

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### INTRODUCTION

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Supplemental EIR) to the 2006 Final EIR for the City of Goleta (City) General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP, or Plan) was prepared to address any new or modified environmental impacts associated with selected revisions to the GP/CLUP. The GP/CLUP was adopted in October 2006 and is the primary means for guiding future change in Goleta as the City faces decisions about growth, housing, environmental protection, neighborhood compatibility/preservation, public facilities/services, and transportation. The Final EIR addressing the potential environmental impacts of the GP/CLUP was certified in October 2006.

In March 2007, the City Council initiated a process for reopening the GP/CLUP to consider the emergence of suggested amendments by City staff, the public-at-large, landowners, developers, and special interest groups. Those City-initiated amendments were subsequently grouped into five categories: *Track 1* for Housing Element revisions to respond to State Department of Housing and Community Development Department comments; *Track 2* for minor technical or editorial revisions presenting no new significant environmental impacts; *Track 3* for revisions meriting more detailed review as to their potential impacts; *Track 4* for project-sponsored amendments; and *Track 5* for Sphere of Influence.

### PURPOSE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL EIR

The purpose of this Supplemental EIR is to document the CEQA review for those proposed amendments categorized as Track 3 revisions to the GP/CLUP. The CEQA lead agency for this Supplemental EIR is the City of Goleta. This document has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) and CEQA Statutes provided in California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. Furthermore, a supplemental EIR was chosen for this project following conditions and definitions in Section 15162 and 15163 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

#### Location and Existing Conditions

The City of Goleta is located in southern Santa Barbara County, California, west of the city of Santa Barbara between the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains and the Pacific Ocean (see Figure 2-1, Project Vicinity Map). The City of Goleta and surrounding area is generally referred to as the *Goleta Valley*. Goleta is bisected by U.S. Highway 101 (US-101), which extends in an east-west alignment across the city. State Route 217 (SR-217) connects US-101 with the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) to the south. Portions of the city are bordered by UCSB and by the city of Santa Barbara, including the Santa Barbara Airport. The southern portions of Goleta are within the California Coastal Zone subject to the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission (see Figure 2-2, Coastal Zone Boundary).

Access into and through the city of Goleta is provided primarily through US-101. Other major east-west arterials include Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road. Major north-south arterials are Patterson Avenue, Fairview Avenue, Los Carneros Road, and Storke-Glen Annie Road.

The project location includes the entire territory within the geographic area of the incorporated city limits, and includes a population of approximately 30,000. This area encompasses approximately 7.9 square miles, containing a total of 5,075 acres. In developing the Draft General Plan, the City studied an area of approximately 95 square miles where future development might impact the City or where City plans and policies might have effects outside the city boundaries. Potential future City service areas, filling the probably ultimate physical boundaries and service area of the City, are shown in Figure 2-2.

## Background

California state planning law, at §65300 of the California Government Code, requires that cities adopt a general plan as a guide to their physical development. The role of the general plan is to act as the City's constitution for the physical use of resources, to express the community's preservation and development goals, and to establish public policy relative to the distribution of future public and private land use. The plan must contain the seven elements mandated by state law, and may include other optional elements.

Prior to the City's incorporation in 2002, land use planning for the area encompassing Goleta was addressed through the Goleta Community Plan, a part of the County of Santa Barbara's General Plan. After incorporation, the City adopted interim General Plan policies. In October 2006, the City adopted its current GP/CLUP, which, as amended, establishes goals, policies, and objectives for guiding future change in the City. The subject project comprises amendments to selected policies of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

The Final GP/CLUP is available for review at City Hall and is posted on the City's website ([www.cityofgoleta.org](http://www.cityofgoleta.org)). Opportunities for public participation in the GP/CLUP process have been many and varied over the past 3 years. Activities have included:

- several public workshop series in 2003 and 2004, focusing on policy issues and a broad vision statement;
- a Discussion Draft General Plan Workshop Series in January 2005;
- new working drafts of General Plan elements released and discussed at Planning Agency meetings during summer and fall 2005;
- two community meetings on housing needs, issues, and strategies in August 2005;
- a traffic forecast and modeling presented at a Special Planning Agency meeting in December 2005;
- a Draft GP/CLUP released in March 2006 for the formal public hearing process;
- a Draft GP/CLUP EIR released on May 31, 2006, for public and agency review;
- a Final GP/CLUP released on August 25, 2006;
- a Final GP/CLUP EIR certified on October 2, 2006;
- City Council authorization to reopen the GP/CLUP in March 2007 to consider suggested amendments;
- City Council hearing to consider initiation of General Plan Amendments on April 16, 2007;
- City Council hearing to consider General Plan Amendments on July 16, 2007;
- City Council hearing to consider initiation of General Plan Amendments on August 6, 2007;

- a series of four workshops hosted by the City between September 15, 2007, and October 17, 2007, to collect feedback on proposed amendments from the public;
- additional City Council hearings held on January 17, 2008, and January 29, 2008, to take a second look at proposed amendments;
- Planning commission hearings on April 14, 2008; April 21, 2008; and May 12, 2008, to consider a CEQA Addendum to the Final EIR and make recommendations to the City Council concerning proposed Track 2 General Plan Amendments;
- City Council hearings on June 3, 2008, and June 17, 2008, with Certification of CEQA Addendum to the Final EIR and Adoption of the Track 2 General Plan Amendments on June 17, 2008;
- a Notice of Preparation soliciting public and agency review of proposed Track 3 Amendments, released on July 29, 2008, and concluding on August 28, 2008;
- a Draft SEIR was released on January 29, 2009, for public and agency review;
- environmental hearings to receive public comment on the Track 3 Draft SEIR occurred on February 25, 2009, and March 16, 2009;
- City Council hearings on May 5, 2009, and May 19, 2009, with Certification of a CEQA Addendum to the Final EIR and adoption of Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments; and
- City Council hearings on May 5, 2009, and May 19, 2009, to consider the Haskell's Landing project with Certification of a CEQA addendum to previously certified EIRs and adoption of two General Plan Amendments (CE 2.2 and HE 11.5).

