SECTION 1.0

Executive Summary

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared by the City of Goleta to evaluate potential environmental impacts resulting from the development of the three components of the Village at Los Carneros Project, referred to herein as the Project. The Project site is located north and west of Los Carneros Road, south of U.S. Route 101, and is bounded on the west by Tecolotito Creek in the City of Goleta.

Component No. 1 of the Project would develop 465 residential units and related amenities on 43.13 contiguous acres. The residential buildings would cover approximately 30.22 net acres together with ancillary walkways, driveways, parking, and landscaping. Public and private amenities would be provided on 12.41 net acres and would include a neighborhood park, bicycle path, a private recreation center, two swimming pools, open space, pocket parks, and preserved stream and associated riparian corridor/buffer areas. If approved, the proposed Project would supersede the previously entitled Village at Los Carneros development plan approved in 2008. Component No. 2 of the Project would permit minor lot line revisions and zone changes affecting 1.89 acres of current business park use and 0.78 acre of currently zoned residential property, consistent with the requirements of a pending Vesting Tentative Map and a pending General Plan Amendment (GPA). The GPA is being separately processed and is not covered by this EIR. Component No. 3 of the Project would repeal the Raytheon Specific Plan, eliminating an obsolete planning document that unnecessarily complicates the completion of this Project.

This EIR was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, *et seq*., "CEQA"), the regulations promulgated there under (14 California Code of Regulations §§15000, *et seq*., the "CEQA Guidelines"), and the City's Environmental Guidelines ("Goleta Guidelines"). CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the Goleta Guidelines may be collectively referred to as "CEQA." The City of Goleta is the lead agency for this EIR as per CEQA Guidelines § 15367. The City will use this EIR when considering the project.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was circulated for review and comment by the public, agencies, and organizations as required under CEQA. The NOP is provided in Appendix I. A public hearing to accept scoping comments was held on November 10, 2011. Comments relating to the EIR scope were taken into consideration in the preparation of this EIR.

This Executive Summary summarizes the Project Description and conclusions of the Impact Analysis provided in the EIR. Chapter 2.0, Project Description provides a detailed description of the Project evaluated in the EIR. Chapter 3.0, Related Projects, lists the projects considered in the cumulative impacts analysis. Chapter 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis, addresses each of the issues that were identified in the Initial Study as requiring further analysis in the EIR. The impact analysis for each issue area examined in this EIR is presented in six subsections as described below:

- **Existing Conditions** – This subsection provides information describing the relevant environmental setting as well as the applicable regulatory setting.
- **Thresholds of Significance** – This subsection identifies the thresholds used to assess the significance of project impacts. These are based primarily on applicable CEQA criteria and the Goleta Guidelines.

- **Project Impacts** - This subsection describes the nature and extent to which the Project would change the existing environment and makes a determination of whether or not these changes would exceed the thresholds of significance.
- **Cumulative Impacts** – This subsection identifies the potential for significant effects to occur as a result of the Project in combination with other development anticipated in the vicinity of the Project site. Where this potential exists, a determination is made as to whether or not the Project's contribution to this impact is cumulatively considerable and therefore significant.
- **Mitigation Measures** – Mitigation measures are identified for each significant impact that would occur as a result of the Project. Although not required under CEQA, in some cases mitigation measures are also recommended for impacts that are considered less than significant in order to further reduce such impacts.
- **Residual Impacts** - This subsection identifies the levels of significance for Project impacts following the implementation of mitigation measures and specifically identifies any significant unavoidable adverse impacts, (i.e., impacts that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels).

Chapter 5.0 describes the environmental effects that were found not to be significant during the scoping process and were, therefore, not included in the analysis in Chapter 4.0. Chapter 6.0 describes alternatives to the Project and the extent to which each alternative would reduce or avoid the environmental impacts associated with the Project. Chapter 7.0 identifies growth-inducing impacts, and Chapter 8.0 identifies significant irreversible environmental changes. Chapter 9 identifies the individual who participated in the development of the EIR and references used to prepare the document.

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Project includes three distinct components affecting a total of approximately 67 acres of land in the City of Goleta that were originally a part of the Raytheon Specific Plan and subdivided by Tract 14,500, as illustrated in Figure 2-2, Aerial View of the Project Site.

Approving Component 1, the Village at Los Carneros, would permit the development of 465 residential units and related amenities on 43.13 contiguous acres. The residential buildings would cover approximately 30.22 net acres inclusive of ancillary walkways, driveways, parking, and landscaping. Public and private amenities would be provided on 12.41 net acres and would include a neighborhood park, public bicycle path, a private recreation center, two swimming pools, miscellaneous open space including pocket parks, and preserved stream and associated riparian corridors/stream protection buffer areas. If approved, this component of the Project would supersede the previously entitled Village at Los Carneros development plan approved in 2008.

Approving Component 2 of the proposed Project (illustrated in Figure 2-5) would revise the zoning designations of approximately 1.17 acres of Design Residential (DR-20) and 0.725 acres of Planned Residential Development-275 (PRD-275) to Industrial Research Park (MRP) and revise the zoning designations of the northern 43.13 acres of the Project site from Residential Design-20 (DR-20) and Planned Residential Development-275 (PRD-275) to Planned Residential Development-465 (PRD-465). Adjustments to the lot lines to reflect these changes would be accomplished with the recordation of the proposed Vesting Tentative Map (VTM) 32,050 (illustrated in Figure 2-4), which is part of the various entitlements requested for this

Project. The zone change and subsequent lot line revision are requested to facilitate the development of, and access to, the proposed Village at Los Carneros residences. The existing research/office buildings located on lots 1 and 3 would remain unchanged and the total number of residential units proposed for the Village at Los Carneros would not increase as a result of approval of Component 2.

Component 3, the repeal of the Raytheon Specific Plan, will not result in any changes to the proposed development of the Project site. The development plan already in place for Lots 1 and 3, together with the complete development proposal for Component 1, will substitute for the Specific Plan. The repeal will simply eliminate an obsolete planning document.

In addition to the Project, three General Plan Amendments (GPA) and a proposed revision to the GP/CLUP Land Use Map are being processed separately. The GPAs would allow implementation of the proposed Project in its entirety, as described above. The potential environmental effects of the General Plan Amendments are analyzed in a separate Addendum to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (FSEIR 2009) prepared for the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (SCH #2005031151). The General Plan Amendments and accompanying CEQA Addendum to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan FEIR will be processed separately but concurrently with the proposed Project.

1.2.1 Project Site

The Project site is located north and west of Los Carneros Road, south of U.S. Route 101, and is bounded on the west by Tecolotito Creek. Figure 2-6 contains a site plan that details both Components 1 and 2.

The Project components comprise consist of a total of approximately 67 gross acres located within the Central Hollister Residential Development Area of the Inland Area of the City, as designated by the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP).

The site is currently divided into eight separate legal lots (Lots 1 through 8) as recorded in existing subdivision Map No. 14,500 (Figure 2-3, Existing Lots). The proposed VTM 32,050 would re-subdivide lots 1 through 7 of Map No. 14,500 into fourteen lots (Figure 2-4, Proposed Lots) of which twelve would be located in the undeveloped residential area and two that would reflect the reconfiguration of the original lots 1 and 3.

The proposed residential Village at Los Carneros (Component 1) development would be located on Lots 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of Map No. 14,500, with some deviation due to minor lot line adjustments between these lots and lots 1 and 3. The lots proposed for residential development are currently undeveloped unimproved and vacant, but heavily disturbed by prior pre-development activity, grading, and weed abatement.

Lots 1 and 3 are designated Office and Industrial-Business Park in the GP/CLUP and zoned Industrial Research Park (MRP) and are occupied by buildings used for those purposes. The Project would not affect these uses with the exception of the minor lot line adjustments described above.

Lot 8, located south of Los Carneros Road, would not be affected by, nor be a part of, development of the Project. Its future development would be consistent with its current commercial zoning and land use designation and would be the subject of a separate entitlement application at some future date.

1.2.2 Project Objectives

The objectives of the Project are to:

1) Provide a mix of residential development consisting of 465 homes, including 321 units of ownership housing, to address the local and regional housing deficit.
2) Provide 70 affordable rental apartments (included within the total of 465 homes) to help address the local affordable housing deficit. Construction of the affordable units would be assured by a Development Agreement to be executed between the Applicant and the City.
3) Provide 74 market-rate rental apartments (also included in the 465 homes) to address the shortage of rental housing in the local and regional community.
4) Provide residential housing opportunities within walking distance of existing adjacent and nearby office and research park development, commercial uses, and primary transportation corridors to address jobs/housing balance, to encourage pedestrian and bicycle commuting, and to reduce vehicle commuting distances where pedestrian and bicycle commuting are not feasible or desired.
5) Provide private common recreation uses including two pools and recreation building for use by the residents.
6) Provide a publically accessible Class I bikeway and pedestrian mall through the Project site.
7) Provide a neighborhood park pursuant to the Open Space Element of the General Plan that will include both active use area and passive open space.
8) Reconfigure existing parking and landscaping for the existing business park development to accommodate access to the residential component of the Project.
9) Repeal the Raytheon Specific Plan to eliminate an obsolete planning document and utilize the City's Development Plan Review Process to ensure consistent, high quality development for all uses within the former Raytheon Specific Plan area consistent with the City's GP/CLUP and the provisions of the Inland Zoning Ordinance (IZO), as adopted by the Goleta Municipal Code ("GMC").

1.2.3 Project Development

Component 1 of the Project would develop the Village at Los Carneros, comprised of multi-family and single-family detached residential buildings, recreation amenities, associated internal streets, driveways, and landscaping features.

Residential Construction

The Village at Los Carneros would consist of a mix of 465 residential units in 106 buildings. The 465 residential units would include:

Single-family dwellings (SFDs) in the form of Two-Pac units and alley-loaded units.
The Two-Pac units would be four to five bedroom single-family dwellings arranged in a dual unit layout with a landscaped yard area to one side of each dwelling and a driveway and garage with

no side-yard setback on the other. The Two-Pac units are laid out to mirror one another so that the landscaped area of one dwelling abuts the landscaped area of the adjacent dwelling to one side. Similarly, the garage and driveway on the other side of each dwelling abuts the driveway and garage of the adjacent unit. See Figures 2-7.a and 2-7.b, which illustrates the elevations and layout. The Project would construct 28 of these units.

Alley-loaded units would be three to four bedroom detached single family units characterized by a driveway and garage on one side facing an alley, with the front door located on the opposite side of the dwelling facing the street. The front of each dwelling would be separated from the street by a variable width landscaped front yard area. Figures 2-8.a and 2-8.b illustrate the elevations and layout. The Project would construct 28 of these units.

Townhomes in the form of Triplexes
A triplex is one structure containing three attached dwelling units. Each two to four bedroom, two-story townhome unit in the triplex configuration would be accessed individually and have internal access to its own private garage. Figure 2-9 illustrates the triplex elevation and layout. The Project would construct 27 of these units.

Townhomes in the form of Four-plexes
A four-plex is one structure containing four attached dwelling units. Each two-story townhome unit in the four-plex configuration would be accessed individually and have internal access to its own private garage. Figure 2-10 illustrates the four-plex layout and elevation. The Project would construct 72 of these units.

Attached townhomes and flats
Two-story townhomes with two to four bedrooms each, and flats with one to three bedrooms each will be constructed in buildings containing three to six units each. These one and two-story units would front onto a shared courtyard and each unit would have an individual garage accessed at the rear of the buildings. Figure 2-11 illustrates the shared townhome/flat combination buildings. The Project would construct 78 of these units.

One- to three-bedroom stacked flats will be constructed in two, 3-story buildings in which residential units are constructed around an interior courtyard. Semi-subterranean parking garages would be constructed for each building, with elevators and internal walkways that provide access to the residential units from the garage area. Figure 2-12 illustrates the “podium flats.” The Project would construct 88 of these units.

Market-rate rental apartments would be provided in three buildings, housing a total of 74 units with a mix of one, two, and three bedroom floor plans units. Figures 2-13.a and 2-13.b illustrate the layout and elevations of these apartments.

Affordable rental apartments, available to low income households at below market rates, would be constructed as stacked flats with a total of 70 units consisting of a mix of one, two, and three bedroom floor plans units. These units will be rent-restricted for affordability pursuant to the provisions of a the Project’s Development Agreement (DA) for a set period of years. Figure 2-14 illustrates the elevation and general layout of these units.

Table 1-1 summarizes the types of units, configuration, the number of buildings, units, and bedrooms for each of the various dwelling units described above.

Table 1-1
Summary Residential Building and Unit Count

Building Type	Housing Type	Number of Buildings	Units Per Building	Number of Housing Units	Number of Bedrooms Per Unit
Two-Pac	Single-family Dwelling	28	1	28	4 - 5
Alley-loaded	Single-family Dwelling	28	1	28	3 - 4
Triplex	Condominium Townhome	9	3	27	2 - 4
Fourplex	Condominium Townhome	18	4	72	2 - 4
Townhomes and Flats	Condominium Townhomes and Flats	14	3 – 6[1]	78	2 - 3
Stacked Flats	Condominium Flats	2	44	88	1 - 3
Market Rate Apartments	Multi-family Rental Units	3	-	74	1 - 3
Affordable Apartments	Rent-restricted Multifamily Rental Units	4	-	70	1 - 3
	Total:	**106**	**-**	**465**	-

[1] Building Type 100 contains 3 units each; Building Type 200 contains 4 units each; Building Type 300 contains 6 units each; Building Type 400 contains 5 units each.

Recreational Facilities and Open Space

The Village at Los Carneros component of the Project would include development of a total of approximately 12.91 acres of private and public recreational amenities within the Project site. Publicly accessible recreation facilities would include:

A 4.82-acre Neighborhood Park, with 1.75 acres developed for active recreation and the balance comprised of public passive open space, located in the northwest portion of the site near Tecolotito Creek. The park would include the unnamed tributary creek ESHA and associated upland buffers Stream Protection Area (SPA), which would be protected from public encroachment. The park would be privately owned and maintained, with access available to the public through an access easement from the Tecolotito Creek Maintenance Road, with assumption of liability for public use by the City through the Project's Development Agreement.
A Class I bikeway would be constructed from the Project's east entrance at Calle Koral to and across the span bridge entrance over Tecolotito Creek on the Project's west side. The bikeway would consist of a total of approximately 0.81 acre, and would be privately owned and maintained, with access available to the public subject to a public access easement and assumption of liability for public use by the City through the Project's Development Agreement.

Private recreation amenities provided for resident use only would include:

- An approximately one-acre recreation center with a 1,583 square-foot pool building, pool, spa, and turf play area (see Figure 2-15);
- An approximately 6,000 square-foot recreation area located within the rent-restricted apartment complex courtyard;
- An approximately 13,000 square-foot recreation area/pool located at the market-rate apartment complex;

- Two pocket parks totaling approximately 7,000 square feet located within the ownership component of the Village project; and
- Four open space areas ranging in size from approximately 7,800 square-feet to 28,000 square-feet located primarily within the ownership component of the Village project (See Figure 2-16).

1.2.4 Requested Approvals

The Project scope includes the following requests requiring discretionary approvals by the City Council:

- Repeal the existing Raytheon Specific Plan (10-043-SPA);
- Zone change (10-043-RZ) to change the zoning for:
  1. The northern 44.24 acres of the of the project site from Residential Design-20 (DR-20), and Planned Residential Development (PRD-275), to Planned Residential Development-465 (PRD-465);
  2. 0.786 acres of Industrial Research Park (MRP) to Planned Residential Development-465 (PRD-465);
  3. 1.170 acres of Design Residential-20 (DR-20) and 0.725 acres of Planned Residential Development-275 (PRD-275) to Industrial Research Park (MRP) to accommodate property line adjustments and alterations to existing parking and landscaping areas.

  The zone changes would be consistent with the General Plan Amendment Land Use Designation changes as requested in 10-043-GPA;
- Development Agreement (10-043-OA);
- Vesting Tentative Map (10-043-VTM; 32,050) to re-subdivide the seven existing lots of record to create 12 lots for residential and associated uses and keeping two lots designated for the existing business park purposes;
- Development Plan (10-043-DP) for the 395 residential unit development to provide project-specific development standards;
- Development Plan (10-044-DP) for the development of 70 affordable rental apartments (as a portion of the 465 total proposed units);
- Development Plan Amendment (10-045-DPAM) to amend the existing Development Plan for Lot 1 (83-DP-010) to allow for the construction of the Calle Koral/Los Carneros intersection improvements and associated modifications to zoning regulation standards and
- Development Plan Amendment (10-045-DPAM) to amend the existing Development Plan for Lot 3 (84-DP-011) to allow for changes to the landscape and parking plan and associated modifications to zoning regulation standards.
- Minor Conditional Use Permit (10-043-CUP) for an over-height wall more than 6-feet in height between Lots 1 and 3 (Business Park) and the Village at Los Carneros site.

Amendments to the General Plan are analyzed in a separate CEQA Addendum to the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2005031151). The Addendum is available for review at Goleta City Hall, 130 Cremona Drive, Goleta, CA 93117. The amendments to the GP/CLUP are the following:

- Amendment of the Land Use Element Figure 2-1 (Land Use Plan Map) to change the Land Use Designation of 0.786 acres of Business Park, Office and Industrial to Medium-Density Residential.
- Amendment of the Land Use Element Figure 2-1 (Land Use Plan Map) to change the Land Use Designation of 1.895 acres of Medium-Density Residential to Business Park, Office and Industrial.
- Amendment of the Housing Element, Policy HE.6 Inclusionary Requirement for Affordable Housing Opportunity (AHO) Sites, Figure 10A-2, to remove sites 24, 25, and 26 as Central Hollister Affordable Housing Opportunity Sites.
- Amendment of the Land Use Element, Policy LU 8.1 Applicability- to reduce the acreage of vacant parcels available for residential development, situated largely between North Willow Springs and Castillan Drive, to 27.75 acres from 68.25 acres; and to remove the reference to Raytheon Specific Plan area.
- Amendment of the Land Use Element, Policy LU 8.5 Coordinated Development Plan and Quality Design-to remove the reference to Raytheon Specific Plan.

