				✓	
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				✓	

- Prior to placement of Initial Phase development fill soils in the Valley Floor, a portion of the site contained prime soils, however, the overall site is not considered Prime, Unique or Statewide Important Farmland; the site is categorized as "Urban and Built Up Lands" (State Department of Conservation);
- The Completion Phase project site was developed with extensive fill soils and is otherwise disturbed;
- The property is designated "visitor-serving" and is zoned C-V, Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial
- The site is surrounded by an "Urban and Built Up Lands" designation to the west and north, by "Grazing Lands" designation to the east and the Pacific Ocean to the south (State Department of Conservation designations);
- There are no agriculturally designated or zoned lands immediately surrounding the project site, nor are there lands under Agricultural Preserve contracts within the vicinity.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact to Agricultural Resources would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, a project may pose a significant environmental effect on agricultural resources if it conflicts with adopted environmental plans and goals of the City or converts prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use or impairs the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a. - c.)

- The Valley Floor is not within a Williamson Act contract, is not surrounded by Williamson Act contracted land, nor does the project have an impact upon

conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use or impact agricultural zoning. Therefore no impact on agricultural resources would result.

Cumulative Impacts

- The proposed project would not result in any contribution to cumulative impacts on agricultural resources in the area.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- No mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impact

- No residual impacts on Agricultural Resources would occur as a result of project implementation.

EIR Scope of Work

- No additional analysis required.

AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Docu-ment
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	✓				
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		✓			
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		✓			
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		✓			
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		✓			

Existing Setting

- Santa Barbara County is in attainment for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (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 in nonattainment of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for O_3 and PM_{10}, and in attainment for NO_2, SO_2, and CO.
- The Venoco Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) oil and gas processing plant and associated Marine Terminal (EMT) and Platform Holly facilities operate south and east of the project site. This facility has the potential to generate hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) and odors.
- The northern property line of the project is approximately 300 feet from US Highway 101, but proposed development from US 101 is approximately 450 feet. The California Air Resources Board (CARB), recommends avoiding siting new sensitive land uses, such as the proposed project, within 500 feet of a freeway (based on a typical urban freeway with truck volumes of 10,000 -20,000 trips per day) to reduce exposure to high concentrations of air quality pollutants generated from a vehicular traffic.

Thresholds of Significance

The significance of a criteria pollutant concentration is determined by comparing it to the appropriate national or state ambient air quality standard. These standards represent the allowable atmospheric concentrations at which public health and welfare are protected and include a reasonable margin of safety to protect the more sensitive individuals in the population. A significant Air Quality impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* has identified a long term quantitative emission threshold of significance of 25 pounds/day (PPD) for ozone precursor's nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and reactive organic compounds (ROCs) from combined stationary and mobile sources. The County no longer has emissions significance thresholds for short-term construction activities, as construction emissions from land use development projects have been accounted for in the 2004 Clean Air Plan (CAP). However, since Santa Barbara County currently violates the state standard for PM_{10}, constriction activities that generate fugitive dust (PM_{10}) emissions would be required to implement SBCAPCD standard dust control measures to ensure these emissions remain less than significant.

In addition, the City's has established threshold criteria for conducting carbon monoxide (CO) emission modeling, which may be required to determine if the project would substantially add to the existing background carbon monoxide levels, potentially creating a carbon monoxide "hot spot." A CO hot spot occurs where the California one-hour standard of 20 parts per million (PPM) carbon monoxide is exceeded, which typically occurs at severely congested intersections.[1] Screening for such an impact is determined by the project's peak hour trip contribution. If a project contributes less than 800 peak hour trips, then carbon monoxide modeling is not required.

1 Per the City's Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual, projects that contribute 800 or more peak hour trips to an intersection operating at LOS D or worse are generally considered to potentially pose a significant CO effect and therefore should be required to model CO impacts.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a.)

- The project includes a request for exemption from growth limitations of the GGMO. Therefore, the project may not be consistent with the CAP.

(a. – c.)

- Short term air quality impacts would occur during project construction. Site preparation and grading would generate 35,100 cy of cut and 21,400 cy of fill. Shrinkage, overexcavation and compaction of cut materials would result in an overall balance and preclude the need for off-site import or export according to the engineering earthwork calculations; thus grading activities would not contribute to additional vehicle emissions. Because Santa Barbara County violates the state standard for PM_{10}, standard dust control measures must be implemented for any discretionary project involving earth moving activities.
- Equipment operation during construction of the proposed hotel completion phase would produce combustive PM_{10} emissions, potentially creating a public nuisance or exacerbating the existing PM_{10} nonattainment status within the County. (a-c)
- Heavy equipment used during proposed construction activities would produce combustive NO_X and ROC emissions; however, impacts would be short-term and would not violate established quantitative thresholds.

(b.)

- Operation of the project would produce significant ROC and NO_X emissions from all combined hotel project sources, including vehicular traffic, space and water heating, and consumer products. Further analysis of this issue area is required to determine more exact significance of potential impacts; thus this section will be evaluated in greater detail in the EIR.

(d. – e.)

- The proposed project would result in an adverse, potentially significant impact by increasing the number of people exposed to sources of hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions including acute non-cancer airborne toxins and odor within the region due to it's proximity to the Venoco Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) oil and gas processing plant.

Cumulative Impacts

- Continued operation and increased barge loadings at the Venoco EOF would have the potential for increased odor emissions, potentially resulting in an adverse cumulatively considerable affect on future guests of the Bacara completion phase, as well as sensitive receptors in the surrounding area. Impacts would be potentially significant.
- All related projects would be required to implement standard APCD dust control measures to reduce PM_{10} emissions from project construction. The project's contribution to other cumulative project sources of PM_{10} emissions in the region would produce adverse, but less than significant impacts.

- All related projects would be required to implement standard APCD measures related to construction equipment operation and maintenance to reduce NO_X and ROC emissions from project construction activities. The project's contribution to other cumulative project sources of NO_X and ROC emissions in the region would produce adverse, but less than significant impacts.
- *Global Climate Change:* The proposed project would have the potential to generate short-term GHG emissions including carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), ozone (O_3), and water vapor (H_2O) during construction activities and long-term GHG emissions associated with increased development, including energy use, space/water heating, and most prominently, vehicular trips. In compliance with the City's established methodologies, additional modeling and calculations would be necessary to quantify the project's potential contribution to cumulative Global Climate Change impacts.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- Standard APCD short-term construction and long-term operational standards.

Residual Impact

- To be determined in EIR.

EIR Scope of Work

- Conduct an air quality analysis based on applicant provided traffic and land use information. Address project-generated short term construction and long term operational emissions and the projects potential to exceed emissions thresholds as established by the City of Goleta and the SBCAPCD.
- Include URBEMIS2007 9.2.4 modeling results for construction, area, and mobile emissions. Use the modeled estimated project-generated ROC and NO_X emissions to determine if it would exceed the 25lb/day threshold.
- Determine if the proposed project would considerably contribute to the SCCAB non-attainment status of PM_{10} per both Federal and State standards, and O_3 pursuant to State standards.
- Analyze the potential of the Venoco Ellwood Onshore oil and gas processing plant to produce odors or HAPs affecting future guests of the Bacara Completion Phase project shall be included in the EIR Air Quality Section. A brief discussion of the recommended CARB project siting in relation to freeways will be also be included in the EIR.
- Include a discussion of Global Climate Change and the project's potential to significantly contribute by the production of greenhouse gases will be included within the Air Quality Section. Prepare this analysis in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and Local regulatory guidelines, and will consist of a brief description of Global Climate Change, summarizing the scientific and regulatory fundamentals; estimated project-generated Greenhouse Gas Emissions in regards to mobile and/or operational sources; and, a general

discussion of why the implementation of the proposed project may or may not be a factor in the enhancement of said global phenomenon.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	✓				
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	✓				
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	✓				
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	✓				
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	✓				
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				✓	

Existing Setting

- A number of special status species have been documented on the Bacara Resort and Spa property or have been noted as potentially occurring on in a previous environmental assessment of the property (SFEIR 87-EIR-11 Hyatt Resort and Hotel) including: Prairie bulrush (*Scirpus robustus*), Nuttall's snapdragons (*Antirrhinum nuttallianum*), globuse dune beetle (*Coelus globosus*), monarch butterflies, tidewater goby, southwestern pond turtle, California red-legged frog, Pacific salamander, green-backed heron, common yellowthroat, California least

tern, snowy plover, California brown pelican, and various birds of prey species including white-tailed kites, American kestrels, red-tailed hawk, red-shouldered hawk, Cooper's hawk, sharp-skinned hawk, great horned owl and barn owl. These species were the subject of prior environmental reviews and the Conditions of Approvals.