The California Coastal Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 30000 et seq) was enacted by the State legislature in 1976 to provide long-term protection of California's 1,100-mile coastline. The California Coastal Commission, in partnership with coastal cities and counties, plans and regulates the use of land and water in the coastal zone. The Coastal Act requires local governments in the California Coastal Zone to create and implement Local Coastal Programs (LCPs). Each LCP consists of a Coastal Land Use Plan and a Regulatory Plan (zoning). The City of Goleta's adopted GP/CLUP serves as the CLUP for coastal zone areas within the City boundaries. The CLUP has not been submitted to the Coastal Commission for certification. The Coastal Commission retains jurisdiction over projects in the Coastal Zone until such time that the City submits a complete LCP and receives certification. The City's certified GP/CLUP EIR, the addendum thereto, and this Supplemental EIR comprise the environmental review for policies presented in the GP/CLUP, as amended.

## Objectives

The fundamental goals of the GP/CLUP are to: (1) ensure a high quality environment by protecting and conserving the community's cultural, historical, natural, and environmental assets, values, and resources; (2) provide a sustainable economy that is not dependent on growth, but provides for economic prosperity and well-being for current and future residents; (3) maintains adequate service standards, including level of service (LOS) on area highways; and (4) enables income group opportunities to meet current and future housing needs. These goals are retained as part of the Supplemental EIR and were used as a guide during the identification of the Track 3 policy revision process.

## Changes to the GP/CLUP

The GP/CLUP is composed of nine elements: Land Use, Open Space, Conservation, Safety, Visual and Historic Resources, Transportation, Public Facilities, Noise, and Housing. As noted earlier, in response to further consideration by the Goleta City Council, as well as public and agency review comments received on both the Final GP/CLUP and 2006 Final EIR, the City authorized review of selected policies to be considered for amendment as Track 3 revisions. In general, these revisions were made to improve or clarify the text of selected policies or subsections, to provide City staff with increased flexibility in policy implementation, or to refine policies with more succinct and appropriate wording based upon the observations and experiences of City staff during implementation of the newly adopted GP/CLUP. The proposed revisions pertain to the Land Use, Open Space, Conservation, and Transportation Elements.

Policy amendments are organized by GP/CLUP element; include 1 policy objective, 35 subpolicies, 2 implementation actions, 1 figure, 1 table, and 1 informational statement; and generally address the following topics:

### Land Use Element

- Locations of large regional development
- Revision to growth management directives

### Open Space Element

- Beach access
- Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) definition and designation

### Conservation Element

- ESHA definition and designation
- ESHA protection and buffers
- ESHA development standards
- Width of streamside protection areas
- Allowable uses and activities in streamside protection areas
- Maintenance of creeks
- Definition of wetlands
- Protection of wetlands, both in and out of the coastal zone
- Protection of trees

### Transportation Element

- Options if traffic mitigations are not fully funded

The policies evaluated in this Supplemental EIR have the potential to involve significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental effects. Accordingly, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the appropriate form of CEQA documentation for these Track 3 revisions is a Supplemental EIR.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This Supplemental EIR includes the certified 2006 Final EIR by reference. The Supplemental EIR identifies changes in the environmental setting and regulatory environment since adoption of the Final EIR, addresses new or modified environmental impacts associated with revisions to selected GP/CLUP policies, and identifies mitigation measures designed to reduce new significant impacts where feasible.

Identified impacts were evaluated in terms of their potential significance based on their applicable significance thresholds and the classes of impacts (I through IV) used by the City for CEQA analyses. Cumulative impacts were examined in terms of the combined effects of the impacts associated with GP/CLUP implementation and foreseeable projects in areas adjacent to the City. Residual impacts were examined in terms of the potential for significant effects to occur after mitigation of any Class I, Class II, or significant cumulative impacts. The EIR also identified GP/CLUP policies that would reduce potentially significant impacts resulting from Plan buildout to less-than-significant levels.

A primary purpose of the analysis in this Supplemental EIR is to determine how impacts of GP/CLUP implementation and the mitigating effect of the GP/CLUP policies would change if some or all of the proposed amendments were adopted. To determine this, the amended policy text proposed was evaluated herein in terms of three questions:

1. Is the change to a policy cited as mitigation for a Class II impact of the existing GP/CLUP?
2. If the change were accepted, would implementation of the amended GP/CLUP result in greater or different impacts than those analyzed in the Final EIR?
3. Does the change have the potential to result in potentially significant impacts? If yes, is there feasible mitigation to reduce the effects?

The results of this evaluation are presented in Sections 3.1 through 3.13 and are summarized below. A tabular summary is provided in the screening tables in Appendix B. For those disciplines where the GP/CLUP amendments listed in Table 2-1 of this Supplemental EIR are not proposed to policies cited as mitigation for a given topic, would not result in greater or different impacts to the topic than those analyzed in the Final EIR, and do not have the potential to result in new potentially significant impacts to that topic, the analysis presented in the 2006 Final EIR is considered sufficient, and no further discussion is presented in this Supplemental EIR.