The proposed Component 1 would be required to obtain permits from other regulatory agencies to allow for the proposed bridge over Tecolotito Creek:

- Clean Water Act Section 404 permit administered by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps or ACOE);
- Clean Water Act Section 401 permit administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB);
- Fish and Game Code Section 1602 agreement administered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

1.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1-2 summarizes the Project's environmental impacts and the measures identified to mitigate these impacts. The table also notes the significance of impacts before and after mitigation is implemented. Impacts are classified as follows:

- Class I – Significant impact that cannot be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures.
- Class II – Significant impacts that can be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures.
- Class III – Less than significant impacts. Mitigation measures are not required but may be recommended.
- Class IV – Beneficial impacts.

1.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Through the NOP public review process, the public raised a number of issues and concerns for the proposed Project, including the potential for the development to impact sensitive habitat, traffic, air quality, utilities and public services and views. Each of these issues is addressed in Chapter 4 under the appropriate subheading.

Table 1-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Description of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
Visual Resources **Impact AES 1:** Does the site contain any visual resources as described and would the development interfere with the public's enjoyment of those resources, result in the removal of significant amounts of vegetation, alteration of natural character or loss of important open space, or (Appendix G) would the project degrade any of the existing visual resources of the site? The Project site consists of either fully developed business park uses (Lots 1 and 3) or vacant but heavily disturbed property that has been previously graded to the extent that its natural topography and visual character have been erased (contiguous Lots 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7). The cleared and graded residential site lacks discernable relief and, with the notable exception of the Tecolotito Creek riparian corridor and the north row of eucalyptus trees, lacks significant natural scenic features or visual resources. While None of the Project site's contiguous vacant lots are identified in the General Plan as important or planned open space (See GP/CLUP Figure 3-5). Tecolotito Creek traverses Lots 6 and 7 and is designated "an Open Space for the Preservation of Natural Resources" in the City's Open Space Element. The City's Visual and Historical Resources Element identifies "creeks and the vegetation associated with their riparian corridors" as scenic resources (Policy VH 1.1). At present, public views of the corridor from offsite are relatively limited by intervening topography and the elevation of immediately adjacent roadways; however project development and access improvements, including the construction of the Tecolotito Creek bridge, will allow more residents to enjoy the beauty of this natural area. General Plan Policy 1.6 (Preservation of Natural Landforms) requires minimization of any alteration to natural landforms by ensuring that development is designed to coordinate with surrounding natural features such as mature trees, native vegetation, and drainage courses. Among the recommended	Less Than Significant	**No mitigation required.**	Less Than Significant (Class III)

actions are the minimization of vegetation clearance for fuel management and the clustering of building sites and structures to avoid encroachment. Although the SPA is less than 100-feet wide for approximately 50 percent of the creek's length, it will nonetheless enhance the visual appeal of the creek corridor Construction of a bridge over the creek to provide access to the residential Project site will result in removal of vegetation and disruption of natural vegetation within the creek. Mitigation measures imposed in Section 4.3 and those that will be imposed by regulatory agencies will require mitigation of those impacts and the bridge will not result in degradation of the creek area. Minor lot line revisions between the residential area and the adjacent business park will result in the removal of some mature landscaping from the business park area; however mitigation measures require replacement of any such landscape and impacts associated with these minor changes will be reduced to a less than significant level. The site consists primarily of vacant property that was previously disturbed by grading to the extent that it lacks discernible relief and its natural topography and visual character were erased. The cleared and graded residential site is not identified in the General Plan as important or planned open space (See GP/CLUP Figure 3-5). A notable exception to the lack of significant open space and visual resources on the site is the Tecolotito Creek riparian corridor at the western margin of the site (Lots 6 and 7). This corridor is designated "an Open Space for the Preservation of Natural Resources" in the City's Open Space Element and the City's Visual and Historical Resources Element identifies "creeks and the vegetation associated with their riparian corridors" as scenic resources (Policy VH 1.1). The creek channel underwent previous alterations including straightening the course and lining the bed and banks with concrete and riprap to prevent erosion and maintain its current alignment and capacity. However, the creek's riparian corridor would be considered a visual resource pursuant to CEQA and City policy (GP Policy VH 1.1). At present, public views of the corridor from offsite are relatively limited by intervening			

topography and the elevation of immediately adjacent roadways. The Project's nearest proposed residential units are set back approximately 50 feet from the bank of the Creek to minimize any alteration to natural landforms from construction or fuel modification actions. The Project would develop a neighborhood park and open space, available to the public, east of the creek within Lot 7, allowing the public significantly greater access to this visual resource. In addition, the Project would construct a bridge over the creek at Cortina Drive, providing views of the riparian corridor visual resource. The Project would also re-vegetate an unnamed tributary drainage that enters the Project site from the north and joins Tecolotito Creek. This would create an additional riparian corridor with landscaped open space areas available for public enjoyment (**Class III**).			
Visual Character **Impact AES 2:** Does the Project have the potential to impact visual resources of the Coastal Zone or other visually important area such as a scenic travel corridor, conflict with any policies set forth in the City's GP/CLUP, demonstrate incompatibility with surrounding uses, structures, or intensity of development, lack adequate landscaping, propose extensive grading visible from public areas, or (Appendix G) substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings? The Project site is surrounded by urban development including major transportation corridors, business parks with large footprint office and research structures surrounded by expansive surface parking lots, and a two-story multi-family development. The Project would introduce structures with a visual character that is similar to the existing and planned residential elements in the surrounding area, and would not significantly exceed the building heights or massing of existing structures adjacent to and in the vicinity of the Project. Development of the Project would contribute positively to the visual quality of the area surrounding it by developing landscaping within the site. In addition, the project would landscape existing cut and fill slopes on the site's perimeter;	Potentially Significant	**AES 2-1** The Permittee must implement the following to reduce potential visual impacts resulting from the construction of the proposed residential component of the Project on Lots 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of Tract 14,500: a. The construction site shall be fenced by a chain link fencing with green fabric backing installed in locations visible from public roads and adjacent properties. b. The construction site must be maintained free of debris and trash. It is the responsibility of the general contractor and/or site superintendent to ensure that sufficient numbers of trash containers are available on the site and located so that they are easily accessible from all construction locations. Trash containers must be covered and lids must remain closed unless trash is being deposited. Workers must be detailed at the end of the working day to clear trash and debris from the construction site, ensure that construction materials are properly stored or stacked, and that construction equipment is appropriately stored.	Less Than Significant (Class II)

complete the Los Carneros Road streetscape on the site's frontage; and eliminate an unsightly, disturbed, vacant parcel. Additionally, the Project would provide a minimum 50-wide Stream Protection Area that will enlarge the natural vegetation and appearance of Tecolotito Creek. ~~greater access to the visual resource of the Tecolotito Creek riparian corridor.~~ Construction Phase Visual Impacts During construction of the project, mechanical equipment, material stockpiles, staging areas, latrines, and associated trash bins could temporarily degrade the visual quality of the Project if not properly concealed or screened from view. Utilities and Mechanical Features ~~Elements of~~ New onsite utility elements such as backflow preventers, water meter assemblies, gas meters, power meters, cable TV pedestals, and other ground and roof mounted mechanical equipment such as heating, ventilation, and air conditions (HVAC) units, that could not be located underground, could result in adverse visual impacts unless adequately screened, housed or otherwise helped to blend into the overall fabric of the development. Maintenance Landscaping, parking areas, trash bin storage areas, and building facades would require regular maintenance as needed to avoid potentially impacting the site's visual character. Visual Character Visual character compared to existing development in the surrounding area is consistent with existing and planned construction. The Project is located in the Central Hollister Residential Development Area and includes an evolving mix of various types of residential development, commercial uses, business parks and similar uses. It differs from most other areas of the City but the Project is consistent with this evolving visual character and impacts relative to all surrounding development are less than significant.		c. Steel shaker plates must be installed over gravel at all site construction entrances and exits to reduce track out. d. Adjacent streets must be cleaned at least once each day to remove construction debris and tracked out dirt and dust. e. A construction staging area must be maintained free of trash and debris. Concrete washout areas must be surrounded by secondary containment and cleaned out at the end of each working day. f. Sufficient numbers of sanitary facilities must be provided around the construction site to be easily accessible to workers and must be maintained in a clean and sanitary condition. Sanitary facilities must be placed on pads and provided with secondary containment and secured to the ground to avoid tip-over. g. Gravel bags used to prevent runoff from entering the public storm drain must be promptly replaced when broken and the spilled gravel promptly removed. h. Dirt stockpiles must be covered with tarps. i. Security lighting must meet the City's dark sky compliant requirements (GP Sub-policy VH 4.12) to prevent light spillover. j. Grading must be established at the outward edge of the existing ESHA. Vegetation must be retained except where removal is required to accommodate construction of the storm drain outlets and bridge. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Fencing and shaker plates must be installed before the City issues a grading permit. All other requirements must be implemented within one week after the City issues grading permits and before grading begins. These requirements apply throughout the construction phase of the Project. **Monitoring:** Compliance will be monitored by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee. ~~Department of Building and Safety~~	

		AES 2-2: Before the City issues the ~~1st~~ first certificate of occupancy for the Village at Los Carneros residential Project, the Permittee must ensure ongoing maintenance of buildings, common areas, recreational facilities, parking lots, trash disposal areas, and driveways through an addition to the condition approved in 2008, incorporated by reference and made part of this condition, which required ~~the~~ formation of a HOA ~~or POA~~ to maintain roads, bridges, drainage and water quality control features, and street improvements. a. The Permittee or Successor in Interest must enter into an agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, to install required landscaping and water-conserving irrigation systems as well as to maintain required landscaping for a period of five (5) years from the date of the first certificate of occupancy for any residential unit. The Project Homeowners Association (HOA) is responsible for maintaining all Project landscaping from the end of the Permittee's responsible period for ~~through~~ the life of the Project. b. Before the City issues the first ~~1st~~ certificate of occupancy for any unit or building within the residential Project area, the Permittee must form and incorporate a ~~Resident's Association,~~ Homeowner's Association, or other entity acceptable to the City, with By-laws empowering it to assess and collect fees from property owners and enforce collection by lien against the property ~~of fees from property owners~~ within the residential Project, including apartment complexes, sufficient to pay the cost of professional management and maintenance of the community as determined by an annual budget prepared by a professional management company and adopted annually by the HOA Board of Directors and to contract for professional property management and other services such as trash collection, landscape	

		maintenance, street cleaning, vector control and such other services as necessary to ensure the long term maintenance of buildings, common areas, recreational facilities, landscaping, streets, driveways and parking lots, exterior lighting, etc. c. The Permittee must enter into a maintenance agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, to promptly remove any graffiti at the Project site. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Permittee must sign the landscape installation and landscape and common area maintenance agreement, including a 5-year maintenance period, before the City issues the first occupancy permit ~~a LUP~~. Performance securities for installation and maintenance must be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee before the City ~~issues a LUP~~ approves recordation of the final map. **Monitoring:** Before final inspection, the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must inspect the site to ensure installation according to the approved plan. The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must check maintenance as needed through the maintenance period. Release of any performance security requires appropriate documentation and the signature of the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee as set forth in the agreement. Failure of the HOA ~~or POA~~ to maintain Project landscaping and common areas after the Permittee's 5-year obligation is met will be subject to code enforcement action.	
Impacts on Designated Views from Designated Public Scenic Vantage Points and/or Scenic Highways/Corridors **Impact AES 3-1 through 3-4:** Does the Project have the potential to create significant adverse aesthetic impacts through obstruction of public views or (Appendix G) have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially	~~Less Than Significant~~ Potentially Significant	**AES 3-1:** The height of structural development shown on final plans cannot exceed the mean height and peak height shown on approved Project exhibit maps. Finished grade must be consistent with the approved final grading plan. Height	Less Than Significant (Class ~~I~~II)

damage a scenic or historic resource within a State or locally designated scenic highway corridor? U.S. Highway 101 is a locally designated scenic route that is not a designated State scenic highway or listed as eligible for that designation. No corridor plan has been adopted to control development along the route, and no other scenic routes have been designated in the vicinity. The Project's features would not interfere with views of the Santa Ynez Mountains or other significant visual resources designated in the GP/CLUP from either the U.S. 101 or from any other public vantage points designated in the GP/CLUP.		limitations shown on issued building permit ~~LUP~~ plan sets must be adhered to during construction. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** During the framing stage of construction and before commencement of roofing, the Permittee must submit verification from a licensed surveyor demonstrating that all the mean height and peak height of all structures conform to those shown on issued ~~LUP~~ building permit plan sets. **Monitoring**: The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance before the City issues building permits ~~any LUP~~ during field inspections, and before commencement of roofing. **AES 3-2:** The Permittee must submit a composite utility plan for review by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee. All external or roof mounted mechanical equipment (including HVAC condensers, switch boxes, and meters) must be included on all building plans and must be designed to be integrated into the structure and/or screened in their entirety from public view. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Detailed plans showing all external or roof mounted mechanical equipment must be submitted for review by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, before the City issues a building permit ~~LUP~~. **Monitoring:** Before final inspection, the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify installation of all external and roof mounted mechanical equipment per the approved plans.	

		AES 3-3: Project landscaping must consist of approximately seventy five percent drought-tolerant native and/or Mediterranean type plant coverage, which adequately complements the Project design and integrates the site with surrounding land uses. Project landscaping must provide partial screening of the site parking area and structures. Landscaping must also consist of plant species that are known to thrive in the site's specific soils (highly saline), based on soil testing that evaluates soil characteristics to appropriate depths. Invasive plant species are prohibited for use in Project landscape. Excluded species include, but are not limited to, those plants listed as problematic or invasive by the California Native Plant Society, the California Invasive Plant Council, or are listed as "noxious weeds" by the State of California or the federal government. The finial landscape plan must identify all of the following: (1) type of irrigation; (2) all existing trees, shrubs, and groundcover by location and species; (3) size of all plantings; (4) a map depicting areas of high saline constrained soils; and (5) the location of all plantings. The plant palette must be adhered to throughout the life of the development. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must review and approve the landscape plan before the City issues a ~~LUP~~ grading permit. A City-designated biologist must review and approve the landscape plan to ensure that the proposed plantings are consistent with the requirements to protect the Tecolotito Creek ESHA, plans for the vegetation of the SPA, and contain no invasive plant species.	

		Monitoring: Before final inspection, the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee, in consultation with the approved biologist, must inspect the Project site to ensure that landscape has been installed consistent with the final approved landscape plan.	
Light and Glare **Impact AES 4: Would the Project introduce new sources of light and glare?** Existing development in the surrounding area currently use night lighting in the vicinity. Development of the Project would introduce additional point sources of light emanating from windows as well as from exterior light fixtures along internal streets, walkways, and parking areas. Perimeter landscaping would reduce light spillover to some extent. However, the City ensures appropriate reduction of light and glare impacts by Code-required use of dark sky compliant fixtures for exterior lighting (**Class II**). The potential effects of light spillover into the site's ESHA/SPA areas is discussed and mitigated for in Section 4.3 (Biological Resources).	~~Less Than Significant~~ Potentially Significant	~~No mitigation required.~~ **AES 4-1** As noted in the analysis section, all outdoor lighting on the Project site shall fully conform to the requirements of General Plan Policy VH 4.12. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Project's lighting plan must be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, before the City issues ~~an LUP~~ building permits for residential structures. **Monitoring:** Before final inspection, the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must inspect the Project to ensure that exterior lighting fixtures have been installed consistent with approved plans.	Less Than Significant (Class II)
Air Quality			
Impact AQ 1: Would construction of the Project generate air pollutant emissions, including dust and equipment exhaust emissions that could interfere with progress towards attainment of the ozone standard or equal or exceed the State or federal ambient air quality standard or (Appendix G) violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of air pollutants? **Construction Period Impacts** Temporary construction activity emissions would occur during Project build-out. Such emissions include on-site generation of dust and equipment exhaust from demolition, grading, and construction activities, and off-site emissions from construction employee commuting and/or trucks delivering building materials or exporting unused excavated soils (**Class II).**	Potentially Significant	**AQ 1-1:** Dust generated by construction and/or demolition activities must be kept to a minimum. **Plan Requirements**: The following dust control measures must be shown on all building and grading plans and the Permittee must ensure that these measures are implemented by the contractor/builder. During clearing, grading, earth-moving, excavation, and/or transportation of cut or fill materials, excessive fugitive dust emissions must be controlled by regular watering or other dust-preventative measures using the following procedures, as specified by the SBAPCD:	Less Than Significant (Class II)