- A Globose Dune Beetle Protection Plan was completed as one of the 159 Conditions of Approval. The Completion Phase improvements would not extend into areas of the coastal strand habitat.
- A Tidewater Goby Protection Plan was completed as one the 159 Conditions of Approval in the Bell Creek Canyon area that was completed during the installation of the Initial Phase Improvements. The Completion Phase project would not extend into this area of Bell Creek.
- A previous environmental assessment of the property (SFEIR 87-EIR-11 Hyatt Resort and Hotel) noted a number of potentially significant sensitive habitat areas on or near the Bacara Resort and Spa property, including: riparian woodland, brackish marsh habitat associated with the immediately adjacent Tecolote Creek, and Bell Creek (which is not directly adjacent to the proposed building site but is located in the immediate vicinity), coastal strand habitat, and coastal sage scrub. In addition, Monterey Pine stands and Eucalyptus groves may be considered sensitive habitats when supporting raptor breeding, nesting or roosting activities or monarch butterfly roost sites and, in some instances, open native or non-native grassland areas may be considered sensitive habitat areas if providing a significant foraging area for raptors, particularly adjacent to nest sites. The proposed Completion Phase site is removed from the Monarch Butterfly roost sites. The majority of the other areas mentioned within this existing setting bullet have been addressed within the Initial Phase of construction, which have been fully completed and mitigated, where required pursuant to the Conditions of Approval.
- A previous environmental assessment of the property (SFEIR 87-EIR-11 Hyatt Resort and Hotel) documented a number of native trees on the property associated with significant habitat areas including: western sycamore, white alder, and coast live oak. The Initial Phase improvements, in accordance with the Conditions of Approval as shown in Attachment A were developed to preserve the riparian woodlands coastal strand and brackish marsh within the Tecolote Creek area that are within the initial phase portions of the property, adjacent to the completion phase site. A 100-foot wide buffer-zone was developed from the centerline of Tecolote Creek to reduce impacts to any habitat areas. The proposed improvements of the Completion Phase are not located within this 100 foot wide buffer zone.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Biological Resources would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, per the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* a project would pose a significant environmental impact(s) on biological resources in any of the following would result from project implementation:

a) A conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located;
b) Substantial effect on a rare or endangered plant or animal species;
c) Substantial interference with the movement of any migratory or resident fish or wildlife species;
d) Substantial diminishment of habitat for fish, wildlife, or plants.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a. - e.)

- Project implementation could result in both direct and indirect impacts to special status species previous observed and/or known to occur on or adjacent to the project site due unintentional mortality during construction activities, intensification of noise, lighting and on-site population increases associated with buildout of the project which could disturb wildlife and hinder their normal activities, and habitat loss.
- Project implementation could result in indirect impacts to natural habitat areas and wildlife movement corridors associated with adjacent riparian, coastal sage scrub, and coastal strand habitats. The project could also result in potential water quality impacts and degradation of adjacent riparian corridor and marine aquatic habitat due to storm water runoff and increased pollutants from impermeable surfaces, soil erosion and sedimentation, and construction activities and waste.
- Project implementation could result in both direct and indirect impacts to native or specimen trees established as a result of Initial Phase mitigation.
- Potential impacts to raptor species could occur if suitable onsite tree habitat and adjunct foraging areas are adversely affected by the project.
- Study is needed to characterize the site in detail, to identify and map sensitive habitat areas and evaluate impacts to biological resources located adjacent to the Completion Phase project site area from a cumulative and regional perspective and to assess project consistency with applicable plans and policies.

(f.)

- The project site is not the subject of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Cumulative Impacts

- Impacts to special status species, degradation and loss of native habitat across the project site could contribute incrementally to cumulative regional biological resources impacts. Impacts to onsite habitat areas may have potentially significant cumulative impacts to regional habitats and wildlife use, movement and foraging, particularly along the adjacent riparian corridors.

Residual Impacts

Impacts to individual specimen native trees on and adjacent to the Completion Phase project site would be less than significant with implementation of appropriate mitigation. Project-specific and cumulative biological impacts to special status species, natural communities and sensitive habitat areas, wildlife, and migration and dispersal, and native trees are potentially significant.

EIR Scope of Work

- Conduct field surveys and describe site conditions, including existing onsite and adjacent flora and fauna, and sensitive habitat areas, and habitat values. Accurately map, habitat areas native and mature specimen trees on the project site.
- Describe project changes and evaluate impacts to existing biological resources within the Completion Phase project site and indirect impacts on adjacent Initial Phase project areas from proposed project implementation including loss of habitat, habitat fragmentation; impacts to wildlife populations, corridors and movement areas, including access to habitat in adjacent areas. Consider impacts to special-status species, if applicable, and discuss role of other regulatory agencies (e.g. USFWS, CDFG, USACOE, etc.). Evaluate potential impacts to biological resources from intensification of noise, lighting and increased on-site population and potential degradation of water quality. Characterize impact significance.
- Consider completion of previous mitigation plans and identify where necessary feasible mitigation measures to reduce any significant biological impacts resulting from Completion Phase construction and operation.

CULTURAL RESOURCES **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact.**	**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**	**See Prior Doc-ument**
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	✓				
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	✓				
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✓	
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	✓				

Existing Setting

- Prehistoric Chumash populations occupied the Tecolote Canyon and Creek estuary over several millennia. One village, CA-SBA-72, is recorded within the Valley Floor Completion Phase project site.
- The entire archaeologically sensitive area, including two cemeteries, was systematically protected by placement of approximately two feet of yellow, non-cultural sand and a Geo-Tech fabric as a condition of Initial Phase Bacara Resort & Spa approvals. In addition, layers of fill three (3) to twenty (20) feet in height were added above this sand layer during the initial phase of the resort. This fill layer has effectively protected the sensitive cultural area from historical incidences of illicit artifact looting and destruction.
- The archaeological site is considered to be an extremely important heritage resource to the local Chumash community. Members of the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation have participated in implementation of all aspects of the Cultural Resources Management Plan prepared as a condition of approval, including Phase 2 significance assessment and directing mitigation efforts including project design to minimize direct impacts, identify and implement Phase 3 archaeological data recovery programs to address unavoidable impacts, and monitoring of all construction-related activities including vegetation removal within the archaeological site area.

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 above 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. – b.)