### Impacts with Same Level of Significance as 2006 Final EIR

The impacts associated with the alternatives analyzed in this EIR would not change from those included in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Those impacts are listed below:

#### No Change to Policies Related to Impact

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources
- Agriculture and Farmland
- Air Quality: Construction Emissions, Vehicle Miles Traveled Consistency, Operational Contributions to Air Pollutant Emissions, Cumulative ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> Emissions, Cumulative PM<sub>10</sub> Emissions

- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials: All Except Impact 3.7-7
- Population and Housing: Additional Housing and Jobs Demand (Impact 3.8-1), Additional Residential Units (Impact 3.8-3), Displacement (Impact 3.8-5)
- Water Quality: Adequacy of Water Supplies to Serve New Development, 100-Year Flood Hazard Area, Risk of Tsunami/Mudslide/Seiche, Risk of Dam Failure, Cumulative Effects on Water Supply
- Land Use and Recreation: Physical Division of Established Community
- Noise
- Public Services and Utilities
- Transportation and Circulation: All Except 3.13-2

#### **Amended Policy Does Not Change Significance**

- Air Quality: Growth Projections Consistency
- Biological Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Surface Water
- Population and Housing: Population Growth (Impact 3.8-2), Additional Jobs (3.8-4)
- Water Quality: Degradation of Water Quality, Changes in Groundwater Supply, Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns, Increase in Point and Nonpoint Source Pollution, Water Quality Impacts to 303(d) Listed Water Bodies
- Land Use and Recreation: All Except Impact 3.10-8
- Transportation and Circulation: Exceed LOS Standard Class II (Impact 3.13-2)

#### **Impacts with Lower Level of Significance than 2006 Final EIR**

- None Identified

#### **Impacts with Greater Level of Significance than 2006 Final EIR**

- None Identified

#### **New Impacts**

- Air Quality: Greenhouse Gas (Impact 3.3-7)—Class II

Sections 3.1 through 3.13 provide a detailed discussion of the environmental setting of the proposed project, the impacts that would result from implementing the GP/CLUP, mitigation measures and GP/CLUP policies that would reduce those impacts, and a discussion of proposed amendments to policies and the impacts of these proposed changes. A summary of the impacts, mitigation measures and GP/CLUP policies proposed under the No Action policy, and residual impacts from these policies is found in Table ES-1. Proposed amended GP/CLUP

policies are bolded and a comparison of impacts for policy amendments alternatives are presented in the right-hand column. Alternatives are compared to the residual impacts of the original GP/CLUP. An impact has no change (“NC”) when the policies listed as mitigation for that impact were not proposed to be amended. Amended policies which do not change the level of significance of an impact are considered to have the same (“=”) impact. A policy amendment could also potentially result in an increase (>) or decrease (<) in the level of significance of the impact determined for the 2006 Final EIR.

As a result of impact analysis, no policy amendments would require changing the original finding of significance in the 2006 Final EIR, as defined by CEQA. However, there is one new significant impact which does not result from a policy amendment, but rather a regulatory change. Assembly Bill 32 which addresses greenhouse gas emissions was signed in September 2006, after certification of the 2006 Final EIR. Therefore, Impact 3.3-7 relating to greenhouse gas emissions is a new impact in this Supplemental EIR. There are no policies in the original GP/CLUP specifically designed to address greenhouse gases; however, some general measures do reduce emissions. Proposed policy amendments along with new mitigation measures (developed for this impact) would result in reducing this significant impact to less than significant for the 2030 planning horizon.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

The following environmental areas were found to have cumulative impacts that are impacted by proposed amendments:

- Air Quality: Greenhouse Gas Emissions—Class II

Greenhouse gas emissions (Impact 3.3-7) are a new cumulative impact that were not addressed in the 2006 Final EIR, as described above. Incorporation of proposed mitigation measures will reduce this potentially significant impact to levels less than significant for the 2030 planning horizon.

A detailed discussion of the cumulative impacts resulting from the implementation of the GP/CLUP (under any alternative) is found in Sections 3.1 through 3.13.

### **Growth-Inducing Impacts**

In adopting the GP/CLUP amendments, the City is continuing to manage future growth and development within its City boundary. Therefore, by nature, the GP/CLUP amendments are growth-inducing. However, all growth-inducing impacts were previously addressed in the 2006 Final EIR and policy amendments would not result in new growth-inducing impacts. In addition, the proposed amendments include the removal of nonresidential growth management policies from the Land Use Element of the GP/CLUP (LU 11 and LU-IA-2). The impacts of the removal of Policies LU 11 and LU-IA-2 are analyzed in Section 3.8.3.3. In summary, all growth within the City (commercial, industrial, residential, etc.) is currently regulated by GP/CLUP Figure 2-1 (Land Use Plan Map), adopted as part of the GP/CLUP in 2006. Given the small amount of developable vacant land left remaining in the City, GP/CLUP Figure 2-1 is an appropriate growth management tool, and the currently specified land use designations have accounted for an acceptable ratio of development. While removal of the nonresidential growth management policies from the GP/CLUP and elimination of the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance (GGMO) may affect the pacing of nonresidential growth within the city, removal of those specific

regulations would not alter the amount, type, or location of nonresidential growth in the City as previously analyzed in the 2006 Final EIR.

## ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires an assessment of a reasonable range of alternatives to a project. The alternatives must meet most of the objectives and avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the project. CEQA also requires that an EIR assess the No Project alternative, providing an assessment of what would reasonably be expected to occur if the project were not implemented. The public process that the City underwent to develop the proposed project and alternatives is outlined in Section 2.5.

### Alternatives Considered

The City, in preparing this Supplemental EIR, developed revisions to the existing GP/CLUP policies which are described as alternatives to the proposed project. They are, as follows:

- **Alternative 1—No Changes:** This alternative is the “No Project” alternative as defined in CEQA. This alternative represents the continuation of the existing GP/CLUP policies. It provides the basis for comparing the impacts of not amending or amending the GP/CLUP. This alternative also expresses recommendations made at the workshops and public hearings urging no change to these sections of the GP/CLUP at this time.
- **Alternative 2a—City-Initiated Revisions:** This alternative is the *proposed project* as defined in CEQA and presents the text of policy revisions as initiated by the Goleta City Council. The precise wording of these revisions incorporates what was originally requested by advocates of the revision, as modified (where applicable) by the City Council during their public hearing deliberations.
- **Alternative 2b—Options Associated With City-Initiated Revisions:** This alternative presents the text of optional revisions to Alternative 2a for selected ESHA, wetlands, and related policies. This optional text concerns the development of plans and guidelines that would provide further guidance on policy implementation or could replace the existing policy. The precise wording of these options is based on suggestions to City staff regarding other ways to resolve issues associated with the ESHA, wetland, and related policies in the existing GP/CLUP.
- **Alternative 3—SEIR Recommended Revisions:** This alternative consists of revisions that the SEIR preparer (ICF Jones & Stokes) and City staff recommend be made in order to better reflect the intention of the initiated amendment, consistency with other applicable rules and regulations, and lessons learned during the environmental analysis process. The specific revisions are based on the materials circulated at the workshops and public hearings in fall 2007 and January 2008. In some instances, the wording combines similar versions of a proposed change or was developed in response to comments made at the workshops, hearings, and through the Notice of Preparation process.