		Truck Hauling: No person, including facility or site owner or operator of source may load or allow the loading of bulk materials or soil onto outbound trucks unless at least one of the following dust prevention techniques is utilized: a. Use properly secured tarps or cargo covering that covers the entire surface area of the load or use a container type enclosure. b. Maintain a minimum of 6 inches of freeboard below the rim of the truck bed where the load touches the sides of the cargo area and ensure that the peak of the load does not extend above any part of the upper edge of the cargo area c. Water or otherwise treat the bulk material to minimize loss of material to wind or spillage. d. Other effective dust prevention control measures approved in writing by the Control Officer. Track-Out/Carry Out Visible roadway dust as a result of active operations, spillage from transport trucks, erosion, or tract-out/carry-out must be controlled as outlined below: a. Visible roadway dust shall be minimized by the use of any of the following tract-out/carry-out and erosion control measures that apply to the Project or operations: track-out grates on gravel beds at each egress point, wheel-washing at each egress point during muddy conditions, soil binders, chemical soil stabilizers, geotextiles, mulching, or seeding; and b. Visible roadway dust shall be removed at the conclusion of each workday when bulk material removal ceases, of every 24 hours for continuous operations. If a street sweeper is used to remove any tract-out/carry-out, only a PM_{10}-Efficient Street Sweeper shall be used. The use of blowers for removal of track-	

		out/carry-out is prohibited. On-site Measures a. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems must be used to keep all areas of the 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 wind exceeds 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. b. Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce on-site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less (the site must post signs with the speed limit). c. Soil stockpiled for more than two days must be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. ~~Trucks transporting soil material to and from the site must be covered with a secured tarp from the point of origin.~~ d. Gravel pads and steel shaker plates must be installed at all access points to prevent the tracking of mud onto public roads. e. After clearing, grading, earth moving, and/or excavation is complete, the disturbed area must be treated by watering, or revegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed in a manner that prevents dust generation. ~~Street surrounding the Project site must be vacuum cleaned once per day for the duration of the construction phase.~~ f. The contractor or builder must designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as needed, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties must include monitoring on holidays and over weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and phone number of such person(s) must be provided to the SBCAPCD and the Director of Planning and	

		Environmental ~~Services~~ Review before land clearance and must be prominently posted on the ~~on~~site in three locations along the Project's perimeter and maintained in a legible manner throughout the construction phase. g. Before land clearance, the ~~applicant~~ Permittee must include these dust control requirements as a note on a separate informational sheet to be recorded with the map. All requirements must be shown on grading and building plans. **Requirements and Timing**: All dust control requirements must be referenced in all plans submitted for any ~~LUP, building, or~~ grading permit and reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, by City staff before the City issues ~~any LUP building, or~~ grading permit(s). Such requirements must be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must ensure mitigation measures are included on plans and must periodically inspect the Project site to verify compliance. SBAPCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints. **AQ 1-2:** Grading and construction contracts must specify that contractors adhere to requirements that reduce emissions of ozone precursors and particulate emissions from diesel exhaust. The following apply: a. All portable diesel-powered construction equipment rated at 50 brake horsepower or greater must be registered with the California portable equipment registration program or obtain a SBAPCD permit. Construction engines with PERP certificates are exempt from APCD permit, provided they will be on-site for less than twelve months.	

		b. Fleet owners of mobile construction equipment are subject to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Regulation for In-use Off-road Diesel Vehicles (13, California Code of Regulations § 2 449). c. All commercial diesel vehicles are subject to limitations on idling time (13 California Code of Regulations §2485). Idling of heavy-duty diesel construction equipment and trucks during loading and unloading is limited to five minutes. Electric auxiliary power units should be used. d. Diesel construction equipment meeting the CARB Tier 2 or higher emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines must be used. If such equipment is not commercially available, equipment meeting CARB Tier 1 or higher emission standards must be used. e. Where it is possible to do so, diesel-powered equipment must be replaced by electric equipment. f. Diesel construction equipment must be equipped with selective catalytic reduction systems, diesel oxidation catalysts, and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by CARB or the EPA, if available. g. Catalytic converters must be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible. h. All construction equipment must be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications. i. The engine size of construction equipment must be the minimum practical size. j. The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously must be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time. k. Construction worker trips must be minimized by promoting carpooling and by providing lunch onsite. l. Coatings (e.g., paints) must be labeled as "low-VOC" or "zero-VOC" in accordance with EPA rules for interior and exterior surfaces. m. A construction traffic management plan must	

		be prepared by the ~~applicant~~ Permittee and submitted to the City's Traffic Engineer and the Director of Planning and Environmental ~~Services~~ Review, or designee, for review and approval before the City issues any grading permit. n. If contaminated soils are found at the Project site, the APCD must be contacted to determine if Authority to Construction and/or Permit to Operate permits will be required. o. Asphalt paving activities ~~shall~~ must comply with APCD Rule 329, Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials. **Requirements and Timing:** All dust control requirements must be included on all ~~LUP,~~ grading and construction plans and must be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, before the City issues any ~~LUP,~~ building, or grading permit(s). Such requirements must be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must ensure all the aforementioned mitigation measures are printed on all plans and must periodically inspect the Project site to verify compliance. SBAPCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints. **AQ 1-3:** Diesel fuel emissions must be limited. **Plan Requirements**: The following limitations on diesel-fueled vehicles in excess of 10,000 pounds apply during all construction and subsequent operational activities: a. Diesel-fueled vehicles exceeding 10,000 pounds cannot idle in one location for more than five (5) minutes at a time. b. Diesel-fueled vehicles exceeding 10,000	

		pounds cannot use diesel-fueled auxiliary power units for more than five (5) minutes to power heater, air conditioner, or other ancillary equipment on any such vehicle. c. The Permittee must designate one or more locations as deemed appropriate, for the permanent posting of a notice(s) to all drivers of diesel-fueled vehicles exceeding 10,000 pounds of these limitations on vehicle idling in all areas of the property that may be frequented by such vehicles. Such signs must be maintained in their approved location(s) as long as diesel-fueled vehicles exceeding 10,000 pounds are being used. **Requirements and Timing**: All such requirements must be included on all ~~LUP,~~ grading and construction plans and must be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, before the City issues any ~~LUP, building, or~~ grading permit(s). The Permittee must adhere to these requirements throughout all grading and construction periods. The location and information provided on the sign(s) must be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, before the City issues any ~~issuance of any LUP, building, or~~ grading permit(s). **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must ensure these mitigation measures are printed on all plans and must periodically inspect the site to verify compliance. SBAPCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.	
Operational Impacts – Mobile and Area Source Emissions **Impact AQ 2**: Would operation of the Project generate mobile and stationary source air pollutant emissions that could interfere with progress towards attainment of the ozone standard or equal or exceed the State or federal ambient air quality standard or (Appendix G) violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality	Potentially Significant	**AQ 2-1:** Mobile Source Emissions The Permittee must prepare an Alternative Transportation/Transportation Demand Management Program to help reduce ~~ROC~~ ROG and NOx emissions associated with Project generated vehicular trips. The	Less Than Significant (Class II)

violation or expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of air pollutants? Mobile Emission Sources Long-term emissions are primarily associated with traffic generated by the Project, which is predicted to result in 2,903 new trip ends per day. Construction emissions would not exceed significance thresholds based on an assumed full occupancy and build out date of 2018. Microscale Impacts Micro-scale air quality impacts are analyzed in CEQA documents where the air basin is in non-attainment for CO. City guidelines require that any project generating less than 800 peak hour trips would not create a CO "hot spot." The Project would generate 267 AM peak hour trips and 320 PM peak hour trips. Therefore the Project would not generate a CO "hot spot" (**Class III**).		Alternative Transportation/ Transportation Demand Management Program must include, without limitation, the following elements: (1) Facilities for the recharging of electric vehicles must be provided pursuant to mitigation measures 2-1 f and g; and (2) Vehicles owned by or leased by the HOA and/or other management entity(s) must adhere to mitigation measure 2-1h. In addition, the following mitigation measures apply: Mobile Source Emissions a. The ~~applicant~~ Permittee must contact the Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) to identify appropriate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs that are available to serve all residents and employees of the Project. Notice of all available TDM programs must be given to all new Project employees when they are hired. Notice of all available TDM programs must be posted in a prominent location inside the community recreation center and maintained there for the life of the Project. Notice of all available TDM programs must also be provided to all Project residents upon initial occupancy. b. Notice of MTD bus routes and schedules must be posted and maintained up-to-date in a central location(s). c. All employees must be advised on any ride sharing program or similar successor program administered by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments. The Permittee must request that all employees register semi-annually in the ride sharing program and must make an effort to encourage participation in the program. d. Secure bicycle storage must be provided onsite throughout all of the multi-family residential buildings. e. All individual garages must be provided with plug in systems for recharging electric vehicle and electrical panels must be sized for this use. f. In apartment buildings and in parking	

		structures serving condominium buildings a minimum of ¼ of all parking spaces must be equipped with electric vehicle recharging stations. g. All vehicles owned by the HOA or by professional management for the purpose of providing access or maintenance must be electric vehicles. Source Air Pollutant Emissions i. Before occupancy, APCD permits must be obtained for all equipment that requires an APCD permit. APCD Authority to Construct permits are required for diesel engines rated at 50 BPH and great (e.g., firewater pumps and emergency standby generators) and boilers/large water heaters whose combined heat input rating exceeds 2.0 million BTUs per hour. i. Small boilers and water heating units rated between 75,000 and 2.0 million BTU/hour must comply with the emissions limits and certification requirements of APCD Rule 360. Combinations of units totaling 2.0 million BTU/hour or greater are required to obtain a District permit prior to installation. See additional Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigation Measures. **Requirement and Timing:** An Alternative Transportation/TDM Program including, without limitation, the above conditions must be prepared by the Permittee for review and approval by the Planning and Environmental ~~Services~~ Review Director, or designee, before the City issues any grading permit ~~LUP~~ for the Project. **Monitoring:** Before the City issues a certificate of occupancy, the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must verify compliance with these mitigation measures.	

Operational Impacts – Heath Risk from Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants Generated by Mobile and Stationary Sources **Impact AQ 3:** Residents of the Project in the vicinity of the US 101/UPRR transportation corridor would be exposed to diesel particulate matter emitted by trains and trucks. Diesel Particulate Matter A health risk assessment (HRA) was prepared for the Project site by SAIC in 202 and was cited in the certified 2008 EIR. The closest residences in the Project are located along the northwestern perimeter, approximately 222 feet from the centerline of U.S. 101. The residential building located closest to the UPRR ROW is 27 feet from the site's north property line at the edge of the ROW. Traffic levels on U.S. 101 are expected in increase by 2018. EMFAC2011 was used to calculate average on-road Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM). Although the risk increase calculated for the Project is not considered significant, it still warrants implement of all reasonably available mitigation. Avoidance measures were not considered feasible. Accordingly, the most reasonably feasible mitigation in requiring installation of upgraded air filtration systems in all residential units with windows or air conditioning systems located within 500 feet of the most southerly edge of the UPRR/U.S. 101 corridor. With mitigation, the health risk to residents would be reduced to a less than significant level (Class II) Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) from Stationary Sources There are no major stationary sources of toxic air contaminants in the Goleta area. The health risk to residents from TACs is less than significant. Although freeway and railroad proximity may be causes for concern, the calculated risks from DPM exposure are within generally acceptable levels. As stated previously, a risk increase that is between one in a million to ten in a million is not considered significant, but warrants that all reasonably available mitigation should be implemented. However, for purposes of this analysis, before implementation of all reasonably available mitigation measures, this risk is conservatively identified as significant.	Potentially Significant	**AQ 3-1:** Ventilation systems rated at MERV13 or better for enhanced particulate removal efficiency must be provided on all residential units and common indoor facilities at the Project site with windows or air conditioning intake located within 500 feet of the north property line (i.e., the outside edge of the UPRR/U.S. 101 transportation corridor ROW) regardless of the presence of intervening structures. The residents of these units must also be provided with information regarding filter maintenance/replacement. For apartment units the building owners must have the financial responsibility for the maintenance of these units. For condominium ownership units the HOA must have the financial responsibility for the maintenance of these units. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The ventilation systems must be shown on all applicable building plans with cut sheets and specifications provided when plans are submitted to the City for plan check before the City issues any ~~LUP or~~ building permits for any residential or common building. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental ~~Services~~ Review Director, or designee, must ensure that all of these requirements are met and reflected on all applicable plans before the City issues any ~~LUP or~~ building permits and verify compliance with installation before the City issues a certificate of occupancy for each residential and common building ~~covered by this requirement~~.	Less Than Significant (Class II)
		AQ 3-2: The Permittee must provide a U.S. 101/UPRR rail line real-estate disclosure to potential buyers and occupants within the Project site informing of site proximity to U.S. 101 and to the Union Pacific Railroad and that there is the potential for exposure to diesel particulate matter emitted by trains and trucks.	

		Plan Requirements and Timing: The Permittee must provide a draft copy of the real estate disclosure including the information of the U.S. 101 and rail line and associated potential exposure to diesel particulate matter emitted by trains and trucks to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, and the City Attorney for review and approval. This disclosure must be accompanied by a plan for keeping the notification documents updated and distributed by facility property management to tenants upon signing of lease agreements and to future owners upon sale of the units. The disclosure must be included in the Project CC&R's, which must be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney before recordation of the final map. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review must verify compliance with this requirement before final map recordation.	
Consistency with Air Quality Plans **Impact AQ 4** The Project would be consistent with air quality planning in that it is ~~an infill project~~ located in close proximity to existing infrastructure and transportation corridors. Further, the incorporation of a bicycle path through the site that connects to offsite bike trails, together with the ability to access ~~to~~ public transit, on nearby Hollister Avenue, ~~would~~ allow for implementation of a multi-modal transportation system to serve area residents. Local planning considerations that contribute to the Project's consistency with current air quality planning principles aimed at reducing vehicle trip length and generation include: (1) the Project's proximity to employment opportunities, commercial and retail services, schools, recreation, and the University of California Santa Barbara (UCSB) main campus. The entire Central Hollister Residential Area was planned to accomplish just such an integration of use, which is carried forward into regional planning and incorporated into the ~~pending~~ SBCAG 2040 RTP/SCS update. For these reasons the Project would not result in an inconsistency with current Air Quality planning based on	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required. However, ~~it is noted that~~ Mitigation Measure AQ 2-1 would further the Project's consistency with air quality plan consistency	Less Than Significant (Class III)

assumed local population growth and the impact would be less than significant (**Class III**).			
Biological Resources			
Impact BIO 1: Would the Project (Appendix G) 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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			
Impact BIO 1-1: Would the Project have an adverse impact on Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species, including Endangered or Threatened Species? Candidate, sensitive, or special-status plant species were not observed in the course of the numerous biological surveys (2005 – 2012), and are considered to be absent within the Project limits of disturbance. Therefore, the Project would not result in impacts to a candidate, sensitive, or a special-status plant species (**Class III**). However, a number of special-status wildlife species, including federal and/or State listed Threatened or Endangered species, may be present on, or utilize the resources of the Project site on a rare, occasional, sporadic, infrequent, or seasonal basis. An assessment of the potential for special- status wildlife species to occur at the site is provided in Appendix C and is discussed in the Existing Conditions section of the Biological Resources Section. Potentially occurring special-status wildlife species may be subject to direct harm from construction activities including tree removal and bridge construction, which would be a potentially significant impact requiring mitigation (**Class III**). Monarch butterflies are expected to be present on the site, but are unlikely to overwinter there because of the lack of suitable groves ~~of pine or cypress trees~~. The windrow of eucalyptus trees along the site's northern property line is not suitable overwintering habitat. Larval host plants for Monarch butterflies were not observed. For this reason, ~~it is unlikely that~~ this species would not be significantly affected by construction of any component of the proposed Project or by subsequent occupancy of the Village at Los Carneros component and the impact would be less than significant (**Class III**).	Potentially Significant	**BIO 1-1:** Two preconstruction surveys for special status wildlife species must be conducted by a City-approved biologist before commencement of ground or vegetation disturbing activities including, without limitation ~~but not limited to~~, bridge construction and fuel modification. The first survey must be conducted not more than one week and the second survey not more than three days before the commencement of Project activities. The surveys must incorporate methods appropriate for detecting the special-status species that could potentially occur at the site. The survey methods and results must be submitted to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, before beginning construction and/or commencement of any site disturbing activities. If special-status species are found, avoidance by postponing construction until the individual(s) moves out of the construction area on its own is the preferred mitigation option. If avoidance is demonstrated to be infeasible, the species must be captured, when possible, and transferred to adjacent appropriate habitat within the open space onsite or directly adjacent to the Project area by a biologist holding the requisite permits for the capture and handling of the species. If a special-status species is found, the biologist must monitor all ground and vegetation disturbing Project activities within suitable habitats in that area. The biological monitor must conduct ongoing searches for special-	Less Than Significant (Class II)