- Project grading within the Valley Floor and for Hollister Avenue widening improvements requires approximately 35,100 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 21,400 cy of fill. Shrinkage, overexcavation and compaction of cut materials would result in an overall balance and preclude the need for off-site import or export according to the engineering earthwork calculations. The fill that is shown to be cut would be reused within the project and would not be native or archaeologically sensitive soils, but fill soils that were transported and distributed across the Valley Floor during the initial phase of the resort. The project design is intended to reduce disturbance to existing fill soils placed on the Valley Floor during the Initial Phase of Bacara Resort & Spa development, particularly to avoid the protective sand Geo-Tech fabric placed on top of archaeological site CA-SBA-72. The footprint of the project's proposed buildings has also been designed to avoid the placement of buildings within the CA-SBA-72 outline. The only exceptions to this, the pool and cabana pool deck, are proposed at an elevation and in an area with an existing elevation that would allow the majority of the fill in that location to remain with minimum foundations extending below the existing grades. The proposed pool area has an additional 10-15 feet of fill on top of the geo-tech barrier that is designed to protect the areas below this area. These foundations are designed to not penetrate native soils and to instead be placed above soils imported during the construction of the original improvements, including the yellow sand that is protecting the geotech fabric. Any encroachment into native archaeological site soils previously determined to be significant resources would be a potentially significant impact.
- The placement of weight-bearing structures on top of the protective fill and Geo-Tech fabric would introduce new compression on underlying archaeological resources. These forces would have the potential to directly impact friable archaeological artifacts including shellfish, animal bone. This would be a potentially significant impact on cultural resources. The placement of structures within the archaeological site boundary could potentially be in conflict with the philosophy of avoiding such urban uses by some members of the local Chumash community.

(c.)

- Proposed excavations would not be sufficiently deep to encroach within possible marine rock formations in which paleontological resources could be encountered. Impacts would be less than significant.

(d.)

- Existing conditions require that development avoid all Chumash cemeteries. Any additional compression from added fill or structures could have impacts on the human remains. The proposed pool area has an additional 10-15 feet of fill on top of the geo-tech barrier that is designed to protect the areas below this area. These foundations are designed to not penetrate native soils and to instead be placed

above soils imported during the construction of the original improvements, including the yellow sand that is protecting the geotech fabric.

Cumulative Impacts

- Previous oil and gas extraction activities, illicit looting and disturbance, and development of Initial Phase of the Bacara Resort & Spa facilities have resulted in disturbances to archaeological sites in the Tecolote Canyon that are cumulatively significant. Depending on the ability to completely avoid sensitive areas of CA-SBA-72 within the Valley Floor, the project's incremental contribution these cumulative impacts would be potentially significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- Compliance with the existing Bacara Resort & Spa Cultural Resources Management Plan, including: 1) avoiding disturbance or construction in cemetery areas; 2) archaeological testing and mitigation data recovery of all potential impacts to recorded archaeological resources; and 3) construction activity monitoring by a City-qualified archaeologist and local Chumash representative.

Residual Impact

- Depending on the extent of encroachment into and/or compaction on sensitive CA-SBA-72 soils under the protective fill and Geo-Tech fabric, potentially significant.

EIR Scope of Work

- Analysis of grading, utility, lighting, and landscaping plans to assess related ground disturbances within the existing protective fill soils overlaying CA-SBA-72.
- Assessment of location of all ground disturbances relative to existing Chumash cemeteries.
- Assessment of the impacts from increased compaction of proposed development structural loads on underlying archaeological remains.
- Consultation with Chumash descendants identified by the Native American Heritage Commission as having knowledge and concerns of archaeological resources in this area.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		✓			
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?		✓			
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		✓			
iv. Landslides?		✓			
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		✓			
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	✓				
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	✓				
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				✓	

Existing Setting

- The Completion Phase project site southern boundary is located along the Goleta coastline that is subject to coastal hazards such as shoreline/bluff erosion and retreat and beach erosion.
- The Bacara Resort and Spa property ranges in elevation from sea level to approximately 104 feet above mean sea level, and consists of five primary topographic features commonly referred to as the Valley Floor, the Eastern Terrace, the riparian corridor of Tecolote Creek, and the Haskell's Beach shoreline that includes sandy beach area and coastal bluffs. The Completion Phase project site is set within the Valley Floor and portions of the eastern

terrace areas and surrounded by the other three topographical features as listed above.

- Slopes on the project site range from relatively level (less than 3%), with locally confined slopes approaching 25% along the Valley Floor, within the Tecolote Riparian Corridor, and along the shoreline, with nearly level terrain at the summit of the adjacent Eastern Terrace that gives way to steep slopes of 40-70% where the terrace descends approximately 75 feet to the Valley Floor, and near vertical slopes at the adjacent 85-foot coastal bluff at the southernmost portion of terrace.
- The project area is situated in the seismically active southern California region, which is characterized by numerous active, potentially active, and inactive faults. The City of Goleta's Safety Element identifies several faults in proximity to the project area, which have the potential to create seismically induced hazards such as ground shaking, surface rupture, liquefaction, and tsunamis.
- The soil type mapped within the Valley Floor project area consists of stratified (layered) fine sandy loam, loam, and loam sandy, which is moderately well-drained, with a moderately sub-soil permeability due to the clay content of the soil. The clay content has a high shrink-swell potential that can damage building foundations and roads.
- A portion of the project area has been designated by the City of Goleta Safety Element as an area with high Landslide Potential. Soil and slope-related hazards such as expansive soils, compressible and collapsible soils, landslides, and rock falls are known to exist within or in proximity to the project area.
- The Completion Phase project site is east of an area subject to occasional flooding associated with the Pacific Shoreline and Tecolote Creek.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Geology/Soils would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* assumes that a proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact on geological processes if the project, and/or implementation of required mitigation measures, could result in increased erosion, landslides, soil creep, mudslides, and/or unstable slopes. In addition, impacts are considered significant if the project would expose people and/or structures to major geological hazards such as earthquakes, seismic related ground failure, or expansive soils capable of creating a significant risk to life and property.

Project Specific Impacts

(a. i-iv)

- Southern California has numerous active and potentially active faults that could affect the project site.

- The project site is located in proximity to several faults, which have the potential to create seismically induced hazards such as ground shaking, surface rupture, liquefaction, landslides, and tsunamis.
- A geotechnical study has recently been prepared (Earth Systems 12/31/08) to assess the extent of these potential hazards within and in proximity to the project site.

(b.)

- The project involves an estimated 35,100 cy of cut and 21,400 cy of fill for site preparation and grading. Shrinkage, overexcavation and compaction of cut materials would result in an overall balance and preclude the need for off-site import or export according to the engineering earthwork calculations. A substantial amount of surface disturbance and vegetation removal would expose soils to short-term wind and water erosion.
- Implementation of erosion control measures would be necessary to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.
- Specific measures have not been developed as part of the project beyond the standard erosion control measures required by the City's Municipal Code.

(c.)

- The Completion Phase project site is east of the eastern terrace that appears to have been designated by the City of Goleta as having high landslide potential. Peer review of the geotechnical report and potential analysis of this issue is required to determine the significance of potential impacts.
- A long-term shoreline erosion study of the project site has not been conducted to determine if the project area is subject to risks due to storm waves and surges, high surf conditions, shoreline erosion and flooding.

(d.)

- Expansive soils are typically those of high clay content that swell and shrink during wet and dry climatic events, respectively. Due to the presence of alluvial soils throughout the South Coast, which are commonly classified as expansive, there is the potential for new development on vacant sites to be subject to expansive soils, which can damage building foundations if not adequately addressed in the design.

(e.)

- The project site would be served by the Goleta West Sanitary District, which currently serves the Initial Phase of the Bacara Resort and Spa. The proposed project would not require use of septic tanks or an alternative wastewater system to dispose of wastewater.

<u>Cumulative Impacts</u>

- All related projects would be required to implement standard City Grading Ordinance and State Building Code conditions to reduce short-term erosion and long geotechnical hazards from project construction. The project's contribution to cumulative geologic impacts would be adverse, but less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- Standard City of Goleta Best Management Practices (BMP) short-term erosion control measures and long-term grading ordinance and State Building Code operational standards.

Residual Impact

- Less than significant.