### Alternatives Analysis

A detailed analysis of the remaining alternatives (No Project, Alternative 2a, Alternative 2b, Alternative 3) can be found in Chapter 5.0, “Alternatives to the Proposed Project,” of this Supplemental EIR. However, the alternative policy revisions identified for this project are not “alternatives” as defined under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.



## AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Written agency and public comments received during the Notice of Preparation scoping period, along with a table summarizing the issues identified during scoping, are provided in Appendix A. Issues are addressed, where appropriate, in this Final Supplemental EIR, and include:

- Air quality;
- Biological resources;
- Population and housing;
- Water resources;
- Land use;
- Transportation ; and
- Future Service Areas.

## ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved. The major issues that the Lead Agency anticipated to be addressed in this Final Supplemental EIR include:

- Identification of potential environmental impacts of amendments to the GP/CLUP; and
- Comparison of original findings of significance among identified amendment alternatives.

**TABLE ES-1.  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL IMPACTS WITH PROPOSED  
AMENDMENTS**

*Note: The first four columns of this table are verbatim from the certified GP/CLUP FEIR. The last three columns show the change to impact levels, if any, from the three proposed project alternatives. Alternative 2a is the City-initiated revisions, Alternative 2b is options associated with City-initiated revisions, and Alternative 3 reflects revisions identified as a result of the environmental review process.*

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
<b>Aesthetics and Visual Resources</b>						
<b>Impact 3.1-1.</b> Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways	I	Policy VH 1: Scenic Views Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors Policy VH 4: Design Review	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.1-2.</b> Impacts of GP/CLUP on Citywide Visual Character	I	Policy VH 1: Scenic Views Policy VH 3: Community Character Policy VH 4: Design Review	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.1-3.</b> Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Scenic Corridors and Key Public Viewpoints	II	Policy VH 1: Scenic Views Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors Policy VH 4: Design Review	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.1-4.</b> Impacts from Light and Glare	III	Policy VH 4: Design Review Policy VH 4.12: Lighting	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.1-5.</b> Improvements to Visual Quality of City Gateways	IV	No mitigation is required	Beneficial	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.1-6.</b> Creating Well Defined Public Spaces	IV	No mitigation is required	Beneficial	NC	NC	NC
<b>Agriculture and Farmland</b>						
<b>Impact 3.2-1.</b> Conversion of Agricultural Land and Loss or Impairment of Agricultural Productivity	I	Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.2-2.</b> Incompatible Land Uses and Structures	II	Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.2-3.</b> Preservation of Agricultural Land	IV	No mitigation is required	Beneficial	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.2.4.</b> Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Lands	I	No GP/CLUP Policies provided as mitigation in 2006 Final EIR	Significant	NC	NC	NC

<sup>1</sup> Key to Symbols for Residual Impact Comparison:

- NC No change to original GP/CLUP policy; therefore no change to CEQA residual impact finding.
- new\* Impact is a new impact not previously addressed in the 2006 Final EIR.
- = No new impacts would result from proposed policy amendments; residual impact remains the same.
- < Reduction in residual impact with changes to GP/CLUP.

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
<b>Air Quality</b>						
<b>Impact 3.3-1. Construction Emissions</b>	II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliance with SBCAPCD Rule 1001</li> <li>• Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated “clean” diesel engines) should be utilized wherever feasible.</li> <li>• The engine size of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be the minimum practical size.</li> <li>• The amount of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient construction management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.</li> <li>• Construction equipment shall be maintained per the manufacturer’s specifications</li> <li>• Construction equipment operating on site shall be equipped with two or four degree engine timing retard or precombustion chamber engines.</li> <li>• Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.</li> <li>• All diesel-powered equipment shall use ultra low sulfur diesel fuel.</li> <li>• Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, and diesel particulate filters, as certified and/or verified by EPA or California, shall be installed, if available.</li> <li>• Diesel-powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.</li> <li>• Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading should be limited to five minutes; auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible.</li> <li>• Construction worker’s trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch on site.</li> <li>• During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems should be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency should be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.</li> <li>• Minimize the amount of disturbed area and reduce on site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.</li> <li>• Gravel pads must be installed at all access points to</li> </ul>	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
		prevent tracking of mud on to public roads. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be covered with a tarp from the point of origin.</li> <li>• After clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the disturbed area should be treated by watering, revegetating, or spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.</li> <li>• The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SBCAPCD prior to land use clearance for map recordation and land use clearance for finish grading for the structure.</li> <li>• Prior to land clearance, the applicant shall include, as a note on a separate informational sheet to be recorded with map, these dust control requirements. All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans.</li> </ul>				
<b>Impact 3.3-2.</b> GP/CLUP Growth Projections Are Not Consistent with the Clean Air Plan	III	Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality Policy CE 13: Energy Conservation Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses <b>Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management</b> Policy SE 1: Safety in General Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management	Less Than Significant	=	=	=/NC <sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> For Policy LU 11, the text of the proposed amendment is the same for all alternatives. For Policy TE 13, Alternative 3 proposes no change to the policy.