A number of potentially occurring special-status birds may forage or reproduce at the vacant portion of the site, as identified in Existing Conditions and in Appendix C. As many as eleven species of special-status bats could occur on-site for foraging purposes, but are not likely to use the Project site for roosting or hibernating. Direct impacts to special-status birds and bats would be limited to birds that are nesting on or adjacent to the site during construction and are, which is addressed ~~in~~ by Impact BIO-~~10~~ 1-2, below (**Class II**). Although there are no contemporary reports of the federally Endangered southern steelhead or tidewater goby within Tecolotito Creek, the potential remains that one or both of these species could occur within the reach of Tecolotito Creek that flows through the Village at Los Carneros Project site. The coast range newt, southwestern pond turtle and two-striped garter snake, ~~both~~ which are California Species of Special Concern, could also occur within the stream and riparian habitats of Tecolotito Creek and may be adversely affected. ~~Accordingly, construction activities associated with Project implementation occurring within the onsite aquatic, wetland, and riparian habitats of Tecolotito Creek could directly harm these species.~~ Impacts to potentially occurring special-status species are considered potentially significant but can be mitigated to a less than significant level (**Class II**).		status species throughout Project construction activities. The CDFW and the City of Goleta must be formally notified in writing on letterhead transmitted by certified, overnight, or electronic mail with verifying receipt and consulted regarding the presence of a special-status species onsite. If a federally listed species is found, the USFWS must also be notified. In such a case only an USFWS-approved biologist would be allowed to capture and relocate these animals. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** These requirements must be printed on all plan sets submitted for issuance of any grading permit. Building/grading permits for bridge construction must not be issued until the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, determines that this requirement has been satisfied in full. No ground disturbing work is permitted to commence until the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, notifies the Permittee that this requirement has been satisfied in full. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must verify compliance in the field for bridge construction and any permitted fuel modification.	
Impact BIO 1-2: Would the Project have an adverse impact on nesting birds? Vegetation removal and grading, if conducted during the nesting bird season (February 1 to August 31) could result in the loss of trees, shrubs and herbaceous vegetation that may contain active bird nests. Project activities that result in the loss of bird nests, eggs, and young potentially violate Fish and Game Code §§ 3503 (any bird nest), 3503.1 (birds of prey) or 3511 (fully protected birds). In addition, the herbaceous vegetation may contain active bird nests. Project activities that result in the loss of bird nests, eggs, and young potentially violate Fish and Game Code §§3503 (any bird nest), 3503.5 (birds-of-prey), or 3511 (Fully Protected Birds). In addition,	~~Less Than Significant~~ Potentially Significant	**Bio 1-2 – Nesting Bird Surveys** Before Project-related activities with potential to disturb suitable bird nesting habitat including, but not limited to, site preparation, grading, construction, tree removal, landscaping removal, or fuel modification, within the breeding/nesting season for native bird species (typically February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist acceptable to the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee ~~City of Goleta~~, must perform two field surveys to determine if active nests of any bird species protected by the State or federal Endangered Species Acts, Migratory Bird	Less than Significant (Class II)

removal or destruction of one or more active nests of any other birds listed by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA) would be considered a violation of the MBTA. Such damage or ~~development dependent on and compatible with maintaining such resources are allowed within~~ destruction, whether caused by vegetation removal or other construction activities, would violate the MBTA and Fish and Game Code § 3511. Such activity would constitute a significant impact. Potential impact to nesting birds as a result of Project implementation is considered potentially significant, and, under California law, a nesting bird survey is required before the start of construction during nesting season. If active nests are found, construction is not permitted within 300 feet of the active nest until the nest is abandoned or the young have fledged. Continued monitoring of the Project site by the Project's biologist will enforce this prohibition. Consequently, with mitigation the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level (**Class II**)		Treaty Act, and/or the California Fish and Game Code §§ 3503, 3503.5, or 3511 are present in the Project area or within 500 feet of the Project area. The first nesting bird survey must be conducted no more than one week before the start of the Project activity and the second nesting bird survey must be conducted no more than three days before the start of Project activity. If Project activities are delayed, then additional surveys for nesting birds must be conducted such that no more than three days will have elapsed between the last survey and the Project activity. If an active nest is found, the biologist must establish an appropriate buffer between the activities and the active nest to avoid harm or disturbance to the nesting birds (typically 300 feet for most birds and 500 feet for raptors). The buffer must be demarcated with highly visible construction fencing and signed as a sensitive area. Project personnel must be instructed to avoid nesting bird buffers. Project activities with potential to harm or disturb the nesting birds must be postponed within the buffer until the nest is vacated, the nestlings have fledged, the fledglings have left the area, as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. If an active nest of a bird species listed under the federal or California Endangered Species Acts is found, Project activities within a 500-foot radius of the nest must be halted until the Permittee ~~Applicant~~ has consulted with the City, CDFW, and USFWS, if applicable. Before start of grading or any site clearing activities, the biologist must submit a report discussing the pre-Project nesting bird survey methods and results, as well as any measures to be implemented to avoid harm or disturbance to nesting birds to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, CDFW, and USFWS, if applicable.	

		Plan Requirements and Timing: All plans submitted for obtaining a permit, including any grading or building permit(s), must include notes requiring biological field surveys for nesting birds. All plans must be revised, as necessary, to reflect setbacks and barrier fence details used to establish sensitive biological areas. A City-approved biologist must conduct a field survey not earlier than one week and a second survey not earlier than three days before Project activities with potential to disturb nesting habitat and during Project activities in the event that an active nest(s) is (are) found within the survey area. The biologist's report must be submitted to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, for review and approval before commencement of any Project activities that could disturb suitable nesting habitat, such as site preparation, grading, fuel modification, or tree removal. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must review any biological reports in consultation with resource/trustee agencies, as needed, such as the USFWS and CDFW. If the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, finds it necessary, monitoring must be conducted and setbacks must be maintained throughout the construction period.	
Impact BIO 2: Would construction of a bridge over Tecolotito Creek ~~the project~~ (Appendix G) have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? ~~or~~ Would the Project (Appendix G) have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, without limitation, marsh, vernal pool, and coastal) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? Would the Project (Appendix G) conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (specifically, City of Goleta General Plan Conservation Element Policies CE1: Environmentally Sensitive			

Habitat Area (ESHA) Designations and CE2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas)?			
Impact BIO 2-1: Would the variable width of the Tecolotitio Creek SPA Upland Buffer adversely impact the biological integrity and critical biotic functions of the Tecolotitio Creek ESHA and unnamed tributary ESHA? With the exception of foraging habitat provided in the ruderal grassland of the 43 acre residential site, only habitat associated with Tecolotito Creek can be considered reasonably intact; although the creek has been repeatedly disturbed by flood control maintenance activity, freeway and street construction along its entire length south of U.S. 101. Actions by the Santa Barbara Flood Control and Water Conservation District to mitigate the effects of the realignment of the creek and facility maintenance has provided a sufficient level of habitat restoration within and immediately adjacent to Tecolotito Creek to qualify the creek as a City-designated ESHA. Among the most critical ecological functions of the creek is the provision of fresh water to the Goleta Slough, as it is one of only two creeks (the second is Los Carneros) that supply most of the Slough's fresh water. In addition, the ESHA contains significant wetland and riparian habitat and acts as a corridor for wildlife movement. The creek's hydrologic functions are discussed in detail in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, though this function is touched on in this section. As discussed in the Existing Conditions subsection, 60-foot wide (top of bank to top of bank) segment of Tecolotito Creek is a designated ESHA in the City's General Plan. The unnamed tributary on Lot 7 is also designated as an ESHA as the tributary's channel meets the City's one-parameter wetland criteria. ESHAs within the City of Goleta are protected against significant disruption of ecological values, and only uses or development dependent on and compatible with maintaining such resources are allowed within ESHAs or their SPA buffers. GP/CLUP Policy CE 1.8 requires a buffer around ESHAs, "of sufficient size to ensure the biological integrity and preservation of the ESHA they are designed to protect." GP/CLUP Policy CE 2.2 requires a Streamside Protection Area (SPA) for the Tecolotito Creek ESHA, which is defined to	Potentially Significant	**Bio 2-1(a):** The proposed permanent loss of 0.09 acre of Tecolotito Creek ESHA (coincident with Tecolotito Creek SPA, City of Goleta wetlands ESHA, and CDFW jurisdictional habitat), consisting of 0.07 acre of Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest and 0.02 acres of Coastal Freshwater Marsh, must be mitigated on-site at a 3:1 ratio by implementation of a City and California Department of Fish and Wildlife approved on-site restoration plan. To the extent feasible, grading shall avoid the creek, creek banks, and riparian vegetation and upland SPA buffer ~~corridor~~ and must be modified unless modification is shown to be infeasible to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works and the Director of Planning and Environmental Review. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** A Wetland and Riparian Area Mitigation Plan must be developed by a City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist and approved by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, ~~Department~~ or ~~its~~ designee, and those additional federal/State/local agencies with jurisdictional responsibilities over wetlands and riparian areas before the City issues a grading permit. At a minimum, the Plan must include: • Description of the project/impact and mitigation site(s) • Specific objectives • Plant palette • Implementation plan • Success criteria • Required maintenance activities • Monitoring plan • Contingency measures **Monitoring:** The Wetland and Riparian Mitigation Area Plan implementation must be	Less than Significant (Class II)

include the creek channel itself (i.e. the ESHA), its associated wetlands, and/or riparian vegetation related to the creek hydrology, and any adjacent upland buffer area. The Policy states that the SPA's upland buffer component is ideally 100 feet in width measured outward on both sides of the creek as measured from the top of the bank or the outer limit of wetlands and/or riparian vegetation, whichever is greater. However, the City reserves the right to reduce an SPA upland buffer to not less than 25 feet wide, based on a site specific assessment if: (1) there is no feasible alternative siting for development that will allow avoidance of the larger SPA upland buffer; and (2) the project's impacts will not have significant adverse effects on streamside vegetation or the biotic quality of the stream. There is a narrow, 10-foot wide upland buffer on the western side of the creek that contains a paved walking path and some riparian vegetation, but is of limited value in providing protection to the adjacent ESHA. The edge effects created by the limited buffering on the west side of the creek include light from the adjacent parking lot, streets, and buildings, noise associated with business activity, parking, and deliveries, and water quality degradation due to the presence of paved parking lots immediately adjacent to the Creek with no obvious BMPs. Several versions of alternative site plans for the Project were reviewed as part of the Alternatives analysis. One, which is reviewed as Alternative 2 in Section 6.0, would allow provision of a minimum 100-foot SPA upland buffer along a 753 feet of the segment of Tecolotito Creek in Lots 6 and 7 was determined to be infeasible as discussed in Section 4.9: Land Use and Planning and alternative site locations were found to be unfeasible as discussed in Section 6.0: Alternatives. Mitigation measures provided in Section 4.8, Hydrology, provide adequate protection for water quality entering Tecolotito Creek from the developed Project site. Therefore, this critical biotic function of the ESHA is adequately addressed by structural BMPs and a 100-foot wide SPA is not required to address this potential impact. As pointed out in the existing conditions, Tecolotito Creek in this location is subject to ongoing maintenance activity by the County Flood Control District, which routinely disrupts existing freshwater marsh and riparian habitat within the creek. The District is responsible for		monitored for a five-year period commencing when the City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist notifies the City that installation of all elements of the approved Plan have been completed. Five years after implementation of the Mitigation Plan ~~project~~, a final report must be submitted to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, and appropriate federal/State/local agencies, which at a minimum must discuss the implementation, monitoring, and management of the Mitigation Plan ~~project~~ over the five-year period, and indicate whether the mitigation has been successful based on established success criteria. **Bio 2-1(b):** The Permittee must provide performance securities and enter into agreements, in a form approved by the City Attorney, for installation and maintenance of the Wetland and Riparian Area Mitigation Plan. The maintenance period must be a minimum of five (5) years from the date the City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist notifies the City that the installation of all Wetland and Riparian Area Mitigation Plan elements is complete. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The performance securities must be provided and agreements signed before the City issues any ~~LUP for project construction~~ grading or building permit. **Monitoring:** Upon notification by the City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist, the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must inspect the site to verify installation according to the approved Wetland and Riparian Area Mitigation ~~restoration~~ Plan. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must check maintenance as needed. The Director of Planning and Environmental	

mitigating these impacts and most commonly accomplishes this by restoring the disturbed habitat. The riparian habitat in the ESHA is located within the creek itself, although the canopy of some willows extends over the edge of the bank. The presence of a dirt maintenance road eliminates the ability of the SPA buffer to provide riparian vegetation adjacent to the creek where it could perform its primary function of shading the creek. Instead, the riparian vegetation would be placed behind the maintenance road along with a Zone of multi-storied, mixed riparian and upland vegetation, which will provide adequate cover for the dispersal of small mammals, reptiles and nesting locations for birds. Approximately half of the over 1300 linear feet of Tecolotito Creek that traverses the project site will be impacted by the reduced upland buffer area of the SPA. The balance of the area will have upland buffers that exceed 100 feet in width. As noted in Impact 2.2, the Fire Department has determined that fuel modification activity is not required within the ESHA/SPA, which will mitigate against potential impacts to vegetation. In addition, Mitigation Measures 2.1c, 2.1d, 2.1f, 2.2a, 2.2b, and 2.3 will reduce any potential adverse effects resulting from the reduction of a portion of the Tecolotito ESHA/SPA upland buffer to a minimum of 50 feet in width to a less than significant level (**Class II**).		Review, or designee, may permit release of the performance security for good cause shown. **Bio 2-1(c): Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP)** Temporary impacts to 0.09 acre of Tecolotito Creek ESHA, coincident with the Tecolotito Creek SPA, City of Goleta wetlands ESHA, and CDFW jurisdictional habitat, consisting of 0.09 acres of Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest and 0.001 acre of Coastal Freshwater Marsh, must be mitigated on-site at a 3:1 ratio through the restoration of the impacted area, as well as enhancement of additional disturbed habitats within Tecolotito Creek and/or the unnamed tributary. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** A Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) must be developed by a City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist and approved by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, and federal/State/local public agencies with jurisdiction before the City issues a grading permit for the Project. Only naturally occurring species from Tecolotito Creek and associated riparian habitats (currently or historically) can be included in the plant palette. The Plan must also require removal of exotic weeds and weed control within the mitigation area. The Plan must be reviewed by the County Fire ~~Prevention~~ Protection District for potential conflicts with any fuel modification requirements. The Plan must at a minimum include: • Description of the mitigation site • Specific objectives • Plant palette • Implementation plan • Success criteria • Required maintenance activities	

		• Monitoring plan • Contingency measures **Monitoring:** The HMMP and Wetland and Riparian Area Mitigation Plan ~~mitigation program~~ must be monitored for a five-year period commencing when the City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist notifies the City that installation of all elements of the approved Plan have been completed. Five years after implementation of the mitigation plan ~~project~~, a final report must be submitted to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, and appropriate federal/State/local agencies, which must, at a minimum, discuss the implementation, monitoring, and management of the mitigation plan over the five-year period, and indicate whether the mitigation has been successful based on established success criteria. **Bio 2-1(d):** The Permittee must provide performance securities and enter into agreements, in forms approved by the City Attorney, for installing and maintaining the HMMP and Wetland and Riparian Area Mitigation Plan ~~bridge/riparian corridor mitigation plan~~. The maintenance period must be a minimum of five (5) years from the date the City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist notifies the City in writing that the installation of all ~~mitigation~~ Plan elements is complete. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The performance securities must be provided and agreements signed before the City issues ~~any LUP~~ any building permit for Project construction. **Monitoring:** Upon notification by the City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist, the Director of Planning and	

		Environmental Review, or designee, must inspect the site to verify installation according to the approved HMMP and ~~riparian corridor~~ Wetland and Riparian Area Mitigation ~~restoration~~ Plan. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must check maintenance as needed. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, may, upon request, release the performance security for good cause shown. **Bio 2-1(e):** Bridge construction must occur during low flow periods between July 1st and October 31st. During bridge construction, flows of water in Tecolotito Creek cannot be obstructed or diverted. Shoring cannot be installed in the creek bed. The use of wheeled or other mechanized equipment within the banks of the stream channel is prohibited at all times. A City-approved biologist must monitor all bridge construction activities at all times to prevent disturbance to any special- status aquatic, avian, or terrestrial species that might occur within the bridge construction site, to the maximum extent feasible. The monitoring biologist must work under contract to the City and shall be funded by the Permittee ~~Applicant~~. Vegetation removal, as identified on the approved ~~LUP~~ permit for bridge construction, must be conducted by manual methods (e.g., using hand tools). **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement must be included on all Project construction plans. The City approved monitoring biologist must be identified and under contract to the City for bridge construction monitoring before the City issues any ~~LUP~~ building permit for bridge construction. Funding for the full amount of the monitoring contract must be deposited with the City before the City issues any ~~LUP~~ permit for bridge construction.	