EIR Scope of Work

- Review all previous and present geotechnical analyses to determine the existence and extent of any expansive soils on the project site.
- Discuss all standard short-term and long-term conditions to address geologic hazards.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			✓		
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	✓				
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓	
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and , as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	✓				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓	
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✓		
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		✓			

Existing Setting

- Proposed project is located adjacent to Venoco Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) oil and gas processing plant that treats crude oil and gas produced from offshore oil and gas platforms.
- The site is located in proximity to a major transportation corridor and the Venoco facility that transport and store hazardous materials.
- The project site was once occupied by petroleum drilling, storage and processing facilities abandoned in the1950s. The site may contain remnant oil and gas production materials associated with previous oil and gas operations. The entire site, including the areas of the site that were once occupied by petroleum drilling was studied as part of the original entitlement history. These studies include methane and hydrogen sulphide studies, with methane and hydrogen sulphide detection systems in place for the initial phase of the resort.
- The project area has been designated by the City of Goleta Safety Element as a high wildland fire hazards area due to the relatively steep slopes and ample vegetation that occur in the area.
- The site is located approximately one mile from the closest school (Ellwood Elementary School).
- The project area is located over two miles from the closest public airport and no private airstrips exist within the region.
- An Emergency Response Plan was developed pursuant to the initial improvements of the resort that addressed the measures that would be undertaken in the event of an event at the Venoco Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF).
- A Hydrogen Sulfide Monitoring Plan was developed during the initial phase of the resort and approved by the Fire Department. There are current hydrogen sulfide monitors within the area of the completion phase.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact with regard to Hazards & Hazardous Materials would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* addresses public safety impacts resulting from involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. These thresholds focus on the activities that include the installation or modification to facilities that handle hazardous materials, transportation of hazardous materials, or non-hazardous land uses in proximity to hazardous facilities. Since the proposed project is not a hazardous materials facility, the City's risk based thresholds are not particularly applicable. However, for the purposes of this analysis, the proposed project would be considered to pose a significant impact if it results in the exposure of people to a variety of hazards or hazardous materials as listed above.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a.)

- The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment from routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.
- Small amounts of hazardous materials may be found in solvents similar to those found in common household products, such as cleaning products or pesticides.
- Hazardous materials used in construction and operation of the proposed project would be subject to City, State, and federal regulations, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

(b.)

- The transport and storage of hazardous materials associated with the adjacent major highway transportation corridor, Union Pacific Railroad and Venoco, Inc. Oil and Gas processing facility may create a significant hazard for people residing or working in the project area and/or the environment.
- A Hydrogen Sulfide Monitoring Plan, developed during the initial phase of the resort, will be reconfigured, where required, to accommodate the proposed completion phase improvements
- An Emergency Response Plan, developed during the initial phase of the resort. The proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

(c.)

- The project site is located approximately one mile from Ellwood Elementary School on Hollister Avenue.
- The project would not result in hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials.
- No impacts would occur in this regard.

(d.)

- The project site is currently developed with a tennis facility and maintenance building, four (4) tennis courts, maintained landscaping, a public parking lot and vertical beach access trail to the beach, beach house (snack bar and public

restrooms), all associated with and developed concurrent with the existing Bacara Resort and Spa located on the adjacent parcel to the east.

- A search of regulatory databases for sites with known or suspected hazardous material contamination, use of hazardous or toxic materials and regulated wastes, discharge or spillage incidents, discharge permits, landfills, and storage tanks for the project site has not been conducted to determine the presence of any known contamination or hazardous conditions on the property.
- In accordance with CEQA 1988 Findings and pursuant to Condition Numbers 97 & 105 of the Conditions of Approval and the Environmental Health Services Letter of 11/10/87, an Environmental Quality Assurance Program (EQAP) was required and instituted that provided for the monitoring and reporting for the investigation and removal of hazardous materials during the installation of the initial phase of the resort and included follow up reports. The Completion Phase project site has been fully explored, capped and sealed with layers of fill soils brought in from the Initial Phase of the construction.

(e.)

- The project site is not located within an airport land use plan.
- The City of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is located approximately 4.5 miles south of the project site.
- The proposed project would not create a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the project area.

(f.)

- Refer to Response (e.) above.

(g.)

- The proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.
- The project would provide adequate access for emergency vehicles, and appropriate evacuation routes, as well as regulate the storage of any flammable and explosive materials and their transport within the Plan area.
- A new/relocated emergency access road is proposed adjacent to the new/relocated vertical beach access trail. The emergency access road would be available for emergency responders to access the coast during emergency situations. The emergency access road would terminate with a fire department turnaround and staging area adjacent to the beach and would provide for the launch of amphibious vehicles, currently the only location in the City where this operation can occur.
- All internal jitney paths within the proposed project area have also been designed to accommodate emergency response vehicles.
- The project would comply with applicable Uniform Fire Code regulations for issues such as fire protection systems and equipment, general safety precautions, water supplies and distances from fire hydrants.
- During construction of the proposed improvements, temporary road or lane closures, which could potentially block emergency access and/or evacuation routes, are not anticipated to occur.

(h.)

- The Completion Phase improvements are proposed to be constructed in Type 1"B" construction , a non-combustible, fire proof form of construction. In addition, all areas would be fire sprinkled. The site plan landscaping has been configured to meet the requirements of the Fire Department for fire spread.
- The proposed project is located in an area designated as a high wildland fire hazard area per the City of Goleta Safety Element.
- The project includes new development and associated and visitors into a high fire hazard area.
- The proposed uses, programs, and facility improvements must ensure that all development and uses minimize risks to life and property in areas of high fire hazards.
- A Fire Protection Plan, developed during the initial phase of the resort, will be updated to include the improvements proposed within the completion phase.
- The project is planned to be constructed in conformance to a Type 1B fire proof construction, as well as being fully sprinkled.

Cumulative Impacts

- All related projects would be required to implement standard County of Santa Barbara Fire Department hazardous material use and storage and fire suppression conditions to reduce hazards from project occupancy. The project's contribution to cumulative hazardous materials impacts would be adverse, but less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- County of Santa Barbara Fire Department hazardous material use and storage conditions.

Residual Impact

- To be determined through EIR analysis

EIR Scope of Work

- Review fire protection plans for compliance with Santa Barbara County Fire Department standards.
- Discuss all standard short-term and long-term conditions to address hazardous materials storage and use.
- Consult with Santa Barbara County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Section staff regarding compliance.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		✓			
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			✓		
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		✓			
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		✓			
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		✓			
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		✓			
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				✓	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✓	
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	✓				
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	✓				

Existing Setting

- The project site is located within the West Sub-Basin of the Goleta Water Basin;
- The project site is located in the Santa Barbara Coastal Plain, directly adjacent to the Pacific Ocean;
- Tecolote Creek is located west of the Completion Phase project site and Bell Canyon Creek is located to the east of the project site;
- Portions of the project site are located with the 100- and 500-year Flood Hazard zones of the Pacific Shoreline and Tecolote Creek, according to figure 5.2 of the City of Goleta's Fire, Flood and Tsunami Hazards Map, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, September 2006; (within FEMA flood zones AE and VE).
- The project site is located with a Potential Tsunami Run-Up Area according to the City of Goleta's Flood & Tsunami Hazards Map (Figure 3.9-2, City of Goleta Final General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, September, 2006 and Figure 5.2, Fire, Flood and Tsunami Hazards Map, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, September 2006);
- The pre-development site contains four watersheds.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Hydrology & Water Quality would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines* Manual assume that a significant impact on hydrology and water resources would occur if a project would result in a substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns, alter the course of a stream or river, increase the rate of surface runoff to the extent that flooding, including increased erosion or sedimentation, occurs, create or contribute to runoff volumes exceed existing or planned stormwater runoff facilities, or substantially degrade water quality.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a. – f.)

- No structures are proposed to be erected in the 100- and 500-year flood hazard zones.
- Stormwater flow rates for existing and proposed conditions slightly increase, however, (per the preliminary Grading and Drainage Report prepared by the project), storm water runoff from impervious surfaces would be routed through vegetation and soil prior to leaving the site where feasible. In areas where biofiltration is infeasible, catch basin filter inserts would be used to treat runoff from impervious surfaces at the source; a Hydrologic analysis prepared for the project concluded that a slight increase from existing to proposed flow rates of a 100-year storm event would occur..
- After development, amount of watersheds on-site would be reduced due to installation of a storm drain system which would re-direct storm water flows from watersheds 1, 2, and 3 into existing outlets.