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
		Policy TE 7: Public Transit (Bus Transportation) Policy TE 8: Rail Transportation Policy TE 10: Pedestrian Circulation Policy TE 11: Bikeways Plan Policy TE 12: Transportation Systems Management <b>Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development</b> Policy TE 14: Financing Transportation Improvements Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation Adherence to the requirements of the State Implementation Plan and the provisions under the County's CAP.				
<b>Impact 3.3-3.</b> The GP/CLUP Rate of Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled is Greater Than the Rate of Population Growth for the Same Area	III	Adherence to the requirements of the State Implementation Plan and the provisions under the County's CAP.	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.3-4.</b> Long-term Operational Contributions to Air Pollutant Emissions as a Result of GP/CLUP Buildout	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.3-5.</b> Cumulative ROG and NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	I	No GP/CLUP Policies provided as mitigation in 2006 Final EIR	Cumulatively Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.3-6.</b> Cumulative PM <sub>10</sub> Emissions	II	Implementation of City Grading Ordinance and SBCAPCD dust-control measures	Cumulatively Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.3-7. Greenhouse Gas</b>	II	<i>The 2006 Final EIR did not specifically address GHG emissions<sup>3</sup>, however the following existing policies in the GP/CLUP relate to reduction of GHGs:</i> Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands Policy CE 12: Transportation Systems Management Policy CE 13: Energy Conservation Policy HE 3: Linkage of Housing and Jobs <b>Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management</b> Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map Policy TE 7: Public Transit (Bus Transportation) Policy TE 8: Rail Transportation Policy TE 10: Pedestrian Circulation Policy TE 11: Bikeways Plan Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation <i>The following measure is proposed in order to reduce GHG emissions to less than significant levels.</i>	No Action: Cumulatively Significant <sup>3</sup>  <u>Alternatives with Amendments and new Mitigation Measure AQ-1:</u> Less than Significant (for 2030 planning horizon)	new*	new*	new*

<sup>3</sup> This impact is a new significant but mitigable impact not previously evaluated in the 2006 Final EIR. The Final EIR was certified prior to the signing of Assembly Bill 32 in September 2006. While this impact could be considered an increase from impacts in the 2006 Final EIR document, the alternatives analyzed in this Supplemental EIR would decrease the impact to levels less than significant for the 2030 planning horizon.

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
		AQ-1: Add a Policy that Requires Development of a GHG Reduction Plan				
<b>Biological Resources</b>						
<b>Impact 3.4-1.</b> Temporary Impacts to Special Status Habitats and Special Status Species	II	<b>Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy</b> <b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> <b>Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands</b> <b>Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas</b> <b>Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas</b> Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats <b>Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species</b> <b>Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands</b> <b>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</b> Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan <b>Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map</b> Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-2.</b> Loss of Special Status Habitats	II	See Impact 3.4-1	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-3.</b> Long-term Degradation of Special Status Habitats	II	<b>Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy</b> <b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> <b>Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands</b> <b>Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas</b> <b>Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas</b> Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats <b>Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands</b> <b>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</b> Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)	Less Than Significant	=	=	=

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
<b>Impact 3.4-4.</b> Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats	II	See Impact 3.4-1	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-5.</b> Harm to Listed Species	II	See Impact 3.4-1	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-6.</b> Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species	II	See Impact 3.4-1	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-7.</b> Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species	II	See Impact 3.4-1	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-8.</b> Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages	II	See Impact 3.4-1	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-9.</b> Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat	II	See Impact 3.4-1	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-10.</b> Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy	II	See Impact 3.4-1	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-11.</b> Impacts to Non-Special-Status Habitats and Species	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-12.</b> Resources Not Effected by Maintenance/Management	IV	No mitigation is required	Beneficial	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-13.</b> Protection of ESHAs and Maintenance/Management of Regional and Neighborhood Open Space Area	IV	No mitigation is required	Beneficial	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.4-14.</b> Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources	III	<b>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</b> Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and –Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites) Policy LU 12: Land Use in Goleta’s Environs	Cumulatively Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Cultural Resources</b>						
<b>Impact 3.5-1.</b> Damage to Sites of Cultural, Historical, or Paleontological Significance	II	Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources Policy VH 5: Historic Resources Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.5-2.</b> Loss or Destruction of an Important Historical Building, Archaeological Site, or Paleontological Site	II	Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources Policy VH 5: Historic Resources Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.5-3.</b> Loss or Destruction of Significant Cultural Resource	II	Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources Policy VH 5: Historic Resources Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
<b>Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources</b>						
<b>Impact 3.6-1.</b> Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil	II	Policy SE 1: Safety in General Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.6-2.</b> Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from the Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault, Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismically Induced Landsliding, or Liquefaction	II	Policy SE 1: Safety in General Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically Induced Hazards Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.6-3.</b> Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting from Development on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils or Steep Slopes	II	Policy SE 1: Safety in General Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.6-4.</b> Location of Development on Expansive Soil That Could Lead to Risks to People or Structures	II	Policy SE 1: Safety in General Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.6-5.</b> Exposure of People to Elevated Levels of Indoor Radon	III	Policy SE 1.9: Reduction of Radon Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC



Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>						
<b>Impact 3.7-1.</b> Risk of Upset at Venoco Facilities	I	Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses LU 10-4b: State Lands Commission Lease 421 Policy SE 1: Safety in General SE 1.2: Guidelines for Siting Highly Sensitive Uses and Critical Facilities Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards SE 8.1: Nonconforming Status of EOF SE 8.2: Consideration of Offshore Gas Processing SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required SE 8.4: Enhanced Preparedness for Hydrogen Sulfide Release SE 8.6: Quantitative Risk Assessment SE 8.7: Routing of Gas Pipelines SE 8.8: Development near Gas Pipelines SE 8.9: Safety Requirements for New Petroleum Pipelines SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines SE 8.11: Safety Measures for Pipelines Transporting Produced Gas SE 8.12: Consultation with Pipeline Operators SE 8.13: Setbacks from Gas Pipelines SE 8.14: Pipeline Burial Depths SE 8.15: Pipeline Marking and Warning Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness SE 11.1: Education and Awareness Programs SE 11.2: Improved Information Transfer during Emergencies SE 11.4: Incorporation of Emergency Response Plans into GIS SE 11.5: Monitoring of Trends and Improvements in Emergency Preparedness	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.7-2.</b> Transport	I	Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards SE 8.2: Consideration of Offshore Gas Processing SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required SE 8.4: Enhanced Preparedness for Hydrogen Sulfide Release SE 8.6: Quantitative Risk Assessment SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities SE 10.1: Identification of Hazardous Materials Facilities	Significant	NC	NC	NC