		Monitoring: Planning and Environmental Review staff must review construction plans to verify compliance before the City issues any ~~LUP~~ permit for bridge construction. The City approved monitoring biologist must monitor all bridge construction activities that could potentially result in impacts to protected or regulated biological resources. The monitoring biologist working under contract to the City and funded by the Permittee ~~applicant~~ must report directly to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee. **Bio 2-1(f): Mitigation of Habitat Impacts** The ~~Permittee must offset any~~ bridge to be constructed over Tecolotito Creek to provide bicycle, vehicle, and pedestrian access to the Project site must be located so that it will not damage the marsh habitat within the creek bed and limit impacts to protected native trees, with onsite replacement planting at a minimum replacement ratio of 10:1 with 1- gallon oaks or at a 3:1 ratio with 24-inch box oaks or as otherwise determined by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee. Impact Bio 2-1 would also be mitigated by Mitigation Measure Hydro 1-2 in Section 4.8 *Hydrology and Water Quality*, which would ensure that bridge infrastructure would not be situated with the bed or banks of Tecolotito Cree. Refer to other mitigation measures identified in Section 4.8 *Hydrology and Water Quality*, regarding water quality in Tecolotito Creek. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** To ensure that the Tecolotito Creek bridge will not interfere with habitat, the pilings and structural support features of the bridge must not be constructed on or within the creek bed and banks and must be designed so that the bridge does not require construction of wing walls or riprap within the	

		creek bed or banks. The structural supports for the bridge must also be designed to avoid the 100-year flood plain, if possible. **Monitoring:** The ~~City~~ Building Official and the ~~City's~~ Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must examine and approve any engineered drawings for the proposed bridge over Tecolotito Creek and ensure that the bridge design would meet the requirements of this measure ~~prior to~~ before the City issues ~~issuance of~~ any permit for bridge construction.	
Impact BIO 2-2: Would the bridge over Tecolotito Creek adversely impact the designated Tecolotito Creek ESHA ~~areas?~~ and SPA, CDFW sensitive plant communities, ACOE jurisdictional wetlands, and CDFW jurisdictional habitat? The Village at Los Carneros Project requires construction of a 50-foot wide, 75-foot long span bridge over Tecolotito Creek, which, based on the currently proposed design, would impact the Creek's riparian vegetation ~~corridor~~ and creek bottom, both of which are covered by City ESHA and SPA designations and fall under the jurisdiction of both the Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. In addition, a paved extension of Cortona Drive would be constructed within the ESHA/SPA upland buffer on the eastern side of Tecolotito Creek. The uses and developments permitted within ESHA's and their buffers are outlined in GP/CLUP Policy CE 1.6, and GP/CLUP Policy CE 2.3 defines allowable uses and activities within SPAs, including SPA upland buffers. Among those allowable uses are bridges and paved roads that are public road crossings, provided that there are no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternatives. The Policy further requires that development of a public road crossing be subject to mitigation measures to avoid or on reduce impacts to the maximum extent practicable. While the bridge itself is a private facility, it includes a public Class I bikeway and pedestrian walkway. Therefore, ~~the creek bottom or banks.~~ the Tecolotito Creek bridge is considered an allowable use and the construction is an allowable activity pursuant to General Plan	Potentially Significant	**Bio 2-2(a)**: An ESHA/SPA Upland Buffer Vegetation Restoration and Enhancement Plan must be prepared by a City-approved restoration biologist/ecologist or restoration specialist. To reduce the potential impacts of a reduced SPA upland buffer, the Plan ~~shall~~ must, to the maximum extent possible, prevent degradation of the ecological functions and ensure the biological integrity and preservation of the creek and its riparian and wetland habitats t. The Plan must also be designed to provide, to the maximum extent possible, suitable habitats within the upland buffer for a variety of common wildlife species, such as amphibians, reptiles, birds, and small mammals, including the California vole. To protect the streamside vegetation and biotic quality of Tecolotito Creek the use of fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides in the upland SPA buffer shall be avoided or minimized. Due to the ecological importance of deadwood both as habitat and for ecosystem process such as nutrient recycling, the Plan should minimize, to the maximum extent feasible, removal of deadwood, which should be avoided within the Tecolotito ESHA/SPA, including the ESHA/SPA upland buffer, except in the case of abnormal and significant die-off or decay of vegetation. If cutting of deadwood is necessary, the deadwood must be in part broken up and in part mulched and carefully	Less than Significant (Class II)

policies cited above. Alternative project designs that did not include the bridge over Tecolotito Creek and Cortona Drive extension, or that incorporated other full-movement access options in order to avoid impacts to the Tecolotito Creek ESHA/SPA and its ESHA/SPA upland buffer, were considered but rejected as infeasible. The bridge over Tecolotito Creek is considered essential to the Project, ~~both for the provision of adequate fire protection and emergency response access as well~~ for the provision and enhancement of improved bicycle and pedestrian access through the City. Construction of the proposed bridge across Tecolotito Creek as presently designed ~~bridge construction~~ would result in 0.09 acre~~s~~ of permanent impacts and 0.09 acre~~s~~ of temporary impacts to the Tecolotito Creek ESHA/SPA. Approximately 0.09 acre of permanent impacts would occur in the area beneath the bridge due to shading of existing vegetation. Of the 0.09 total acre of the Tecolotito Creek ESHA/SPA that would be permanently impacted, 0.02 acre would consist of Coastal Freshwater Marsh and 0.07 acre would be Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest. Approximately 0.09 acre of temporary impacts (including foot traffic) necessary to construct the bridge would occur within 25 feet upstream and downstream of the permanent impact zone. Of the 0.09 total acre of the Tecolotito Creek ESHA/SPA that would be temporarily impacted, 0.001 acre would consist of Coastal Freshwater Marsh and 0.09 acre would be Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest. Coastal Freshwater Marsh and Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest are considered to be sensitive plant communities by the CDFW. Tecolotito Creek contains ACOE jurisdictional areas (non-wetland and wetland Waters of the United States) and CDFW jurisdictional areas (streambed, banks, and riparian habitat) (see inset map on **Figure 4.3-2**). The Project as proposed would result in permanent and temporary impacts to 0.04 acre of ACOE jurisdictional areas coincident with 0.04 acre under CDFW jurisdiction, as well as an additional 0.05 acres of CDFW jurisdictional habitat for a total of 0.09 acre of permanent impacts and 0.09 acre of temporary impacts to CDFW habitat. The total impacted acreages of Tecolotito Creek ESHA, Tecolotito Creek SPA, City of Goleta wetlands ESHA, and CDFW sensitive plant communities, including Southern Arroyo	Potentially Significant	spread in areas where it was removed in a manner that would not disturb existing native vegetation. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** A City approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist must prepare ~~a riparian corridor~~ an ESHA/SPA Upland Buffer Vegetation Restoration and Enhancement Plan that must be approved by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, ~~and the Fire Department~~ and the resource agencies having jurisdiction over the resources before its submittal to the ~~Design Review Board~~ Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for their review and approval. The plant palette must include only naturally occurring native species found in riparian habitats, wetlands, or upland stream buffers in the Goleta area (currently or historically). The Plan must require removal and control of exotic weeds within the mitigation area and provide suitable habitat for common wildlife species, such as amphibians, reptiles, birds, and small mammals, including the California vole. The Plan must at a minimum include: • Description of the mitigation site • Specific objectives • Plant palette • Implementation plan • Success criteria • Required maintenance activities • Monitoring plan • Contingency measures **Monitoring:** The ESHA/SPA Upland Buffer Vegetation Restoration and Enhancement Plan ~~mitigation, restoration, and enhancement project~~ must be monitored for a five-year period commencing when the City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist notifies the City that installation of all elements of the approved Plan have been completed.	Less than Significant (Class II)

Willow Riparian Forest and Coastal Freshwater Marsh, are provided. These impacts would be mitigated to less than significant levels by implementation of Bio 2-1(a) through Bio 2-1(f) (**Class II**). The engineering design for the bridge has not been completed. In order to reduce potential impacts to sensitive riparian habitats and marsh vegetation in the creek channel, mitigation measure Bio 2-1(f) would prohibit the location of piles, wing walls, and riprap within the creek bed or bank and, to the extent feasible, beyond the 100-year flood limits of the creek. Impacts to 0.04-acre of ACOE jurisdictional area could be permitted subject to mitigation acceptable to the ACOE under Nationwide Permit 14 (Linear Transportation Projects) as the total impacts fall under the 0.33 – 0.50-acre statutory limit for Nationwide Permit 14. A 404 permit would be required from the Corps of Engineers before start of construction. Similarly, before construction the ~~Applicant~~ Permittee would be required to obtain a 1602 Agreement (Streambed Alteration Agreement) from the CDFW for the 0.09-acre temporary and permanent impacts associated with the proposed activity within areas subject to the agency's jurisdiction. A 401 permit from the RWQCB will also be required. Each of the agencies will require mitigation for permanent and temporary impacts. The acreages of permanent and temporary impacts to ACOE and CDFW jurisdictional areas are shown in the EIR. While all Project impacts to ACOE and CDFW jurisdictional areas are considered potentially significant, they would be mitigated to a less than significant level through the conditions imposed pursuant to the Project's 404, 401 and 1602 permits/agreement as well as by mitigation measures imposed by this EIR (**Class II**).	Potentially Significant	Five years after implementation of the ~~mitigation project~~ Restoration and Enhancement Plan, a final report must be submitted to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, and appropriate federal/State/local agencies, which must at a minimum discuss the implementation, monitoring, and management of the ~~mitigation project~~ Restoration and Enhancement Plan over the five-year monitoring period, and indicate whether the intended mitigation has been successful based on established success criteria. **Bio 2-2(b):** The Permittee must provide performance securities and enter into agreements, in forms approved by the City Attorney, for installation and maintenance of the ESHA/SPA Upland Buffer Vegetation Restoration and Enhancement Plan, including the replacement of all native trees affected by the Project. The maintenance period must be a minimum of five (5) years from the date the City- approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist notifies the City that the installation of all ~~mitigation~~ Plan elements is complete. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The performance securities must be provided and agreements signed before the City issues any grading permit ~~LUP for project construction~~. **Monitoring:** Upon notification by the City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist, the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must inspect the site to verify installation according to the approved ~~riparian corridor mitigation~~ ESHA/SPA Upland Buffer Vegetation Restoration and Enhancement Plan. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must check maintenance as needed. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, may, upon	Less than Significant (Class II)

		request, release the performance security for good cause shown.	
Impact BIO 2-3: Would fuel modification activities or a reduced ESHA/SPA buffer adversely impact the designated Tecolotito Creek ESHA and SPA, and CDFW Sensitive Plan Community? The Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District approved a Fuel Modification Plan (FMP) that would require fuel modification during the operational phase of the Project within the Tecolotito Creek ESHA/SPA buffers adjacent to both Tecolotito Creek and its unnamed tributary. However, a subsequent letter received from the Fire Protection District ~~Department~~ indicates that fuel modification would not be required where those activities, "will have adverse effects on sensitive natural communities identified by the ESHA, Creeks, and Riparian policies of the General Plan designated as having special ecological value." Consequently, due to the biological sensitivity of native vegetation of the entire Tecolotito Creek SPA and the Tecolotito Creek ESHA ~~and associated SPA~~ including the ESHA/SPA upland buffer, would not be subject to the Fire Protection District's ~~Department's~~ defensible space requirements even though designated ESHA/SPA areas lies within 100 feet of proposed condominium buildings on Lot 6 and single family homes on Lot 7. Removal of dead wood and vegetation would only be required provided those actions do not interfere with or disturb the ESHA/SPA habitat. For this reason, the ESHAs, CDFW sensitive plant communities, and the SPA uplands would not be subject to the District's ~~Department's~~ "defensible space" requirements based on Fire Protection District policy (**Class II)** As stated, the Project would maintain a minimum 50-foot ESHA/SPA upland buffer between the eastern limits of the ESHA area and the Project's developed areas along its western boundary south of the Tecolotito Creek bridge. North of Tecolotito Creek bridge the upland buffer would widen significantly and reach over 700 feet in width at the northern property line. The south SPA upland buffer, while less than the 100-foot recommended in the General Plan ~~SPA upland buffer provided for in the applicable General Plan policy,~~ exceeds the 25-foot minimum buffer permitted under certain circumstances pursuant to the General Plan. The unnamed tributary on Lot 7 and immediate surroundings is open in character, lacks trees	Potentially Significant	**BIO 2-3:** Non-Invasives Only non-invasive ornamental or appropriate native plant species may be used for Project landscaping. Excluded species must include ~~without limitation~~ those listed as problematic and/or invasive by the California Native Plant Society, the California Invasive Plant Council, or which are listed as 'noxious weeds' by the State of California or the federal government. The Permittee must submit a ~~Revised Landscape Plan~~ Revised Landscape Plan for the creation of required ESHA/SPA Upland Buffer and, if required, a Revised Fuel Modification Plan to the City, consistent with all mitigation measures and requirements of the resource agencies with jurisdiction over the effected resources, which must be reviewed by a City-approved biologist or restoration ecologist to ensure that all potentially invasive ornamental species have been excluded. Species used for bio-swales and bio-detention basins must be selected from species native to the Goleta area. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Revised Landscape Plan and a Fuel Modification Plan, if needed must include a plant pallet that is approved by a City-approved biologist. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review must approve the Landscape Plan for the ESHA/SPA Upland Buffer areas and a Fuel Modification Plan, if needed, before the City issues any ~~LUP~~ building permit for the Project. The approved plant palette must be adhered to throughout the life of the Project. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must conduct site inspections to ensure that appropriate plant materials have been planted	Less Than Significant (Class II)

and shrubs, is currently subject to routine fuel modification work, and is shown as predominantly non-native grasslands, with a minor number of eucalyptus trees. However the area would be vegetated as an upland buffer between Tecolotito Creek and the active area of the combined open space/active neighborhood park **Class II**).		and are maintained through the last final inspection or occupancy clearance for the Project.	
Impact BIO 3: Would the Project (Appendix G) have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? Would the project (Appendix G) conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (specifically, City of Goleta General Plan Element Policies CE1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) Designations and CE2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas?			
Impact BIO 3-1: Would the Project adversely impact the Tecolotito Creek ESHA including, without limitation, by potentially increasing human and pet encroachment, noise, light trespass, and glare from artificial nighttime lighting? Would the Project adversely impact wildlife movement or an established wildlife movement corridor by increasing human and pet encroachment, noise, light trespass and glare from artificial nighttime lighting? The close proximity of the proposed residential development to Tecolotito Creek could result in adverse edge effects that could adversely impact riparian habitats and associated wildlife, and compromise its value as a wildlife corridor. Although Tecolotito Creek is already significant affected by human and pet encroachment as the result of the use of the access road on the east side of the creek by District maintenance personnel and equipment, pedestrians, and pet owners, and by the limited separation between the Tecolotito Creek ESHA and the development on the west side of the creek, development of the Project can be expected to increase human activity in the vicinity of Tecolotito Creek, which would result in an increase in the frequency of human and pet encroachment into the Tecolotito Creek ESHA when compared to the existing condition. Human encroachment has the potential to disturb vegetation, particularly sensitive marsh habitats. Also, human and pet encroachment could result in	Potentially Significant	**Bio 3-1(a):** The Permittee must construct Ranch-style five-foot high post and rail fencing ~~with rail spacing of no more than eight inches~~ along the outside boundary of the Tecolotito Creek ESHA/SPA.~~Behind the fence~~ The ESHA/SPA. Revegetation and Enhancement Plan must include the planting of a non-invasive, fast growing, dense native hedge ~~to further restrict~~ to discourage human and domestic animal intrusion into the ESHA. ~~and SPA~~ Any barrier to wildlife movement through the corridor is prohibited. Permanent signage must be posted to inform the public of the ESHA/SPA status and the sensitivity of the riparian, wetland, and aquatic habitats of Tecolotito Creek, as well as the ESHA/SPA upland buffer. Signage must also prohibit access by domestic pets with or without leashes in the ESHA and upland SPA and impose fines for violation of this prohibition. Uses that would produce excessive outdoor noise must be prohibited within 50-feet of ESHAs and SPAs. ~~s/SPAs, including the ESHA/SPA upland buffer.~~ **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues any permit for ground disturbing	Less Than Significant (Class II)

disturbance, harassment, capture, removal, and/or mortality of wildlife, including nesting birds. Excessive noise and light trespass and glare from artificial night lighting associated with the development could disturb wildlife and cause some species to avoid the area. however, the Tecolotitio Creek ESHA is already significantly disturbed by excessive noise and light trespass, including glare from artificial night lighting, by the Castilian Business Park developed on the west side of the Creek ESHA and the conditions on the Village at Los Carneros will be mitigated by the proposed minimum 50-foot wide upland buffer. Mitigation measures will be required to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level such as construction of barriers (both fencing and vegetative) to human and domestic animal encroachment into protected habitat, efforts to reduce noise impacts is proximity to the ESHA areas by carefully vetting proposed uses in proximity to the corridors and buffers, reduction or elimination of night lighting in proximity to ESHA areas, and such other mitigation measures as may be required by State and federal resource agencies as part of their permitting process. With implementation of these mitigation measures, some of which may be imposed by federal and State resource agencies subsequent to project approval, these impacts would be considered potentially significant but mitigable (**Class II**).		activities or grading permit ~~LUP for Project construction~~, the Permittee must submit a plan for the siting, design, and installation of the required fencing, signage, vegetation installation, and noise control to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, for review and approval. The Permittee must receive approval by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, regarding compliance with this condition. Installation of the fencing, vegetative hedge, and signage must be completed before ~~to issuance of~~ the City issues any occupancy permit and must be undertaken under the supervision of the Project's biological monitor. **Monitoring**: Planning and Environmental Review Department must conduct site inspections to ensure the required fencing has been constructed and permanent signage has been posted. **Bio 3-1(b) – Performance Security:** The Permittee must provide performance securities and enter into agreements, in forms approved by the City Attorney, for installing and maintaining all fencing and signage required to ensure protection of the ESHA, ~~SPA~~, and to prevent riparian corridor trespass. The maintenance period must be a minimum of five (5) years from the date the City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist notifies the City in writing that the installation of all mitigation plan elements is complete. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The performance securities must be provided and agreements signed before the City issues any building permit for Project construction. **Monitoring:** Upon notification by the City-approved biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist, the Director of Planning and	

		Environmental Review, or designee, must inspect the site to verify installation according to the approved fencing and signage plan. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must check maintenance as needed. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, may, upon request, release the performance security for demonstrated good cause. **Bio 3-1(c)**: All construction personnel working on any aspect of the residential Project or the construction of utilities and the road and bridge must receive training from a certified biologist at the ~~applicant's~~ Permittee's expense regarding the values of the sensitive habitats of the Tecolotito Creek SPA ~~riparian corridor~~. Any work performed in or within 100 feet of the edge of the ~~corridor~~ SPA must be supervised on a daily basis by a certified biologist with the authority to stop or redirect work should unpermitted encroachment occur. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** Before the City issues any grading permit ~~LUP~~ for site clearance and continuing through the construction phase of the Project, the ~~Applicant~~ Permittee must provide the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, with a copy of an executed contract between the ~~applicant~~ Permittee and a City-approved, certified biologist including a scope of work that includes all of the above responsibilities and authorities. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must conduct unannounced inspections of the Project site during periods when work is being conducted in or in the vicinity of the ESHA/SPA area. The Project's certified biologist must provide monthly reports to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review	

		documenting monitoring activities including the date(s), location(s), and activity being monitored and any enforcement actions taken. **Bio 3-1(d):** Exterior night lighting must be minimized, restricted to low intensity fixtures that are shielded and directed away from any ESHA/SPA, including ESHA/SPA upland buffers. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues any building permit ~~any LUP~~ for construction of any structure, the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must review and approve Project lighting plans for appropriate exterior night lighting design that would meet requirements for use in areas adjacent to ESHAs. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must conduct site inspections to ensure that appropriate exterior night lighting has been installed per the approved lighting plans before the City issues any occupancy permit.	
Impact BIO 4: Would the Project (Appendix G) 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?-			
Impact BIO 4-1 Would the bridge over Tecolotito Creek substantially interfere with wildlife movement or with an established wildlife corridor? As noted in the discussion of wildlife corridors in the Existing Conditions subsection, Tecolotito Creek and its associated habitat riparian habitat, together with the unnamed tributary drainage, serves as a primary wildlife movement corridor between the Goleta Slough and the Santa Ynez Mountains north of U.S. 101. A draft study by the Cheadle Center for Biodiversity and Ecological Restoration (CCBER) and the Bren	Potentially Significant	**Bio 4-1:** The bridge to be constructed over Tecolotito Creek to provide pedestrian, vehicle, and bicycle access to the Project site must be designed to provide sufficient height to allow the passage of large mammals under the bridge within the creek and SPA upland buffer ~~riparian corridor~~ as measured from the creek bed to the lowest part of the bridge and/or any infrastructure suspended from the bottom of the bridge that crosses Tecolotito Creek consistent with the Los Carneros Road bridge south of the	Less Than Significant (Class II)