- Impervious paving surfaces may be located in parking lots and vehicle routes to reduce rainwater runoff volumes and improve groundwater quality. Porous paving materials are designed to be used wherever soil conditions allow, minimizing the impact of the development on the existing hydrological conditions. Materials for the motor court, jitney and pedestrian paths would potentially consist of interlocking stone to allow for rainwater infiltration;
- The project does not currently have water use-calculations/use projections, and more information is required, however, a project of this size would not likely create a significant impact upon groundwater resources; use of low-flow plumbing, native/drought tolerant landscaping and flow-flow irrigations would be incorporated into the project;
- All of the units' two-story units of the proposed project would have partially vegetated roofs, to slow down rainwater run-off and increase biodiversity.
- Construction/short-term impacts to water quality would be reduced to less than significant levels through required implementation of the City of Goleta's standard mitigation measures;

(g. – h.)

- No structures are proposed in the 100- and 500-year flood hazard zones;

(i. - j.)

- The project site is located with the Potential Tsunami Run-Up Area according to the City of Goleta's Flood & Tsunami Hazards Map (Figure 3.9-2, City of Goleta Final General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, September, 2006 and Figure 5.2, Fire, Flood and Tsunami Hazards Map, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, September 2006);

<u>Cumulative Impacts</u>

- All related projects would be required to implement standard City Grading Ordinance and State Building Code conditions to reduce short-term erosion and long hydrological hazards from project construction. The project's contribution to cumulative hydrological and water quality impacts would be potentially significant.

<u>Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures</u>

- Biofiltration measures already incorporated in to the project description, green roofs on a portion of the proposed units;
- Title 24 compliant, low-flow plumbing and irrigation;
- Pervious paving/surfaces where feasible;
- Compliance with the City of Goleta Design Standards;
- Compliance with the City of Goleta Storm Water Quality Standards and NPDES requirements;
- Storm drain pipes should be sized to accommodate the 25-year peak flow rate;
- Grated inlets should be sized to accommodate twice the 100-year peak flow rate. (To account for partial blockage);
- Storm water quality treatment facilities should treat as much runoff as is practical.

Residual Impact

- Further analysis of this issue area is required, thus this section will be evaluated in greater detail in the EIR.

EIR Scope of Work

- Peer review and summarize Preliminary Grading and Drainage Report prepared for the project by Penfield & Smith, November 12, 2008, and Preliminary Hydrology Report prepared for the project by Penfield & Smith, February 10, 2005.
- Consult with City Community Services Department staff to identify all necessary conditions for construction and long-term water quality insurance.
- Analyze available site specific data and assess potential project impacts associated with tsunami run-up.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
a. Physically divide an established community?				✓	
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	✓				
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓	

Existing Setting

- The project site is located on the western boundary of the City of Goleta within the California Coastal Zone. The present use and development on the site includes resort amenities (tennis facility, maintenance, parking), public access and recreation.
- The site is surrounded by a range of land uses. Land uses to the immediate east of the site consist of the Venoco Oil and Gas processing facility, the Sandpiper Golf Course and generally urban uses including commercial and residential developments. Land uses to the north of the site include the Union Pacific Rail

Road, US Highway 101, and the 248-acre Rancho Embarcadero residential subdivision located in Tecolote Canyon beyond US Highway 101.

- Land use directly west and adjacent to the project consists of the Initial Phase of the Bacara Resort and Spa and associated improvements, with land beyond the existing Resort consisting primarily of rural agricultural uses.
- Haskell's Beach and the Pacific Ocean occur immediately to the south of the site.
- The Ellwood Pier is located approximately 150 feet from the Bacara Resort.
- The property is the only shoreline site in the City of Goleta with a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan designation of Commercial Visitor-Serving and a zoning designation of C-V (Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial).
- The City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan identified the Bacara property as a coastal resource area and specifically designated the Bacara property as a key Pacific Shoreline site. Land Use Policy 9.1 of the City of Goleta GP/LCUP specifically applies to the Bacara property to ensure that the area's significant environmental values and resources are protected and preserved in a natural condition, while appropriate locations for active and passive recreation, including public access and coastal-dependent recreation, are identified.
- All development is required to accommodate the public's right of access to the sea and shoreline. All land uses and development must be protective of coastal resources, including marine and land habitats, scenic and visual resources, agricultural lands, and archaeological resources. Because the southern portions of the City are within the California Coastal Zone, the project is within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission, and is subject to California Coastal Act requirements.
- The proposed project involves a request for approval of a various General Plan policy amendments (07-102-GPA) as initiated by the Council on May 20, 2008 and to reflect further refinements in the language of amendments that the City is currently processing under what is commonly referred to as "Track 3" General Plan Amendments (see Project Description).

Thresholds of Significance

A significant Land Use & Planning impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a.)

- The development would be located within a site area referred to as the Valley Floor of the Bacara property. The proposed project would not divide an established community or neighborhood. Impacts would be less than significant.

(b.)

- The proposed project would potentially conflict in some respects with various aspects of the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and California Coastal

Act, including overlay designations for Open Space and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area, as well as policies for new development, hazard protection, and archaeological resources. The project includes a series of General Plan Amendments (GPAs) to resolve potential policy inconsistencies (see Table 1). The City of Goleta also is considering GPAs as part of the Tract 3 process (see Attachment B).

(c.)

- There are no habitat conservation plan(s) or natural community conservation plan(s) applicable to the project site or project area. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with any habitat conservation plans. No impacts on land use would result.

Cumulative Impacts

- All related projects would be required to comply with relevant Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- To be determined through EIR process.

Residual Impact

- Further analysis of this issue area is required, thus this section will be evaluated in greater detail in the EIR.

EIR Scope of Work

- Review aspects of the project including proposed General Plan policy amendments, overlay designations for Open Space and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area, as well as policies for new development, hazard protection, and archaeological resources and their relationship to GP/CLUP and Coastal Act policies to evaluate the proposed project consistency with City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and California Coastal Act policies.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact.**	**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**	**See Prior Doc-ument**
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				✓	
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				✓	

Existing Setting

- The project is located next to Venoco Ellwood Onshore Facility processing oil & gas.
- There are no major non-fuel mineral related resources in the City.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Mineral Resources would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the checklist above.

Project-Specific Impacts
(a. – b.)

- The project would not affect the extraction and processing of oil/gas
- There are no other known mineral resources that would be of value to the region or the state on the site;
- There would be no loss to important mineral resource recovery site delineated on any local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. No impacts on mineral resources would result.

Cumulative Impacts

- The project would not have any cumulatively considerable contribution to related project cumulative impacts on mineral resources.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- No mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impact

- No residual impacts on Mineral Resources would occur.

EIR Scope of Work

- No EIR analysis of impacts on Mineral Resources is required.

NOISE **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact.**	**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**	**See Prior Doc-ument**
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	✓				
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	✓				
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	✓				
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓			
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓	
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓	

Existing Setting

- Sources of noise in the vicinity of the Project area include occasional aircraft overflights (the Santa Barbara Airport is approximately 4.5 miles from the project site), the Venoco Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF), and on-road traffic.
- Sources of transportation noise affecting the project area includes traffic on public roadways and nearby State highways (U.S. Highway 101 and Highway 217), railroad lines (Union Pacific Railroad), and airports (Santa Barbara Municipal Airport).
- 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.
    - 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. 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.