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
		SE 10.2: Compliance with Law SE 10.4: Prohibition on New Facilities Posing Unacceptable Risks Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness SE 11.1: Education and Awareness Programs SE 11.2: Improved Information Transfer during Emergencies SE 11.4: Incorporation of Emergency Response Plans into GIS SE 11.5: Monitoring of Trends and Improvements in Emergency Preparedness				
<b>Impact 3.7-3.</b> Risk of Upset at S.L. 421 Wells	II	Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses LU 10-3a: Oil and Gas Transport and Storage Facilities LU 10-4a and b: State Lands Commission Lease 421 Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required SE 8.6: Quantitative Risk Assessment SE 8.9: Safety Requirements for New Petroleum Pipelines SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines SE 8.14: Pipeline Burial Depths SE 8.15: Pipeline Marking and Warning	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.7-4.</b> Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal	II	Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required SE 8.5: Inventory of Oil and Gas Pipelines SE 8.9: Safety Requirements for New Petroleum Pipelines SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines SE 8.14: Pipeline Burial Depths	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.7-5.</b> Airport	II	Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards SE 9.1: Clear Zone and Airport Approach Zone Regulations SE 9.2: Height Restrictions SE 9.3: Limitations on Development and Uses SE 9.4: Maintenance of an Airport Safety Corridor for Runway 7 SE 9.5: Limitations on Density SE 9.6: Limitations on Residential Development SE 9.7: Real Estate Disclosure SE 9.8: Limitations on Hazardous Facilities	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.7-6.</b> Wildland Fires	II	Policy SE1: Safety in General SE 1.1: Maintenance of Maps and Resources on Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
		SE 1.2: Guidelines for Siting Highly Sensitive Uses and Critical Facilities SE 1.3: Site-Specific Hazards Studies SE 1.4: Deed Restriction in Hazardous Areas SE 1.5: Subdivision of New Lots in Hazard Areas SE 1.6: Enforcement of Building Codes SE 1.7: Abatement of Public Safety Hazards SE 1.8: Reduction of Non-Conforming or Substandard Structural Conditions  Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards SE 7.1: Fire Prevention and Response Measures for New Development  SE 7.2: Review of New Development SE 7.3: Identification of Fire Hazard Areas SE 7.4: Fuel Modification Plans SE 7.5: Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems SE 7.6: Standards for Rebuilding in High Fire Hazard Areas				
Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water	II	Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy <b>CE 1.1: Definition of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas</b> <b>CE 1.2: Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas</b> CE 1.3: Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs CE 1.4: Illegal Destruction of ESHAs CE 1.5: Corrections to Map of ESHAs CE 1.6: Protection of ESHAs CE 1.7: Mitigation of Impacts to ESHAs CE 1.8: ESHA Buffers <b>CE 1.9: Standards Applicable to Development Projects</b> CE 1.10: Management of ESHAs Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas CE 2.1: Designation of Protected Creeks <b>CE 2.2: Streamside Protection Areas</b> <b>CE 2.3: Allowable Uses and Activities in Streamside Protection Areas</b> CE 2.4: Dedication of Easements or Other Property Interests <b>CE 2.5: Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems</b> CE 2.6: Restoration of Degraded Creeks Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands	Less Than Significant	=	=	=

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
		CE 3.1: Definition of Wetlands CE 3.2: Designation of Wetland ESHAs CE 3.3: Site-Specific Wetland Delineations CE 3.4: Protection of Wetlands CE 3.5: Wetland Buffer Areas CE 3.6: Mitigation of Wetland Fill CE 3.7: Lagoon Protection CE 3.8: Vernal Pool Protection Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality CE 10.1: New Development and Water Quality CE 10.2: Siting and Design of New Development <b>CE 10.3: Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management</b> CE 10.4: New Facilities CE 10.5: Beachfront and Blufftop Development CE 10.6: Stormwater Management Requirements CE 10.7: Drainage and Stormwater Management Plans CE 10.8: Maintenance of Stormwater Management Facilities CE 10.9: Landscaping to Control Erosion				
<b>Impact 3.7-8.</b> Exposure of Population to Listed/Contaminated Sites	II	Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities SE 10.1: Identification of Hazardous Materials Facilities SE 10.3: Hazard Assessment Required for Hazardous Materials Facilities SE 10.4: Prohibition on New Facilities Posing Unacceptable Risks SE 10.5: Restriction on Residential Development near Hazardous Facilities SE 10.6: Responsibility for Cleanup by Responsible Party SE 10.7: Identification, Transport, and Disposition of Potentially Contaminated Soil	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.7-9.</b> Contaminated Soil	II	Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities SE 10.1: Identification of Hazardous Materials Facilities SE 10.2: Compliance with Law SE 10.5: Restriction on Residential Development near Hazardous Facilities SE 10.6: Responsibility for Cleanup by Responsible Party SE 10.7: Identification, Transport, and Disposition of Potentially Contaminated Soil (formerly MM 3.7-1)	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.7-10.</b> Exposure of Populated Areas to Oil and Gas Pipelines	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
<b>Impact 3.7-11.</b> Ellwood Facility	III	Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.7-12.</b> EMFs	III	No mitigation is required		NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.7-13.</b> Upset and Accident Conditions	III	No GP/CLUP Policies provided as mitigation in 2006 Final EIR	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.7-14.</b> Contaminated Groundwater	III	Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Population and Housing</b>						
<b>Impact 3.8-1.</b> The Result of the Increased Population Would Be the Need for Additional Housing and Jobs, Which Would Result in the Physical Alteration of Vacant and Previously Developed Land within the City	II	No GP/CLUP Policies provided as mitigation in 2006 Final EIR	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.8-2.</b> Population Growth Associated with Implementation of the Proposed GP/CLUP Is Anticipated to Result in an Increase in the Population by 24 Percent at Full or Ultimate Buildout	II	<b>Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management</b>	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.8-3.</b> Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Could Result in the Addition of 3,730 Residential Units to the City's Housing Stock	II	Policy HE 1: Equal Housing Opportunities Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships Policy HE 4: Variety of Housing Choices and Affordable Housing Opportunities Policy HE 5: Special Needs Housing and Support Programs Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta's RHNA Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design Policy HE 10: Production of New Affordable Housing Policy HE 11: Inclusion of Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income Housing in New Development Policy HE 12: Funding for Affordable Housing	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.8-4.</b> Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Would Result in the Addition of Approximately 3,400 to 3,900 Jobs	II	Policy HE 3: Linkage of Housing and Jobs Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta's RHNA Policy HE 7: Opportunities for Mixed-Use Housing Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses <b>Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses</b> Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area <b>Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management</b> Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management <b>Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development</b>	Less Than Significant	=	=	=