School of Environmental Science and Management at the University of California, Santa Barbara postulates that one of the primary reasons that the creek is able to perform this function is the height of bridges over Tecolotito Creek at Los Carneros Road and U.S. 101 that may allow the passage of large mammals. While the large mammals cited in the Draft study (deer, bear, and mountain lion) are not known to utilize the Goleta Slough, many other mammals, including badgers, fox, coyote, and skunk do and are also seen in Tecolotito Creek. The proposed residential component of the Project would add an additional bridge over Tecolotito Creek to provide access to/from the site. Engineering design for the bridge has not been completed. In order to ensure that this bridge will not interfere with the use of the Tecolotito Creek corridor for wildlife movement, a mitigation measure would require that the bridge maintain a height from creek bed to bottom of bridge (inclusive of any utilities carried on the bridge bottom) sufficient to allow continued passage of large mammals. With this mitigation measure, the impact of the bridge on the above listed threshold would be reduced to a less than significant level **(Class II).**		Project site unless a lower height can be shown to serve the stated purpose by a City-approved certified biologist, on the basis of substantial evidence acceptable to the City. **Plan Requirement and Timing:** Before the submission of bridge plans to the City ~~and the County Flood Control District,~~ engineered drawings must be submitted to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, showing the height of the bridge from the creek bed to the bottom of the lowest structure suspended from the bottom of the bridge together with cross sections comparing the bridge cross section to a cross section of the Los Carneros/Tecolotito bridge. ~~If the bridge height is~~ The Project's Tecolotito Creek bridge may not be lower than the Los Carneros/Tecolotito bridge, ~~the City must submit the bridge drawings to a certified biologists of its choosing (cost to be paid by the applicant~~ unless a lower height can be shown to serve the stated purpose, verified by a certified biologist, on the basis of substantial evidence acceptable to the City. The biologist must provide the City with a written finding indicating whether the bridge height as proposed is sufficient to accommodate large mammals and that it will not interfere with the use of the Tecolotito Creek ESHA/SPA ~~corridor~~ as a wildlife corridor, consistent with its current use. In the event that such a finding is not made, the biologist must state in writing, based on substantial evidence, the minimum height necessary for continued function of the wildlife corridor including passage for large mammals and the bridge must be redesigned to meet those criteria. ~~Prior to~~ Before submission of bridge plans to the City, engineered drawings must be submitted to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee. The review required by this Mitigation Measure must be completed before	

		the City issues any permits for the construction of the bridge. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must review any engineered drawings and associated biological reports in consultation with resource/trustee agencies, as needed, such as the USFWS and CDFW. The signature of the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, indicating that the bridge design satisfies the wildlife corridor criteria pursuant to this condition is required before the ~~County o~~r City issues any permits for bridge construction.	
Impact BIO 5: Would the Project (City 1) substantially reduce or eliminate quantity or quality of nesting areas? Would the Project (City 3) substantially fragment, eliminate, or otherwise disrupt foraging areas and/or access to food resources? Raptors have been observed foraging during biological surveys of the Project site. These species are listed in Appendix B and discussed in "Existing Conditions" under "Birds" in this Section of the EIR. As previously noted, there are no historical or active raptor nests or communal roosts at the Project site or within 100 feet of any area that is or will be subject to development within the Project area. Several species of raptors could potentially nest within the riparian habitats of Tecolotito Creek or in the eucalyptus trees along the northern boundary of the Village at Los Carneros site, although the quality of these areas as raptor nesting habitat is relatively low due to surrounding development, noise, and human activities. For this reason, development of the Village at Los Carneros and the reconfiguration of the parking within the business park area would not substantially reduce or eliminate the quantity or quality of raptor nesting or communal roosting areas and would have a less than significant impact (**Class III**). On an incremental basis, the development of the Village at Los Carneros would result in the permanent loss of approximately 37.78 acres of suitable foraging habitat for raptors, but the foraging habitat at this site is not essential for the successful	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant (Class III)

breeding of raptors nesting in the Goleta area and is not designated as an ESHA for this purpose (GP/CLUP FEIR). Therefore, development of the Project would not substantially limit reproductive capacity of raptors in Goleta through loss of foraging habitat. As previously noted in Existing Conditions, the non- native vegetation that would be removed by the residential Project site is of less importance to raptors than the habitat available in larger and more diverse natural habitats in the Goleta area. As raptors are mobile species with generally large home ranges they are capable of compensating for the loss of small acreages of foraging habitat in a local area by moving to other suitable foraging habitats. Therefore, development of the Project would not eliminate significant raptor foraging areas or limit raptors' access to food resources, making potential impacts to raptors due to the development of the Project less than significant (**Class III**).=			
Impact BIO 6: Would the Project (Appendix G) conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (specifically, City of Goleta General Plan Conservation Element policy CE 9, which protects native trees)? The City's General Plan Policy CE 9 provides for the protection of native trees. The policy requires that new development be sited and designed to preserve native oaks (*Quercus* spp.), walnut (*Juglans californica*), sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), cottonwood (*Populus* spp.), willows (*Salix* spp.), or other native trees that are not located and protected in ESHAs. The City's GP/CLUP also requires mitigation for impacts to *mature* protected native trees, including removal of the tree or encroachment within the canopy or protection zone surrounding the tree. For the purposes of this impact analysis, a mature native tree has a diameter of at least 6 inches at 4.5 feet above soil level (diameter at breast height [dbh]). Project grading to construct the bridge over Tecolotito Creek would potentially impact two protected trees (a Coast live oak and a Western sycamore) by direct removal or encroachment into their canopy or root protection zones. Grading associated with the construction of fill slopes and contouring could affect five mature protected trees, including three coast live oaks and two western sycamores within the proposed Village at Los Carneros site (Component 1 of the Project). Protected trees that could potentially be impacted by the Project that are located outside of designated ESHA are identified in the EIR.	Potentially Significant	**Bio 6-1:** The Permittee must offset any impacts to protected native trees with onsite replacement planting at a minimum replacement ratio of 10:1 with 1-gallon oaks or at a 3:1 ratio with 24-inch box oaks or as otherwise determined by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues any grading permit ~~LUP~~ for Project construction, the Permittee must submit a Tree Protection and Replacement Plan (TPRP) prepared by a certified arborist or other qualified expert to the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, for review and approval. The Plan must include an inventory of native trees at the site, identify native protected trees that will be impacted by the Project, and provide a plan for tree protection and replacement that includes monitoring and success criteria. The Permittee must post a performance security in an amount acceptable to the City Attorney to ensure compliance with the approved TPRP. **Monitoring:** A certified arborist acceptable to	Less Than Significant (Class II)

Several native trees within the Tecolotito Creek ESHA could potentially be removed or otherwise impacted by construction of the bridge over Tecolotito Creek. The species, location, and quantity of mature protected trees within the Tecolotito Creek ESHA that may be impacted by the Project would be determined through specific tree surveys conducted before the approval of street improvement plans and issuance of encroachment permits for the construction of the bridge. Impacts to protected native trees are considered potentially significant, but would be mitigated to a less than significant level by requiring appropriate replacement pursuant to City policy (**Class II**).		the City must conduct site inspections during construction and tree replacement to ensure compliance with the approved Plan. Monitoring of replacement tree success, and maintenance of the performance security, must continue until the success criteria are achieved.	
Cumulative Effects on ESHAs The development of the Village at Los Carneros component of this Project together with related projects in the City of Goleta would result in significant cumulative impacts to the remaining creeks, riparian corridors, and wetland ESHAs in the City. However mitigation measures provided in Section 4.3 would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to creek, riparian, and wetland resources to a less than cumulatively considerable level (**Class II**).	Potentially Significant	See Above	Less Than Significant (Class II)
Cumulative Effects of Invasive Species Development of the Project in combination with related projects in the Goleta area could result in significant cumulative impacts to ESHAs as a result of the potential spread of invasive species. Compliance with mitigation that would prohibit the planting of invasive species on the Project site would reduce Project's contribution to such a cumulative impact to a less than cumulatively considerable level (**Class II**).	Potentially Significant	See Above	Less Than Significant (Class II)
Cumulative Loss of Raptor Foraging Habitat Development of the Project would not result in a significant incremental loss of suitable nesting or roosting habitat for raptors due to the low quality of lost habitat, the availability of superior habitat in the Goleta area, and the mobility of the potential impacted species. Therefore, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Cultural Resources			
Historical Resources There are no historic structures at or in the immediate vicinity	~~Less Than Significant~~ No Impact	**No mitigation required.**	~~Less than Significant (Class III)~~

of the Project site and the Project would result in no impacts to historic resources			No Impact
Archaeological Resources: **Impact CR 1**: Would the Project result in the potential to degrade archaeological resources? Potentially significant archaeological resources were identified at the Project site in prior studies dating to 1983 and continuing through 2008. The results of the 1983 study recovered two burials and a number of artifacts from outside the current Project area as part of CA-SBA 1203. However, as Native Americans historically used the area examined in the 1981 Phase I and Phase 2 study, the 1983 Phase III study, and 2008 Phase I/Partial Phase II study, there remains a potential that previously unmapped cultural material could be uncovered in the course of development in the area illustrated in the 2008 Report and designated as a resource setback area within the current Project site. ~~No significant archaeological resources were identified at the Project site. However, as Native Americans historically used the general area, there remains a potential that previously unmapped cultural material could be uncovered.~~ The Project is designed to avoid subsurface grading or placement of permanent structures ~~above~~ within the potentially sensitive area of CA-SBA-~~1023~~1203; however some grading to establish a pad for the most southerly Podium Flat building would intrude into the area, consisting of placement of fill soil and its compaction to ensure soil stability. Subsurface construction activities extending beneath previously disturbed areas at the site could result in potentially significant impacts that may be mitigated through avoidance and monitoring (**Class II**).	Potentially Significant	**CR 1-1:** A City-approved archaeologist and local qualified Chumash ~~observer~~ monitor must monitor Project implementation during the initial grading and excavation activities until such time as sufficient subsurface soil has been uncovered/excavated to ascertain that no prehistoric, archaeological or cultural resources are located on the Project site and through the capping process required within the identified sensitive area. In accordance with local guidelines, the monitor(s) must have the following authorities: a. The archaeological monitor(s) and Native American monitor(s) must be on-site on a full-time basis during any earthmoving activities, including preparation of the area for capping; grading; trenching, vegetation removal, or other excavation activities. The monitors will remain on-site until it is determined through consultation with the Permittee, Planning and Environmental ~~Services~~ Review Director, or designee, archaeological consultant, and Native American monitor ~~representative~~ that monitoring is no longer warranted; b. The monitor(s) have authority to halt any activities impacting previously unidentified cultural resources and to conduct an initial assessment of the resource(s); c. If an artifact is identified as an isolated find, the monitor(s) must recover the artifact(s) with the appropriate locational data and include the item in the overall inventory for the site; d. If a feature or concentration of artifacts is identified, the monitor(s) must halt activities in the vicinity of the find, notify the Permittee and the City, and prepare a proposal for the assessment and treatment of the find(s). This treatment may range from additional study to avoidance, depending on the nature of the	Less than Significant (Class II)

		find(s); e. Prepare a comprehensive archaeological technical report documenting the results of the monitoring program and include an inventory of recovered artifacts, features, etc.; f. Prepare the artifact assemblage for curation with an appropriate curation facility (e.g., UCSB or local Native American facility). The monitor(s) must include an inventory with the transfer of the collection; and g The monitor(s) must file an updated archaeological site survey record with the UCSB Central Coastal Information Center. h. The Native American Monitor must be qualified based on criteria provided by the California Native American Heritage Commission Cultural Resource Guidelines for Monitors. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement must be printed on all plans submitted for permitting of land disturbing or ground clearing activities ~~any LUP~~ including, without limitation, building, grading or demolition permits. The Permittee must enter into a contract with a City approved archaeologist and qualified Native American monitor ~~representative~~ before the City issues a permit for any ground disturbing or land clearing activity within the area ~~LUP~~. The Permittee must pay for all monitoring required by this condition. **Monitoring:** Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground disturbing activities. **CR 1-2** Before initiating any staging areas, vegetation clearing, or grading activity, the Permittee and construction crew must meet onsite with the archaeological consultant and local Chumash monitor ~~representative(s)~~ and review the	

		procedures to be followed in the ~~unlikely~~ event human remains are uncovered. These procedures must include those identified by Public Resources Code § 5097.98, and the City's Archaeological Guidelines. Per CEQA Statute and Guidelines ~~Section~~ §15064.5(e), the County Coroner must be contacted should human remains be discovered. ~~In addition a satisfactory disposition of the remains must be agreed upon by the stakeholders so as to limit future disturbance.~~ If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. Upon notification by the County Coroner of the discovery, the NAHC is required to notify the Most Likely Descendants (MLD), who then may inspect the site and make recommendations to the landowner within 48 hours regarding the means of treatment of the remains and any associated grave goods. The landowner shall discuss and confer with the descendants all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment as provided in Public Resources Code ~~Section~~ § 5097.98. If the NAHC is unable to identify the MLD or the MLD fails to make a recommendation within ~~24~~ 48 hours of notification by the NAHC, or the landowner and MLD cannot reach an agreement with mediation by the NAHC, then the landowner shall rebury the Native American remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before vegetation clearing or grading and/or excavation, the Permittee must provide the City with the contact information of the Native American representative and monitor and the agreed upon procedures to be followed. If ~~the~~ human remains are found, the County Coroner must be contacted. If the Coroner determines the remains to be of Native American origin, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage	

		Commission and the Commission will name the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD and the landowner or the landowner's authorized representative ~~consulting archaeologist, proponent, and City~~ will consult as to the ~~disposition~~ treatment of the remains per the requirements of Public Resources Code ~~Section~~ §5097.98. If the remains are identified as non-Native American, the Coroner will take possession of the remains and comply with all State and local requirements in the treatment of the remains. **Monitoring:** The archaeological monitor(s) must maintain daily field notes and prepare weekly summaries. Upon completion of the program, a technical report must be prepared. The Planning and Environmental ~~Services~~ Review Director, or designee, must conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground disturbing activities. **CR 1-3:** Within the sensitive archaeological boundary of CA-SBA-1203 ~~1023~~, the Project must incorporate grading designed to cap in place any underlying archaeological deposits that may be discovered, thereby preserving the deposits in place and minimizing or avoiding impacts. Capping and placement of fill soils over the archaeological area of the Project site must include the following surface preparation and fill placement measures: a. Remove all organic material from the archaeological site surface by hand (including brushing, raking, or use of power blower). Use of motorized vehicles for vegetation removal is prohibited. All vegetation must be removed at ground surface such that no soil disturbance results. b. Remaining root balls and masses in the ground after hand removal of vegetation stems/trunks must be sprayed with topical	

		pesticide per manufacturers specifications to ensure no further growth. The resulting dead vegetation masses must be left in place. Complete surface vegetation removal and die-off of root massing must be achieved before geogrid placement. c. No remedial grading, sub-grade preparation or scarification must occur before placement of the geogrid fabric. d. A bioaxial geogrid (Tensar TX 160 or equivalent) must be laid over the ground surface throughout CA-SBA-1203 ~~56~~ site boundaries and a 50 foot buffer area. The proposed geogrid type and verification of its technological capability must be provided by a qualified geotechnical engineer. e. Placement of fill soils on top of the geogrid fabric must be done in no greater than 8-inch lifts with rubber-tired equipment. f. The first six inches of fill must be yellow sand that signals to any future sub-surface activity (e.g. landscaping activity) that excavation must not extend deeper. g. Geogrid fabric must be capable of preventing compaction and load impacts on underlying archaeological resources. h. Fill soils must have a pH ranging from 5.5 to 7.5 only. i. Fill soils must be free of archaeological resources. j. Fill soils must be spread from the outside with rubber track heavy equipment, such that the equipment must only be working on top of the fill soils. The fill soils must be placed ahead of the loading equipment so that the machine does not have contact with the archaeological site surface. k. The fill soils must be sufficiently moist so that they must be cohesive under the weight of the heavy equipment as the material is spread out over the archaeological site and buffer area. l. The Project soils engineering report must be revised to include the above measures with respect to site preparation with the	

		archaeological area to ensure consistency in requirements. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues ~~any LUP~~ a permit for any grading, land clearance, and/or excavation, the Permittee ~~applicant~~ must prepare a Construction Monitoring Plan. Plan specifications for the monitoring must be printed on all plans submitted for grading, landscaping, and building permits. The ~~applicant~~ Permittee must enter into a contract with a City approved archaeologist and qualified Chumash Native American monitor ~~observer~~ and must fund the provision of on-site archaeological/cultural resource construction monitoring during initial grading, and excavation activities before the City issues a ~~LUP~~ grading permit. A qualified geotechnical engineer must provide the geogrid type and verification of its technological capability as part of the grading plan review and approval in consultation with City Public Works Director, or designee ~~Community Services~~. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review ~~Services~~ Director, or designee, must approve the Construction Monitoring Plan and ensure there is a valid contract with an archaeologist and a qualified Chumash Native American monitor ~~observer~~, and must conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground disturbing activities. **CR 1-4:** In the event that archaeological remains are encountered during grading, work must be stopped immediately, or redirected, until a City of Goleta qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor ~~representative~~ are retained by the ~~applicant~~ Permittee to evaluate the significance of the find by completing a Phase 2 investigation as set forth in the Goleta Guidelines. If remains are found to be significant, they are subject to the Phase 3	

		mitigation program consistent with the guidelines set forth in the Thresholds Manual. If human remains are uncovered, the County Coroner must be notified and, if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be notified and permitted to identify the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The ~~disposition~~ treatment of the remains and associated funerary items will be coordinated between the ~~Coroner, NAHC,~~ MLD and the landowner or the landowner's authorized representative per the requirements of Public Resources Code ~~Section~~ § 5097.98. ~~and archaeological consultant.~~ All non-funerary materials recovered from this property must be curated in a federally recognized repository. In this case, the Department of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara, would be the most likely repository. The ~~Project applicant~~ Permittee will be responsible for the curation costs. **Plan Requirements & Timing**: This condition must be printed on all building and grading plans. **Monitoring**: The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must approve plans before the City issues any grading permit ~~LUP~~ to verify compliance and must spot check in the field.	
Paleontological Resources **Impact CR 2:** Would the Project result in the potential to uncover paleontological resources? As described in Existing Conditions, there are no known paleontological resources at the Project site, which consists of fill deposits and alluvium that are relatively recent geologic units not likely to contain paleontological resources (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Cumulative Impact **Impact CR 3:** Would the Project result in the potential to cumulatively degrade archaeological resources?	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures CR 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, and 1-4 would ~~also~~ reduce the Project's contribution to ~~this~~ cumulative impacts.	Less Than Significant (Class II)