- U.S. 101 runs roughly parallel to the northern boundary of the proposed project site at a distance of approximately 300 feet.
- Hollister Avenue, located directly north of the project site, is currently a 2-lane arterial roadway, with speeds of 25 miles per hour.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Noise would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual*. The City's adopted thresholds assume that outdoor CNEL noise levels in excess of 64 dB are considered to pose significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors.
City of Goleta, California XIX-7 General Plan Report: Noise

- A proposed development that would generate noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL and could affect sensitive receptors would generally be presumed to have a significant impact.
- Outdoor living areas of noise sensitive uses that are subject to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL would generally be presumed to be significantly impacted by ambient noise. A significant impact would also generally occur where interior noise levels cannot be reduced to 45 dBA CNEL or less.
- A project will generally have a significant effect on the environment if it will increase substantially the ambient noise levels for noise-sensitive receptors adjoining areas.
- Noise from grading and construction activity proposed within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors would generally result in a potentially significant impact. According to EPA guidelines average construction noise is 95 dBA at a 50-foot distance from the source. A 6 dB drop occurs with a doubling of the distance from the source. Therefore, locations within 1600 feet of the construction site would be affected by noise levels over 65 dBA

Project-Specific Impacts
(a. – d.)

- No noise study has been conducted for the proposed project; it is unknown if the proposed project would expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or by the SBCAPCD. The proposed project would increase density and intensity of land use on the Valley Floor and would potentially incrementally increase noise in comparison to the existing use of the site.
- Sensitive receptors at Initial Phase of the Bacara Resort and Spa site, the Sandpiper Golf Course, and Haskell's Beach would be within 1,600 feet away of project construction could be exposed to temporary noise levels exceeding 65 dB and be potentially significant.
- Long-term operation of the proposed project would potentially generate noise in excess of acceptable levels that adversely affect sensitive receptors.

- The proposed project would generate additional traffic on US 101 and Hollister Avenue potentially generating long term ground borne noise or vibrations to pose a significant noise impacts on adjoining sensitive receptors.
- Operation of heavy equipment for grading and compaction to construct the proposed 56 condominium hotel units and ancillary operational support facilities would occur in sufficient proximity to sensitive receptors, including guests at the existing Bacara Resort and Spa facility and visitors of the public beach, to pose a potentially significant ground borne noise and vibration impact.
- The proposed project would incrementally increased noise along Hollister Avenue as a result of project-generated truck transportation during the construction period.
- Vehicular traffic is currently the most notable continuous noise source in the project area. Project-generated traffic on local streets located in the project area would substantially contribute to existing ambient noise conditions. (c)Construction activities and heavy equipment operations associated with project construction can reach levels of 95 dB, measured 50 feet from the noise source. Due to the close proximity of sensitive receptors to the project site, exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of 65 dB during the construction phase of the proposed Bacara Completion Phase Project would be considered potentially significant.

(e. - f.)

- The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private air strip. As such, the project would not expose people to short term excessive noise levels associated with air travel.

<u>Cumulative Impacts</u>

- Potential cumulative noise impacts on the project site 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.
- As project specific short term construction and long term operational impacts would be considered adverse and potentially significant, the project's contribution to long term cumulative Noise impacts would also be considered adverse and potentially significant. Impacts shall be address in the Noise Report.

<u>Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures</u>

- Standard construction equipment scheduling avoiding night-time, weekend, and holiday activity.
- Design attenuation developed through acoustical analysis.

<u>Residual Impact</u>

- To be determined through EIR.

EIR Scope of Work

- Assess the ambient noise levels and the changes resulting from the project development. Include an acoustical analysis prepared by a licensed acoustical engineer to assess the noise levels to which future guests and employees of the condominium hotel would be exposed to. The report shall provide a basis for significance determination as well as feasible mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				✓	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓	
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓	

Existing Setting

- The project site lies within a Commercial Visitor-Serving area that is zoned and planned for C-V, Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial, under the City's GP/CLUP.
- The project site is located in the City's Coastal Zone adjacent to Haskell's Beach.
- The project site is currently developed with a tennis facility and maintenance building, 4 tennis courts, maintained landscaping, a 50-space public parking lot and 810-foot vertical beach access trail to the beach, beach house (snack bar and public restrooms), all associated with and developed concurrent with the Initial Phase of the Bacara Resort and Spa located on the adjacent parcel to the east.
- Surrounding land uses/zoning include:
    - North: Union Pacific Rail Road/US Highway 101/Rancho Embarcadero
    - South: Haskell's Beach/Pacific Ocean
    - East: Venoco Processing Facility/Sandpiper Golf Course
    - West: Bacara Resort & Spa/ Vacant Agriculturally Zoned Land
- Hollister Avenue would provide access to the project site. A new entrance to the resort area would be provided east of the existing tennis facility and public parking lot entrance. An additional entrance would be provided to the new public parking lot just east of the existing fire access road.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Population & Housing would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a.)

- The proposed Completion Phase project operations would not require a substantial increase in the existing resort and spa Full Time Equivalents ("FTEs") and it is anticipated that the existing employee base would be sufficient to draw from to fill the additional FTE's needed. As the existing resort infrastructure, service areas, ancillary support areas and amenities were sized to accommodate the original plan of 524 keys, the management employee base and the service capacity of those areas will not change. The additional FTE's required to service the Completion Phase would consist primarily of hourly support staff in the areas of Valet & Bellman Services (historically coming from students at UCSB) and Housekeeping. In addition, any FTE count above the existing base would be retained at times when the existing facility is operating at or near capacity (e.g., it can be anticipated that there will be a natural displacement of guests who book suites in the Completion Phase who will be serviced by the same FTE base that would otherwise provide those services at the existing facility). Historically, the existing 360 key facility visitation data indicates that above 100 percent occupancy occurs on average approximately 12-15 days per year such that the anticipated additional Completion Phase FTE employee requirements would be minimal. At full existing Resort and Spa facility occupancy, it is estimated that 35-50 additional full time equivalent (FTE) resort employees would be retained to support Completion Phase guests, but only for those temporary periods when overall occupancy (both the Initial Phase and the Completion Phase) demands.
- The proposed project would relocate parking accommodations and access; increasing public parking availability to 61 spaces and developing a new 600-foot ADA complaint vertical beach accessway. The increase in 11 public parking spaces and an improved access trail is intended to serve the existing patrons of Haskell's Beach and would not induce substantial population growth.
- Proposed infrastructure improvements on Hollister Avenue, including the reconfigurations of existing medians, the development of an expanded left turn deceleration lane, and widening[2] to accommodate such improvements, are intended to serve the resort and public parking lot entrances and would neither facilitate additional residential development within the area nor could it serve substantial new development in the future.

[2] To accommodate the expanded left turn deceleration lane, Hollister Avenue would be widened for approximately 670 feet along the northern road right-of-way opposite the project site.

(b. - c.)

- No residential land uses currently exist on the proposed Bacara Completion Phase project site. Instead, the site is currently developed with tennis courts, a facility house, and a maintenance facility to serve the existing adjacent Initial Phase of the Bacara Resort and Spa operation. Other land uses onsite consist of beach access amenities to serve the public. As no residential units are currently developed on the proposed project site, no displacement of any existing housing or people would occur with the implementation of the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts

- The proposed project's contribution to cumulative population growth and demand for housing would be less than significant as the proposed project would not induce substantial long-term population growth directly or indirectly, or displace existing housing or people.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- No mitigation would be required or recommended.

Residual Impact

- Residual project specific and project contributions to cumulative Population and Housing impacts would be considered less than cumulatively considerable.

EIR Scope of Work

- No further analysis of potential project impacts to Population and Housing is required.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of these public services:					
fire protection?		✓			
police protection?			✓		
schools?			✓		
parks?			✓		
other public facilities?			✓		

Existing Setting

- Fire protection for the proposed project would be provided by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department.
- Police protection would be provided by the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department.
- The proposed project is located in an area served by the Goleta Union and Santa Barbara High School Districts.
- Solid waste collection would be provided by Marborg Industries/Allied Waste Services.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Public Services would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual* includes thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a.)