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
		Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation				
<b>Impact 3.8-5.</b> The GP/CLUP Would Not Result in the Displacement of a Substantial Number of People or Existing Homes	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Water Quality</b>						
<b>Impact 3.9-1.</b> Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants	II	<b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> <b>Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands</b> Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas <b>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</b>	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.9-2.</b> Adequacy of Water Supplies to Serve New Development	II	Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs Policy CE 15: Water Conservation and Materials Recycling Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.9-3.</b> Changes in Groundwater Supply from New Development	II	<b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> <b>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</b> Policy CE 15: Water Conservation and Materials Recycling Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.9-4.</b> Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion	II	Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies <b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats <b>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</b> Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities Policy SE 1: Safety in General Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.9-5.</b> Construction of Structures or Housing in a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area	II	Policy SE 1: Safety in General Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.9-6.</b> Risk to New Development from Inundation by a Tsunami, Mudslide, or Seiche	II	Policy SE 1: Safety in General Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically Induced Hazards Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.9-7.</b> Increases in Point Source and Nonpoint Source Pollution from New Development	II	<b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats	Less Than Significant	=	=	=

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
		<b>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</b> Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character				
<b>Impact 3.9-8.</b> Risk to New Development from Dam Failure and Resultant Flooding	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.9-9.</b> Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies Are 303(d) Listed	I	<b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats <b>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</b> Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character	Cumulatively Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.9-10.</b> Cumulative Effects on Water Supply	III	No mitigation is required.	Cumulatively Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Land Use and Recreation</b>						
<b>Impact 3.10-1.</b> Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities	II	Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses <b>Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy</b> <b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> <b>Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands</b> Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas <b>Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas</b> Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats <b>Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species</b> <b>Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands</b> <b>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</b> Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest Policy SE 1: Safety in General Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.10-2.</b> Adverse Physical Effect on the	II	Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites	Less Than Significant	=	=	=

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
Environment Due To Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities		<b>Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy</b> <b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> <b>Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands</b> Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas <b>Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas</b> Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats <b>Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species</b> Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands <b>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</b> Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest Policy SE 1: Safety in General Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise				
<b>Impact 3.10-3.</b> Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities	II	Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses <b>Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses</b> Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality Policy HE 5: Special Needs Housing and Support Programs Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta's RHNA Policy HE 12: Funding for Affordable Housing Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
<b>Impact 3.10-4.</b> Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	II	Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific	Less Than Significant	=	=	=



Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
		Shoreline Sites) Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan <b>Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map</b> Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites <b>Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy</b> <b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> <b>Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands</b> <b>Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas (GP/CP)</b> Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas (CP) Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards Policy VH 1: Scenic Views Policy VH 3: Community Character Policy TE 9: Parking				
<b>Impact 3.10-5.</b> Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	II	Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses <b>Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses</b> Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites) Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design Policy VH 1: Scenic Views Policy VH 3: Community Character Policy VH 4: Design Review Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development Policy PF 5: School Facilities Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities	Less Than Significant	=	=	=

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
<b>Impact 3.10-6.</b> Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities	II	Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites) Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan <b>Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map</b> Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites <b>Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy</b> <b>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</b> <b>Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands</b> <b>Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas</b> Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards Policy VH 1: Scenic Views Policy TE 9: Parking Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise	Less Than Significant	=	=	=
		Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies <b>Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses</b> Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites) Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan <b>Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map</b> Policy OS 9: Financing Public Parks, Open Space, and	Less Than Significant	=	=	=

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
		Recreation Facilities Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest Policy VH 1: Scenic Views Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors Policy VH 5: Historic Resources Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta Policy PF 5: School Facilities				
<b>Impact 3.10-8.</b> Physical Division of an Established Community Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	II	Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Noise</b>						
<b>Impact 3.11-1.</b> Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Sources	I	Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.11-2.</b> Exposure of Existing or Planned Noise Sensitive Receptors Uses to Increased Noise	I	Policy NE 2: Traffic Noise Sources Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.11-3.</b> Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise	I	Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards Policy NE 2: Traffic Noise Sources Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.11-4.</b> Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Railway Noise	I	Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards Policy NE 4: Railway Noise Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.11.5.</b> Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Industrial and Other Point Sources	I	Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards Policy NE 5: Industrial and Other Point Sources Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.11-6.</b> Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Airport Noise	III	Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards Policy NE 3: Airport Noise Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.11-7.</b> Cumulative Traffic Noise	I	Policy NE 2: Traffic Noise Sources Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise	Cumulatively Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Public Services and Utilities</b>						
<b>Impact 3.12-1.</b> Increased Demand for Police Protection	II	Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta Policy PF 3: Public Safety Services and Facilities Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
<b>Impact 3.12-2.</b> Increased Demand for Fire Protection	II	Policy PF 3: Public Safety Services and Facilities Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.12-3.</b> Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection, Treatment, and Disposal	II	Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.12-4.</b> Increased Demand for Utility Services	II	Policy PF 6: Utilities Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development Policy CE 13: Energy Conservation	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.12-5.</b> Increased Demand on Local School Districts	II	Policy PF 5: School Facilities	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.12-6.</b> Increased Demand on Library Facilities	II	Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.12-7.</b> Exceedence of Capacity of Landfills to Accommodate Additional Solid Waste Stream	III	Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Transportation and Circulation</b>						
<b>Impact 3.13-1.</b> Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways	I	No GP/CLUP Policies provided as mitigation in 2006 Final EIR	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.13-2.</b> Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways	II	Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System Policy TE 4: Target Level of Service Standards Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements <b>Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development</b>	Less Than Significant	=	=	NC
<b>Impact 3.13-3.</b> Increased Traffic Volumes, Either Individually or Cumulatively, without Violation of LOS Standards Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.13-4.</b> LOS under 2030 is expected to improve or remain unchanged at Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive and Cathedral	IV	No mitigation is required	Beneficial	NC	NC	NC