Previous development within Santa Barbara County resulted in the loss of much of the evidence of the prehistoric occupation and use of the area. However, while there is potential for cumulatively significant impacts to cultural resources as a result of cumulative development within the Goleta Slough area, given that the proposed Project contains no known resources it would not be expected to contribute considerably to this potential cumulative impact (**Class II**).			
Geologic Resources			
Faulting **Impact GEO 1**: Would the Project be developed in the vicinity of potentially active faults and folds that could result in (1) surface fault rupture on the site or (2) surface uplift? No active or potentially active faults have been identified on the Project site. The nearest known Alquist-Priolo-zoned active fault is the North More Ranch fault, located approximately 4,600 feet to the south. The nearest known active fold structure is located 1,280-feet north of the site. The potential for fault rupture on the site is less than significant (**Class III**)	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Seismic Ground Shaking **Impact Geo 2**: Would the Project site be subject to strong seismic ground shaking? A potentially active fault is located approximately 4,600 feet south of the Project site. This fault is capable of generating a moderate to large earthquake that could result strong ground shaking at the site. The performance of residential structures during earthquake shaking is addressed, and the acceptable level of risk is inherently defined, by California Building Code (CBC) requirements. Project construction must comply with the seismic safety standards of the most current CBC adopted by the Goleta Municipal Code. Based on the soils and geotechnical engineering reports prepared for the Project site, the site can feasibly support the proposed development from a geotechnical perspective. With enforcement of existing regulatory requirements, impacts from strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant (**Class III**)	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Soils and Slope Stability **Impact Geo 3:** Would development within the Project site be subject to erosion, and slope stability impacts? <u>Residential Development Area Slopes and Open Space</u>:	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures provided in Section 4.8 *Hydrology and Water Quality* would mitigate erosion impacts during construction and long-term operations.	Less Than Significant (Class II)

In general, construction projects have the potential to increase short-term erosion and sedimentation in nearby watercourses due to construction activities that disturb soil and make it more susceptible to erosion. Mitigation for construction phase erosion impacts is provided in Section 4.8 (Hydrology) and with mitigation the Project's erosion impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level (**Class II**).		Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, includes Mitigation Measures AES 3-1, 3-2, 3-7, and 3-8, which provide for landscaping and long-term maintenance that would reduce long-term slope stability impacts.	
Scour and Erosion of Span Bridge: Construction of the Tecolotito Creek bridge foundations has the potential to destabilize creek banks. However, with mitigation measures provided in Section 4.3 (Biological Resources) bridge foundations would not be permitted on the bed and bank of the creek and would be reduced to a less than significant level (**Class II)**	Potentially Significant	Mitigation measures in Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, prohibit the construction of bridge foundations and pilings within or in proximity to the creek or creek bank and recommend their location close to the edge of the 100-year flood plain boundary in order to protect the creek's habitat and the surrounding SPA.	Less Than Significant (Class II)
Geologic and geotechnical characteristics **Impact Geo 4:** Would the geologic and geotechnical characteristics associated with surficial geologic units present at the Project site adversely affect the development due to expansive soils? Potentially unstable artificial fill and alluvium soils would be encountered during grading, trenching, and other excavation in the primary building areas. These soils have moderate to very high expansion potential. Current building codes require preparation of building-specific geotechnical/foundation reports and the provision of foundation specification by the Project's structural engineer where expansive soils are present before the City issues grading or building permits. For purposes of this analysis, a "worst case" assumption is made that soils are moderate to highly expansive throughout the site. Compliance with current regulatory requirements would reduce impacts to a less than significant level (**Class II**)	Less than Significant	~~No mitigation required.~~ **GEO 4-1:** Foundation systems for buildings on expansive soils must be designed and constructed in a manner that will minimize damage to the structure from movement of the soils. The following mitigation measures, in whole or in part, would reduce effects to a less than significant level: a. Depth of footings below the natural and finish grades cannot be less than 24 inches for exterior and 18 inches for interior footings. b. Exterior walls and interior bearing walls must be supported on continuous footings. c. Footings must be reinforced with at least four 1/2-inch-diameter deformed reinforcing bars. Two bars must be placed within 4 inches of the bottom of the footings and two bars within 4 inches of the top of the footing with a minimum concrete cover per ACI 318, Section 7.7.1. d. On-grade concrete floor slabs shall be placed on a 4-inch fill of coarse aggregate or on a 2-inch sand bed over a moisture barrier membrane. The slabs must be at least 3 1/2 inches thick and shall be reinforced with 1/2-inch-diameter deformed reinforcing bars. Reinforcing bars must be spaced at intervals not exceeding 16 inches each way. e. The soil below an interior concrete slab must	Less Than Significant (Class II)

		be pre-saturated to a depth of 18 inches before placing the concrete. f. All drainage adjacent to footings must be conducted away from the structure by a 3-foot-wide sloped apron draining into an approved non-erosive device. g. Slab-on-ground foundations such as a post-tensioned mat or raft will require a soils report and shall be designed to City Code standards. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** ~~Before grading Prior to~~ Before the City issues building permits the Permittee must submit a foundation plan for each lot, prepared by a licensed civil or geotechnical engineer and structural engineer. All foundation design must be approved by the Building and Safety Director, or designee, based on verified conformance with the recommendations contained in the soils report prepared for that location. **Monitoring:** Grading/building inspectors must perform site inspections to ensure that foundations are constructed in accordance with approved plans and permits before the City issues permits for framing.	
Groundwater and Liquefaction **Impact Geo 5:** Would the Project be adversely affected by shallow and/or perched groundwater and the potential for soil liquefaction and/or lateral spreading? Liquefaction and Lateral Spreading: The Project site includes areas that may be subject to impacts created by perching groundwater and liquefaction including Tecolotito Creek, its unnamed tributary, and the area between and adjacent to these two drainages. No structures are planned within the most vulnerable area; however, residential buildings would approach the boundaries of the liquefaction-prone areas. Test borings to date have not indicated that liquefiable soils underlay any of the proposed building pads, and the one area definitively identified as liquefaction-prone is located at the southwest corner of the property near Los Carneros Road	Potentially Significant	**GEO 5-1:** The Permittee ~~applicant~~ must provide verification that all groundwater monitoring wells on the site, including those previously taken out of service, have been properly decommissioned and capped according to standards developed by the State Department of Water Resources pursuant to ~~Section~~ §13800 of the Water Code and adopted by the local agency in accordance with ~~Section~~ §13801 of the Water Code. The wells must be filled and capped to ensure that the abandoned wells do not pose a hazard to persons or provide a path for entry of hazardous substances into the ground or ground water. A permit for abandonment and capping must be obtained from the City of Goleta or from the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board and a copy provided to	Less Than Significant (Class II)

where no structures are proposed. A secondary effect of liquefaction is lateral spreading. Geologic conditions that are conducive to lateral spreading are frequently found along streams in recent alluvial deposits. Because of the potential for liquefaction-induced lateral spreading along Tecolotito Creek, there are requirements that bridge piers supporting the Tecolotito Creek bridge be located well away from the creek bank and as close to the outward edge of the 100-year flood plain as feasible. The proposed Tecolotito Creek bridge supports will need to be located outside of the area that is potentially susceptible to this effect. This reduces the potential for liquefaction-induced lateral spreading along Tecolotito Creek damaging the bridge piers supporting the Tecolotito Creek bridge and associated infrastructure. Before the approval of the Tecolotito Creek bridge both the City of Goleta Public Works Department and the SBCFCWCD will require geotechnical and seismic reports for the locations proposed for bridge foundations. Compliance with mitigation measure GEO 5-1 will reduce impacts to less than significant (**Class II**). Groundwater: The westernmost subsurface infiltration basin proposed to allow storm water infiltration into the soil would be located in an area of relatively higher groundwater, which may lead to increased groundwater elevations (shallower depths) in areas immediately below, adjacent and down-gradient from the basin area. An increase in groundwater could increase the liquefaction potential of soils in the western portion of the site. Additional effects of higher groundwater may include nuisance moisture or see page in underground parking areas, and structural impacts to foundations (**Class II**).		the City if the work has already been completed. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: ~~Prior to~~ Before the City issues ~~the issuance of~~ building permits ~~grading~~, the Permittee must submit a work plan for the filling and capping of the groundwater monitoring wells, prepared by a licensed civil or geotechnical engineer. All well decommissioning will be conducted in accordance with State of California Department of Water Resources (DWR) standards (if applicable) and with conditions associated with a monitoring well destruction permit to be issued by the City of Goleta. **Monitoring:** Grading/building inspectors must perform site inspections to assure deconstruction occurs in accordance with approved plans and permits before the issuance of any grading permit for the site.	
Subsidence **Impact Geo 6**: Would the Project site be adversely impacted by subsidence? The Project site is not located within an area of oil or gas development where subsidence can often occur, and while the site does overlay a groundwater basin, the area is non-producing and is used primarily for recharge. Groundwater monitoring wells installed at the site are for exploratory purposes to determine feasibility of the proposed Project, and are not production wells designed to withdraw quantities that	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant (Class III)

could potentially result in ground surface subsidence (**Class III**).			
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Construction Emissions **Impact GHG 1:** Would the Project, either directly or indirectly, generate greenhouse gas emissions that would impact the environment during construction? The Project's construction would generate approximately 3,263 MTCO2e per year. These emissions would be temporary, occurring only during construction of the Project, and therefore would not constitute an ongoing source of GHG emissions. Cumulative impacts from the Project's construction GHG emissions would be less than significant (**Class III**)	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Operational Emissions **Impact GHG 2**: Would the Project, either directly or indirectly, generate greenhouse gas emissions that would impact the environment during its operational (long term) period? Vehicular Trips Vehicle trips generated by growth within the Project area would result in GHG emissions through combustion of fossil fuels. On-site Use of Natural Gas and Other Fuels Natural gas would be used by the Project for heating of residential space, resulting in a direct release of GHGs. The use of landscaping equipment would also result in onsite GHG emissions. Electricity Use Electricity is generated by a combination of methods, which include combustion of fossil fuels. By using electricity, the Project would contribute indirectly to the GHG emissions associated with electricity production. Water Use and Wastewater Generation California's water conveyance system is energy-intensive, using electricity to pump and treat water and wastewater. Development of the Project would contribute to indirect emissions by consuming water and generating wastewater.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required. Mitigation Measure AQ 2-1 (Section 4.2 Air Quality), which requires the implementation of an Alternative Transportation/Transportation Demand Management Program, ~~which~~ would also reduce the Project's transportation related GHG emissions. The Project's non-transportation related GHG emissions would also be reduced through compliance with mandatory Energy Efficiency Standards required by the GMC ~~Goleta Municipal Code~~, as well as the most current California Green Building Code as adopted by the City. Mitigation Measure GHG-1 ~~has been~~ is included as a recommendation to ensure energy efficiency and conservation features are incorporated as feasible. The use of energy efficient components listed in Mitigation Measure GHG-1 may be adopted as Conditions of Approval for the Project. **GHG-1:** (Recommended) Energy conservation measures must be included in the Conditions of Approval as applicable and feasible for this Project. All new residential ~~and commercial buildings~~ structures of the Project must comply with the energy	Less Than Significant (Class III)

Solid Waste Disposal of organic waste in landfills can lead to the generation of methane, a potent greenhouse gas. By generating solid wastes, proposed Project development would indirectly contribute to the emission of fugitive methane from landfills, as well as CO2, CH4 and N2O from the operation of trash collection vehicles. **Project Emissions Summary** Implementation of the residential Village at Los Carneros Project would contribute to GHG emissions from mobile sources as a result of traffic increases as well as emissions from the generation of energy that is consumed off-site in order to service the Project (such as at utility providers associated with the Project's energy demands). The Project's long-term annual unmitigated operational GHG emissions would be total 4,680 MT CO2e annually and would be less than significant (**Class III**).		efficiency standards set forth in the GMC and with the 2010 State of California Green Building Code, as adopted by the GMC. **Plan Requirements:** The following additional energy conservation measures must be included in the plans unless the Permittee demonstrates their infeasibility to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee: a. use of photovoltaic systems; b. passive cooling strategies such as passive or fan aided cooling plan designed into the structure and/or a roof opening for hot air venting or installation of underground cooling tubes; c. high efficiency outdoor lighting and/or solar powered lighting; d. installation of Energy Star roofs, furnaces, and appliances; e. use of solar-assisted water heating for swimming pools and tankless hot water on demand systems if their energy efficiency is demonstrated to exceed that of a central storage tank water heating system; f. use of passive solar cooling/heating; g. use of natural lighting in lieu of artificial lighting; h. installation of energy efficient lighting; i. use of water-efficient landscapes; water-efficient irrigation systems and devices; and use of reclaimed water (if available); j. installation of cool pavements; k. provision of segregated waste bins for recyclable materials; and l. zero waste/high recycling standards. **Timing:** These requirements must be shown on all plans submitted to the City before the City issues a building permit. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must verify	

		compliance before the City issues building permit(s) for the Project.	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Risk of Upset Associated with the Site's Proximity to the Union Pacific Railroad **Impact HAZ 1**: Would the development of the Project place residential structures and residents in proximity to the existing UPRR railroad tracks, creating a potential risk of upset associated with derailment, chemical leaks, and fire? Freight trains that pass the site could contain hazardous chemicals or flammable materials that could spill if a rail accident occurred. A probability analysis determined there is a risk of one hazardous spill/derailment every 25,000 years on the track segment adjacent to the Project site. Based on this analysis, the risk of derailment with or without hazardous material release is statistically extremely low. However, the consequences of any derailment incident could significantly impact the surrounding population. The FEIR prepared for the City's GP/CLUP found that construction of residential units is proximity to the UPRR/U.S. 101 transportation corridor was a significant and unavoidable impact. The City' adopted Statement of Overriding Considerations as regards this impact when it adopted its GP/CLUP. The EIR for Village at Los Carneros EIR incorporates both the finding and the SOC as part of this EIR by reference (**Class I**).	~~Potentially Significant~~ Significant And Unavoidable (Statement of Overriding Considerations already adopted as part of the Certification of the 2006 General Plan FEIR)	**HAZ 1-1** The Permittee must record a notification, in a form approved by the City Attorney, regarding the proximity of the UPRR railroad tracks and the potential risks associated with such proximity and ensure that any lease or sale documents used for the lease or sale of units on the Project site include this notification. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The Permittee must prepare a Notice to Property Owner (NTPO) and CC&Rs and submit same for review and approval by the City Attorney ~~prior to issuance of~~ before the City issues building permits for any residential structure on the site. ~~any recordation of the final map.~~ The Permittee must provide the City with proof of recordation of the NTPO and CC&Rs before the City issues ~~issuance of~~ building permits ~~map recordation.~~ Before the City issues building permits a separate notice regarding proximity of the UPRR and U.S. 101 and the potential risks associated with such proximity, together with the measures incorporated into the Project to mitigate those risks must be recorded. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, and the City Attorney, or designee, must verify compliance with this requirement before ~~map recordation~~ the City issues a building permit ~~issuance~~ for any residential structure. **HAZ 1-2:** The Permittee must develop a mitigation plan for Project residents that provides safe-harbor and/or evacuation procedures in the event of a train accident and/or potential release of hazardous materials.	~~Less Than Significant (Class II)~~ Significant And Unavoidable (Class I)