- The proposed project would increase the land use intensity on the project site and density of people located in the project area and therefore, could increase the demand for fire protection services.
- As the proposed Bacara Completion Phase project would provide the option of extended hotel stay for guests and condominium hotel unit owner use for a maximum of 3 months/year, the proposed project would have the potential to generate a demand for additional police protection to serve the guests/ condominium hotel unit owners.
- A new/relocated emergency access road is proposed adjacent to the new/relocated vertical beach access trail. The emergency access road would be available for emergency responders to access the coast during emergency situations. The emergency access road would terminate with a fire department turnaround and staging area adjacent to the beach and would provide for the launch of amphibious vehicles, currently the only location in the City where this operation can occur.
- All internal jitney paths within the Completion Phase have been designed to accommodate emergency response vehicles.
- Condominium hotel unit owners would be limited to a maximum of 30 consecutive days no more than three times a year. As such, potential future condominium hotel unit owners would not generate a demand in school facilities and would not require service by the Goleta Union and Santa Barbara High School Districts.
- The incremental increase in demand for park facilities resulting from project implementation would not trigger the need for any new parks nor would the project trigger the need for other expanded public facilities such as area libraries

or expanded City administrative services. As such, project impacts on the provision of such services would be considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

- Proposed project would increase the demand for fire protection and police services by increasing the density of people within the project area. The proposed project incremental demand for those services, in conjunction with additional projects within the vicinity, especially projects along the Hollister Avenue corridor, would result in a potentially cumulatively considerable impact.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- Fire protection measures to be determined during EIR analysis.

Residual Impact

- Residual project- specific and project contributions to cumulative impacts to be determined during EIR analysis.

EIR Scope of Work

- Discuss the existing fire protection and police services available to serve the project site and their respective area of responsibility.
- Analyze the project's potential demand on fire protection and police services pursuant to City of Goleta established thresholds and if that increase in demand would require additional personal or facilities.

RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Document
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			✓		
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	✓				

Existing Setting

- The project site is located adjacent to Haskell's Beach and the Pacific Ocean, Bacara Resort and Spa, coastal hiking trails, and in proximity to a number of public park and open space areas within the city.
- The project site currently provides a tennis facility with four tennis courts for hotel guests, a maintenance facility,, and a 50-space public parking lot and a vertical beach public access trail to an existing beach house with public restrooms, snack shop and showers. The resort as a whole, which includes the existing facility and the Completion Phase project, was planned and designed with sufficient recreational facilities to serve its guests.
- According to the City of Goleta General Plan EIR (2006), the City currently has 16 public parks, four private parks and open space areas, and 18 public open space areas comprising a total of 526 acres, which equates to about 17 acres per 1,000 residents. The ratio of park and open space acres to population exceeds standard population based standards for park and open space recreation areas used by most jurisdictions to assess the adequacy or deficiency of park and recreational facilities.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Recreation would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a.)

- The proposed project includes a new/relocated and expanded 61-space public parking lot that would provide beach access via a new relocated 600-foot ADA compliant vertical beach accessway to Haskell's Beach and an existing beach house with public restrooms, snack shop, and showers. The project also proposes a new/relocated tennis facility, and four (4) tennis courts for hotel guest use. Completion Phase guests would potentially contribute to the demand on existing public recreational facilities including the existing beach house and adjacent Haskell's Beach. Impacts would be potentially significant.
- The proposed project would potentially result in new or expanded private temporary events or uses of Haskell's Beach commonly associated with resort facilities that could conflict with public access and recreation opportunities.

(b.)

- The proposed project includes a new, relocated and expanded 61-space public parking lot that would be dedicated for use by the public and that would provide beach access via a newly relocated 600-foot ADA compliant vertical beach accessway to the existing beach house with public restrooms, snack shop, and showers. The project also proposes relocating and constructing a new tennis facility, maintenance facility, and four (4) tennis courts onsite. No loss of existing parking facilities would occur, but the coastal access would be relocated and reconfigured, shortened and modified to meet ADA grading standards.

- The proposed new/relocated recreational improvements would be located in an area that is paved and is part of disturbed habitat within the Valley Floor. During the construction of the Initial Phase, this entire area was graded and used by the public on a temporary basis for beach access and parking.
- Further analysis of this issue is required to determine the significance of potential impacts.

Cumulative Impacts

- Proposed project would increase demands on coastal recreational facilities, along with others along the Gaviota Coast including Santa Barbara Ranch. The proposed project's incremental demand for those services, in conjunction with additional projects within the vicinity, could result in a potentially cumulatively considerable impact.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- Any recreational impact measures to be determined during EIR analysis.

Residual Impact

- Residual project- specific and project contributions to cumulative impacts to be determined during EIR analysis.

EIR Scope of Work

- Identify existing and future proposed demand on coastal recreational facilities and evaluate that demand relative to General Plan policies and Coastal Act provisions.
- Analyze the project's potential demand on recreational facilities and relocation of amenities including coastal vertical access trail within the Valley Floor and the effect on recreational opportunities and potential sensitive habitat areas.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	✓				
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	✓				

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				✓	
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	✓				
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?		✓			
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?		✓			
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	✓				

Existing Setting

- Access is by Hollister Avenue. Cathedral Oaks Overpass to be completed within the next several years.
- A financial contribution was made in connection with the Cathedral Oaks Overpass by the project developer of the Bacara Resort & Spa.

Thresholds of Significance

The impacts of project-generated traffic are assessed against the following City thresholds. A significant traffic impact occurs when:

1) The addition of project traffic to an intersection increases the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio by the value provided below or sends at least 5, 10, or 15 trips to intersections operating at LOS F, E or D.

LEVEL OF SERVICE	INCREASE IN V/C
including the project	*greater than*
A	.20
B	.15
C	.10
OR THE ADDITION OF	
D	15 TRIPS
E	10 TRIPS
F	5 TRIPS

2) Project access to a major road or arterial road would require a driveway that would create an unsafe situation or a new traffic signal or major revisions to an existing traffic signal.

3) Project adds traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g. narrow width, road side ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or receives use which would be incompatible with a substantial increase in traffic (e.g. rural roads with use by farm equipment, livestock, horseback riding, or residential roads with heavy pedestrian or recreational use, etc.) that will become potential safety problems with the addition of project or cumulative traffic.
4) Project traffic would utilize a substantial portion of an intersection(s) capacity where the intersection is currently operating at acceptable levels of service (A-C) but with cumulative traffic would degrade to or approach LOS D (V/C 0.81) or lower. Substantial is defined as a minimum change of 0.03 for intersections which would operate from 0.80 to 0.85 and a change of 0.02 for intersections which would operate from 0.86 to 0.90, and 0.01 for intersections operating at anything lower.

<u>Project-Specific Impacts</u>

- Proposed:
    - Calle Real via US Highway 101 and/or Hollister Avenue
    - A new entrance to the resort area to be provided east of the current tennis facility and public parking lot entrance.
    - An additional entrance to be provided to the new public parking lot just east of the existing emergency access road, which is also to be relocated. The existing landscape median would be reconfigured to allow for new median breaks and an expanded left turn deceleration lane to serve the resort and public parking lot entrances.
- Parking
    - Existing: One paved parking lot is located on the Valley Floor that consists of 50 public parking spaces that support access to Haskell's Beach and 10 parking spaces that support resort maintenance operations and guest utilizing the tennis facility.
        - At-grade and expanded 61-space public parking lot would be provided just east of the existing lot, adjacent to and across from the proposed entrance court to the new resort area.
        - An underground parking garage with 132 spaces is proposed to accommodate hotel guest parking.
        - The tennis facility and public parking lot entrance would remain and provide access to the Completion Phase parking area and the relocated tennis courts.
- Beach Access:
    - 810-foot vertical beach accessway to Haskell's Beach is generally located in the proposed development area of the resort improvements and is proposed to be relocated to accommodate elements of the proposed project.
    - New 600-foot, ADA compliant vertical beach accessway from the proposed public parking lot to Haskell's Beach. The relocated coastal accessway would access the beach just to the east of the existing beach house,