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
Oaks/Calle Real						
<b>Impact 3.13-5.</b> No adverse impacts to air traffic patterns.	IV	No mitigation is required	Beneficial	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 3.13-6.</b> Increased Transit Ridership and Encourage Alternative Modes of Transportation.	IV	No mitigation is required	Beneficial	NC	NC	NC
<b>Future Service Areas</b>						
<b>Aesthetic and Visual Resources</b>						
<b>Impact 4.1-1.</b> Impacts of Service Areas on Visual Character	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.1-2.</b> Impacts of Service Areas on Visual Resources—Santa Ynez Mountains and Foothills	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Agriculture and Farmland</b>						
<b>Impact 4.2-1.</b> Preservation of Agricultural Land	IV	No mitigation is required	Beneficial	NC	NC	NC
<b>Air Quality</b>						
Short-term Class II impacts are same as those identified in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."				NC	NC	NC
Long-term Class III impacts are same as those identified in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."				NC	NC	NC
Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.3, "Air Quality."				NC	NC	NC
<b>Biological Resources</b>						
Short-term and long-term Class II impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."				NC	NC	NC
Short-term and long-term Class III impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."				NC	NC	NC
Class IV impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."				NC	NC	NC
Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources."				NC	NC	NC
<b>Cultural Resources</b>						
Short- and long-term Class II impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources."				NC	NC	NC
Long-term Class IV impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources."				NC	NC	NC
Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources."				NC	NC	NC
<b>Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources</b>						
<b>Impact 4.6-1.</b> Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting during Construction on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils	II	Policy SE-1: Safety in General Policy SE-2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat Policy SE-3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards Policy SE-5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.6-2.</b> Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil	II	Policy SE-1: Safety in General Policy SE-2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat Policy SE-3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards Policy SE-5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.6-3.</b> Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from	II	Policy SE-1: Safety in General Policy SE-3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
Seismically Induced Landsliding or Liquefaction		Policy SE-4: Seismic and Seismically-Induced Hazards Policy SE-11: Emergency Preparedness				
<b>Impact 4.6-4.</b> Exposure of People to Elevated Levels of Indoor Radon	III	Policy SE 1.9: Reduction of Radon Hazards	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>						
<b>Impact 4.7-1.</b> Wildland Fires	II	See Impact 3.7-6	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.7-2.</b> Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal	II	See Impact 3.7-4	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.7-3.</b> Listed/Contaminated Sites	II	See Impact 3.7-8	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.7-4.</b> Surface Water	II	See Impact 3.7-7	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.7-5.</b> Airport	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.7-6.</b> Exposure of Populated Areas to Oil and Gas Pipelines	III	See Impact 3.7-10	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Population and Housing</b>						
<b>Impact 4.8-1.</b> Increased Population Would Generate the Need for Additional Housing and Jobs, Which Would Result in the Physical Alteration of Vacant and Previously Disturbed Land Within the Service Areas	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.8-2.</b> Annexation of the Services Areas Would Not Result in the Displacement of a Substantial Number of People or Existing Homes	III	No mitigation is required	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Water Resources</b>						
Short-term Class II impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.9, "Water Resources"				NC	NC	NC
Long-term Class III impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.9, "Water Resources."				NC	NC	NC
Cumulative impacts are same as those identified in Section 3.9, "Water Resources."				NC	NC	NC
<b>Land Use and Recreation</b>						
<b>Impact 4.10-1.</b> Potential Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of Future Service Area Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities	II	See Impact 3.10-3	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.10-2.</b> Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due To Buildout of Future Service Area Land Uses	III	No mitigation is required	No Impact	NC	NC	NC

Impact	Class	GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure (No Project) Adopted 2006	Residual Impact <sup>1</sup>			
			Final EIR	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3
<b>Noise</b>						
Short- and long-term Class III impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.11, "Noise"				NC	NC	NC
Cumulative impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.11, "Noise."				NC	NC	NC
<b>Public Services and Utilities</b>						
Long-term Class II impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.12, "Public Services and Utilities."				NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.12-1.</b> Exceedance of Capacity of Landfills to Accommodate Additional Solid Waste Stream	III	Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Transportation and Circulation</b>						
<b>Impact 4.13-1.</b> Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways	I	No GP/CLUP Policies provided as mitigation in 2006 Final EIR	Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.13-2.</b> Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways	II	Implementation of planned transportation improvements	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
<b>Impact 4.13-3.</b> Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways	III	Implementation of planned and recommended transportation improvements	Less Than Significant	NC	NC	NC
Class IV impacts are the same as those identified in Section 3.13, "Transportation and Circulation."				NC	NC	NC

Key to Impact Analysis of Alternatives

NC No change to original GP/CLUP policy; therefore no change to CEQA residual impact finding.  
 = No new impacts would result from proposed policy amendments; residual impact remains the same.  
 < Reduction in residual impact with changes to GP/CLUP.

*This page intentionally left blank*