- *Emergency Access*: A new/relocated emergency access road is proposed adjacent to the new/relocated vertical beach access trail. The emergency access road would be available for emergency responders to access the coast during emergency situations. The emergency access road would terminate with a fire department turnaround and staging area adjacent to the beach and would provide for the launch of amphibious vehicles, currently the only location in the City where this operation can occur. All internal jitney paths within the Completion Phase have also been designed to accommodate emergency response vehicles.
- *Hollister Avenue Road Improvements*. Access to the project site would continue to occur from Hollister Avenue and a new entrance to the resort area would be provided east of the current tennis facility and public parking lot entrance. An additional entrance would be provided to the new public parking lot just east of the existing fire access road. The existing landscape median of Hollister Avenue would be reconfigured to allow for additional median breaks and an expanded left turn deceleration lane to serve the resort and public parking lot entrances. To accommodate the expanded left turn deceleration lane, Hollister Avenue would be widened for approximately 670 feet along the northern road right-of-way opposite the project site. A retaining wall and concrete swale would be constructed along the widened road section opposite the project site and new curb and gutter would be installed on both sides of Hollister Avenue adjacent to the project site. The reconfigured road median is proposed to be planted with a mix of indigenous plantings and is designed to function as a vegetated bioretention strip to treat stormwater runoff from the roadway.

(a.)

- The level of traffic generation (both ADTs and PM peak hour trips) could potentially trigger City thresholds for a significant project specific traffic impact at any of the affected intersections within the City.

(b)

- CMP impacts possible at US 101 ramps.

(c.)

- Project operations are not expected to significantly change or increase air traffic patterns or levels due to the limited scope of the project. Conflicts between the proposed project and airport operations would be less than significant as the project is not within any flight zone.

(d. – g.)

- City road design standards require all City roads providing access to new development to be paved to standards that would support all emergency and fire fighting vehicles. The proposed project would include improvements to comply with City standards; however, proposed improvements would require additional analysis to determine if they would provide sufficient and unobstructed roadway to meet fire vehicle access requirements. Proposed project would potentially result in a potential significant impact to circulation and emergency access. It is unknown if the project would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs

supporting alternative transportation. The project's potential to affect alternative transportation impacts would be considered potentially significant.

(f.)

- The proposed project would be required to comply with City standards requiring sufficient parking supply, as determined by land use. The project would increase available public parking by 11 spaces, proposing to provide 61 total spaces. The underground parking garage would provide 113 spaces, however, a parking demand study is necessary to ensure proposed parking resources would sufficiently accommodate hotel guest parking.

Cumulative Impacts

- Project would incrementally increase daily traffic and peak hour traffic. Project's potential impact to roadways and intersections in combination with other projects within the vicinity that also increase ADT and PHT would be cumulatively considerable. Proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be potentially cumulatively considerable.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- Any transportation impact measures to be determined during EIR analysis.

Residual Impact

- Residual project- specific and project contributions to cumulative transportation impacts to be determined during EIR analysis.

EIR Scope of Work

- Prepare a technical study by City-qualified transportation engineer to assess the project-specific and regional transportation impacts of the proposed project using the City of Goleta adopted methodology.
- Develop estimates of average daily trips or peak-hour trips associated with the proposed project.
- Include the report findings to determine potential impacts to Hollister Avenue corridor, Highway 101, and other roadways within the project's area of potential impact. Analyze the project's potential impact to intersection V/C ratio caused by an increase in traffic during both AM and PM peak hours.
- The project's potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts shall also be assessed in the EIR. Consider impacts subsequent to implementation of the Cathedral Oaks Overpass.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact.**	**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**	**See Prior Doc-ument**
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				✓	
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓	
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded entitlements needed?				✓	
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				✓	
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				✓	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✓	

Existing Setting

- The project is served by Goleta Water District (GWD) and the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD);
- Goleta Water District draws its water supply from Lake Cachuma, the State Water Project, and the Goleta Groundwater Basin, for a total yearly supply of between 15,486 to 17,672 acre feet per year ("AFY") depending upon drought conditions. Average current demand for GWD water in the City of Goleta is currently 5,528 AFY, increasing to 6,792 in the year 2030 (General Plan Final EIR, Tables 3.9-1 and 3.9-2). It is not subject to thresholds of significance subject to the Wright Judgment.
- GWSD's 40.78 percent allocation of the treatment facility capacity would allow a maximum average flow capacity of 3.12 million gallons per day based on 2004 permitted maximum daily discharge of 7.64 million gallons; however, because average daily flow rates vary from year to year, depending upon the amount of rainfall, the amount of remaining capacity also varies. GWSD currently

contributes about 1.71 mgd in flow to the treatment plant. This means under the currently permitted capacity of the treatment facility, GWSD has 1.41 mgd of remaining capacity (General Plan EIR, Section 3.12-5).

- Waste and recycling services are provided by Marborg Industries/Allied Waste Services; Solid waste generated in the City is collected by BFI, Marborg, and Allied Waste and transported to the Tajiguas Landfill 20 miles to the west of Goleta on the Gaviota Coast. The County has received approval from the RWQCB and the State Integrated Waste Management Board to expand the landfill to provide for an additional 13 years of solid waste disposal capacity. The landfill now has sufficient capacity to provide solid waste disposal services to the South Coast until 2020 (General Plan Final EIR, page 3.12-16).

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on Utilities & Service Systems would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, under the City's *Environmental Thresholds & Guidelines Manual*, a project that would generate 196 tons of solid waste/year, after receiving a 50% credit for source reduction, recycling, and composting would be considered to result in a project specific, significant impact on the City's solid waste stream. Any project generating 40 tons/year, after receiving a 50% credit for source reduction, recycling, and composting would be considered to make an adverse contribution to cumulative impacts on the City's solid waste stream.

Project-Specific Impacts

(a. – g.)

- Potable water service would be provided by an existing 10" diameter PVC water main owned by Goleta Water District on the north side of Proposed Lot 1. Less than significant impact.
- Reclaimed water service would be supplied by an existing 12" diameter PVC water main owned by Goleta Water District on the north side of Proposed Lot 1. Less than significant impact.
- Sewage disposal would be provided by the existing 8" HDPE sewer force main owned by Goleta West Sanitary District on the north side of Proposed Lot 1. Less than significant impact.
- The project would contribute to regional solid waste stream, a potentially significant impact.

Cumulative Impacts

- Project would contribute to incremental cumulative impacts on utilities and public services systems.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

- Develop a Solid Waste Management Program that includes the following measures, but is not limited to those measures:

  a) Provision of at least 50 ft2 of space and/or bins for storage of recyclable materials within the project site.
  b) Implementation of a green waste source reduction program focusing on recycling of all green waste generated onsite.
  c) Development of a Source Reduction Plan ("SRP"), describing the recommended program(s) and the estimated reduction of the solid waste disposed by the project. For example, the SRP may include a description of how fill would be used on the construction site, instead of sending excess fill material to a landfill, or a detailed set of office procedures such as use of duplex copy machines and purchase of office supplies with recycled content.
  d) Implementation of a program to purchase materials that have recycled content for project construction and/or operation (i.e., cleaning supplies, etc.). The program could include requesting suppliers to show recycled materials content. To ensure compliance, the applicant shall develop an integrated solid waste management program, including recommended source reduction, recycling, composting programs, and/or a combination of such programs, subject to City staff review and approval prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy

Residual Impact

- Less than significant.

EIR Scope of Work

- Calculate estimates of solid waste generation consistent with City protocols.
- Determine appropriateness of standard source reduction and recycling measures.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact.	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	See Prior Doc-ument
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	✓				
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	✓				
c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	✓				
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	✓				

Figures 1 - 13 Project Maps and Plans

Attachments:

A. Conditions of Approval
B. City of Goleta Proposed GPAs