		Plan Requirements and Timing: The Permittee must provide the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, or designee, with a copy of the mitigation plan for review and approval. The plan must be included in the Project CC&Rs, which must be reviewed and approved by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review and the City Attorney or designee, ~~before the recordation of the Project's final map~~ ~~prior to issuance~~ before the City issues a building permit for the Project. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must verify compliance with this requirement ~~before map recordation issuance~~ before the City issues building permits.	
Exposure to On-site Hazardous Materials (Agriculture Related) **Impact HAZ 2:** Would grading and residential use of the Project site result in exposure to agricultural-related chemicals or unknown chemicals? Previous agricultural production on the site only occurred along the site's western margin, which is presently covered by the Tecolotito Creek riparian corridor and the proposed SPA buffer. No excavation is anticipated in this area; therefore, the potential that soils disturbed by grading on-site may contain pesticides, fertilizers, or other chemicals associated with past agricultural production would be very low and the impact would be less than significant (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Exposure to On-site Hazardous Materials (Non-agriculture Related) **Impact HAZ 3:** Would the demolition of the existing electric transformer equipment result in exposure to hazardous materials? The site contains a pad-mounted transformer constructed and installed subsequent to the U.S. ban on PCBs, therefore, it would not contain PCB-laden oil. The Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, which maintains a list of all potential PCB site, does not include this transformer in its list. Further,	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)

the transformer is not electrically loaded at this time. Therefore, there would be no risk of electrocution for workers engaged in its removal. All workers involved in the removal of the electrical transformer would be employees of Southern California Edison, trained in the safe removal of the company's equipment. The impact would be less than significant (**Class III**)			
Exposure to Hazardous Materials Generated in the Project Vicinity **Impact HAZ 4:** Would hazardous materials sites in the vicinity of the Project result in a potential hazard to workers or residents? Identified Hazardous Materials Sites: The Phase I ESA and HMA determined that neighboring properties identified hazardous materials sites within 0.5-mile from the site, did not to represent an environmental concern to the Project based on the reported operations at the reported facilities, regulatory status of hazardous materials incidents at the facility (e.g., closed case), the distance between the facility and the site, and the hydro-geologically cross-gradient location from the site. In addition, site reconnaissance did not reveal the presence of hazardous chemicals. The impact would be less than significant (**Class III**) Hazardous Materials Business Plan and Generator Sites Within a 2,000-Foot Radius: The HMU requires preparation and filing of a Business Plan and Emergency Response Plan by hazardous materials users based on types and quantities of the substances used. With plans and regulations implemented impacts would be less than significant (**Class III**)	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Residential and Recreation Ground Maintenance Involving the Use, Storage, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials **Impact HAZ 5**: Would operation of the Project place workers or residents at risk of upset involving the use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials? Minimal amounts of hazardous materials typically associated with residential and landscape maintenance would be used and stored onsite. Residents would likely use and store household cleaning chemicals, detergents, bleaches, minor amounts of interior and exterior paint, vehicle fluids, etc.	Potentially Significant	**HAZ 5-1** Before any storage or use of regulated hazardous materials on-site (including pool maintenance chemicals, fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, insecticides, lubricants, etc.), the Permittee must determine whether the amount of hazardous materials stored at the Project site would require a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) approved by the Fire Protection District ~~Department~~. If required, the Permittee must retain the services of a qualified	Less Than Significant (Class II)

Hazardous materials associated with residential operations and maintenance may also be used and stored on-site. These would include pool chemicals, fertilizers, pesticides, solvents, and exterior paints. With mitigation measure HAZ 5-1, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level (**Class II**).		environmental consultant or safety engineer who will develop the business plan and a health and safety plan in order to ensure that compliance issues regarding the proper containment, usage, disposal and transportation practices are used, if required. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** If required, the Fire ~~Department~~ Protection District approved HMBP must be submitted to and approved by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, before the City undertakes final inspection and before the City issues ~~issuance of~~ a certificate of occupancy. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must verify compliance with this requirement before the City issues a certificate of occupancy or conducts a final inspection. If required, the HMBP must be updated and enforced through the life of the Project as required by the Fire Protection District.	
Exposure to Naturally Emitted Radon Gas **Impact HAZ 6:** Would the Project expose residents to low to moderate concentrations of naturally occurring radon gas? Santa Barbara County falls within the EPA's Radon Zone 1 with a predicted average indoor radon screening level of greater than 4 pC/l. Based on this zone designation, the Project site, once developed, may experience radon levels above the recommended EPA Action Level of 4.0 pC/l. Mitigation measure HAZ 6-1 requires testing for radon gas and compliance with existing regulations to reduce the impact to a less than significant level (**Class II**).	Potentially Significant	**HAZ 6-1:** Radon testing must be conducted. If radon gas is present above the recommended EPA action level of (4.0 pC/L), habitable structures must be designed to provide venting and/or any other EPA approved mitigation measures to reduce such exposure below 4.0 pC/L. **Plan Requirements & Timing:** A radon report including recommendations for appropriate EPA approved mitigation measures must be submitted to Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, for review and approval before the City issues any permit allowing construction of any habitable structures. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must ensure compliance with this requirement before the City issues any permit for construction of	Less Than Significant (Class II)

		any habitable structures. The City Building Inspector must verify compliance in the field before conducting a final inspection or issuing a certificate of occupancy.	
Cumulative Hazards Impacts The GP/CLUP Final EIR identifies a significant and unavoidable cumulative hazards and hazardous materials risk of upset/exposure impact resulting from the inherent risk associated with the transport of hazardous materials along major transportation routes (including U.S. 101, and the Union Pacific railroad tracks), which are in close proximity to the Project site. Significant hazards include the risk of a trucking or rail accident and subsequent release of hazardous materials. The overall risk associated with transport of hazardous materials would be expected to increase following build-out the GP/CLUP as addition residential development is introduced in close proximity to major transportation routes. Although the Project's individual on-site risk or exposure to hazards and hazardous materials as a result of a transportation accident would be statistically less than significant, the cumulative risk of such exposure associated with the introduction of additional population in close proximity to U.S. 101 and UPRR railroad tracks, is considered significant and unavoidable and the Project's contribution would be considered cumulatively considerable (**Class I**).	Significant And Unavoidable	**No Mitigation Measures Identified.** The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations with respect to this impact as part of its action in certifying the FEIR for the General Plan. For purposes of this EIR's certification, that Statement of Overriding Considerations would be incorporated into the findings by reference.	Significant And Unavoidable (Class I)
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Hydrology and Drainage **Impact HYDRO 1:** Would the Project would alter existing drainage patterns on the site ~~and~~ such that it would increase the amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding, increased erosion, or increased sedimentation onsite or offsite or create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or increase runoff into naturally drained areas without storm drains? Alteration of On-Site Drainage The Project would require modifications to existing on-site drainage patterns. The primary modifications would be the result of mass grading, which would combine the 15 existing sub-drainage area boundaries into 9 sub-drainage areas. Additional modifications would include: 1) the filling of an existing drainage ditch that currently runs east-west at the	Potentially Significant	**Hydro 1-1:** The Permittee must prepare a final Drainage and Hydrology Study for stormwater runoff control measures, based on related geotechnical and hydrologic engineering reports, including methods of analysis, that have been prepared and approved as demonstrating compliance with City's Stormwater Management Plan and the policies and requirements of the Central Coast RWQCB and incorporate, without limitation, the following: a. Stormwater control measures for the post-development peak flows that ensure such flows would be less than the pre-development peak flows for the entire site; b. Stormwater runoff reduction measures	Less Than Significant (Class II)

western end of the property (runoff from areas that flow to this ditch would be conveyed via subsurface storm drains); 2) installation of storm drains throughout the site with main lines to be placed under Village Way and the bike path; and 3) installation of two subterranean detention basins design to reduce and infiltrate runoff. **Capacity of Existing or Planned Drainage Systems:** Post-development stormwater runoff volume is estimated to be greater than the pre-development volume due to an estimated increase in impervious area. To reduce post-development runoff volumes the Project would install two subterranean detention basins. Water collected within the basins would be detained on-site to allow for percolation into groundwater and to reduce storm water discharge into Tecolotito Creek during peak storm events. These drainage system facilities would reduce post-development flow rates and volumes leaving the site to a level equal to or less than the pre-development flow rates and volumes. These drainage improvements also result in a decrease in the effective impervious area from pre-development (1.4 percent) to post-development (1.0 percent) conditions and a less than significant impact (**Class II**). Location of Westerly Detention Basin: While the preliminary percolation tests indicate the detention basins would be feasible and would adequately allow for infiltration as proposed, additional percolation testing for the exact locations of the basins is required to precisely verify actual infiltration rates and to demonstrate that the subterranean basin depth relative to groundwater elevations would provide enough differential to fully drain the basins within the timeframe provided and not contribute to groundwater perching that could affect adjacent structures. Erosion and Sediment Control – Post Construction Phase: The installation of landscaping and the coverage provided by paving and building construction would control erosion and reduce the amount of sediment discharged from the site into Tecolotito Creek as compared to the existing condition. Tecolotito Creek Bridge: Construction of the Tecolotito Creek bridge would not be permitted to alter the flow of Tecolotito Creek. ~~The~~	Potentially Significant	demonstrating post-development volume quantities retained on-site are greater than pre-development volume quantities for a 1-inch storm event; c. Stormwater control improvements demonstrating effective impervious areas would be less than pre-development; d. Analysis demonstrating that underground basins would be appropriately located to allow for the stated infiltration and not cause groundwater perching affecting adjacent structures; e. Permeability testing at test holes that are in proximity to the underground basins and demonstrate the relevance of the data to the selected basin locations provided; f. Proof that the basins would function appropriately, including schematic drawings of each basin showing the high water level (HWL) at capacity, floor elevations, inlet/outlet elevations and design flow, and affects, if any, on subterranean parking garages; g. Drainage area flow rates, basic outlet inlet/outlet configuration (e.g., pipe, open channel, weir), total available volume, etc.; h. Data on the detention portion of volume utilized at design flow rates and associated retention volume; and, i. Fail safe measures for drainage control, such as the incorporation of drain openings in the screening wall along the westerly Lot 6 boundary, and a swale or small open channel along the southerly boundary of the Project site. j. Additional studies recommended by the geotechnical engineer and hydrologist must be completed to ensure that the proposed placement of the most westerly detention basin will not result in an increased water table elevation that could compromise the capacity of the basin and potentially damage adjacent building foundations. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Plans must be prepared by a registered Civil Engineer and	Less Than Significant (Class II)

	Potentially Significant	submitted to Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, before the City issues ~~any LUP~~ a grading permit for the Project. The bridge must be constructed per the approved bridge plans before the City issues a certificate of occupancy for more than 50 percent of ~~the first unit~~ of ~~any of~~ the Project's residential units ~~buildings~~. **Monitoring:** Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must verify compliance with this condition before the City issues any ~~grading~~ permit for the Project. The City Building Inspector and Public Works Director must verify that the bridge was constructed per the approved plan before the City issues a certificate of occupancy for more than 50 percent of the Project's residential units. ~~any portion of the project~~.	Less Than Significant (Class II)

		Civil Engineer must prepare plans for the bridge. The final Tecolotito Creek bridge plans, cross-sections, and hydrologic calculations must be submitted to the City ~~and the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District~~ for review and approval before the City issues a permit for the construction of the bridge. ~~Any permit for the Project.~~ The bridge must be installed before the City issues a certificate of occupancy for more than 50 percent of the Project's units ~~buildings~~. A long-term maintenance plan and responsibility for long-term maintenance must be prepared by the Permittee and reviewed and approved by Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, before the City issues any permit. **Monitoring:** The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must verify compliance with this condition before the City issues any permit for the Project. The City Building Inspector and Public Works Director must verify that the bridge has been constructed per the approved plan before the City issues any certificate of occupancy for more than 50% of the Project's residential units. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must inspect the bridge construction periodically and verify completion per the approved plans before the City issues a certificate of occupancy for more than 50% of the Project's residential units. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must provide yearly monitoring of bridge maintenance to ensure that the approved maintenance plan is implemented as approved.	
Surface Water and Groundwater Quality **Construction** **Impact WQ 1:** Would the Project disturb more than one acre, increase site imperviousness by more than 25 percent, and adversely impact water quality?	Potentially Significant	**WQ 1-1:** The Permittee must prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) covering all phases of grading operations. **Plan Requirements:** The SWPPP must be	Less Than Significant (Class II)

The Project site would result in the disturbance of approximately 47 acres and would increase site imperviousness by more than 25 percent. It would not, however, require the channelization or relocation of a natural creek or stream. Construction Phase Impacts Potential construction-related water quality impacts could be created by vegetation removal, use of construction materials on the site, and construction staging activities. The Project would involve site disturbance during construction of buildings, sidewalks, roadways, patios, landscaping, and associated facilities. Vegetation removal would expose soil to erosion and temporarily increase the potential for sedimentation of watercourses unless mitigated through implementation of approved BMPs. Construction of the Tecolotito Creek bridge foundations and related grading within the SPA of the creek is of particular concern due to the potential for the release of sediment into the creek. Because the bridge would not be constructed within the creek bed or bank, and construction activities would require implementation and maintenance of appropriate BMPs pursuant to the Project's SWPPP, its construction would not result in bank erosion (**Class II**).		prepared by a licensed civil engineer and incorporate all appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) necessary to mitigate short-term construction impacts. The Plan may include, without limitation, the following BMPs: a. Temporary berms and sedimentation traps (such as silt fencing, straw bales, and sand bags); the BMPs must be placed at the base of all cut/fill slopes and soil stockpile areas where potential erosion may occur and must be maintained to ensure effectiveness; the sedimentation basins and traps must be cleaned periodically and the silt must be removed and disposed of in a location approved by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee; b. Non-paved areas must be revegetated or restored (i.e., geotextile binding fabrics) immediately after grading and installation of utilities, to minimize erosion and to re-establish soil structure and fertility; revegetation must include non-invasive, drought-resistant, fast-growing vegetation that would quickly stabilize exposed ground surfaces; alternative materials rather than reseeding (e.g., gravel) may be used, upon approval by Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, and the Director of Public Works, or designee. c. Runoff must not be directed across exposed slopes; all surface runoff must be conveyed in accordance with the approved drainage plans; d. Energy dissipaters or similar devices must be installed at the end of drainpipe outlets to minimize erosion during storm events; e. Grading must occur during the dry season (April 15th to November 1st) unless the Public Works Director or designee, approved erosion control plan is in place and all erosion control measures are in effect; erosion control measures must be identified on an erosion control plan and must prevent runoff, erosion, and siltation; all exposed graded surfaces must be reseeded with ground cover vegetation to minimize erosion; graded surface must be	

		reseeded within four (4) weeks of grading completion, with the exception of surfaces graded for the placement of structures; these surfaces must be reseeded if construction of structures does not commence within four (4) weeks of grading completion. f. Site grading must be completed to ensure that permanent drainage away from foundations and slabs is provided and so that water must not pond near proposed structures or pavements. **Timing:** The final SWPPP must be submitted to Public Works Director, or designee, for review and approval before the City issues a ~~Land Use Permit for~~ grading permit. BMPs must be installed before initiation of grading as appropriate and maintained throughout the construction period. **Monitoring:** The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify that the SWPPP was implemented in accordance with the approved final plan and before commencement of grading. BMPs must be maintained by the Permittee throughout the construction period and monitored for compliance with the SWPPP by the Public Works Director, or designee, and Building Inspector.	
Surface and Stormwater Quality **Operations** **Impact WQ 2:** Would the Project introduce urban pollutants into stormwater runoff from the site during the post-construction phase or Results in a discharge of pollutants into an "impaired" water body that has been designated as such by the SWRCB or the CCRWQCB under Section 303(d) of the CWA? Post-development impacts to water quality may include introduction of urban pollutants into storm water runoff. The primary sources of such pollutants would be driveways and parking areas that may be coated with oil, grease, and other materials on the pavement surfaces and the discharge of liquid contaminants accumulating in uncovered or corroded trash enclosures. In addition, runoff from landscaped areas may	Potentially Significant	**WQ 2-1:** The Permittee must prepare an Operations and Maintenance Plan (Plan) that addresses maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with the stormwater quality protection/BMPs described in the final drainage/storm water quality protection plan. **Plan Requirements:** At a minimum, the Operations and Maintenance Plan must include requirements that all inline storm drain filters must be inspected, repaired, and cleaned per manufacturer specifications and these requirements must, at a minimum, occur before September 30th of each year. Additional inspections, repairs, and maintenance must be	Less Than Significant (Class II)

contain pesticides, herbicides, and other chemical compounds. Urban runoff may also contain pollutants that can escape primary treatment and enter Tecolotito Creek and flow into the Goleta Slough. Each of the Project's Plans must be reviewed and approved by the City to ensure full compliance with the MEP standard for water quality and the City's SWMP. Such compliance would reduce impacts to a less than significant level (**Class II**)		performed after storm events as needed throughout the rainy season (November 1st to April 15th) and/or per manufacturer specifications. Any necessary minor repairs must be completed before the next rainy season. Before September 30th of each year, the Permittee must have a report summarizing all inspections, repairs, and maintenance work done during the prior year available to submit to the City for its review and approval. **Timing**: The Permittee must submit the required Operations and Maintenance Plan to the Public Works Director, or designee, before the City issues building permits ~~before the City issues a LUP or final map recordation~~. **Monitoring:** The Public Works Director, or designee, must annually verify compliance with the provisions of the Operations and Maintenance Plan and must respond to instances of non-compliance with the agreement. **WQ 2-2:** The Permittee must prepare a Maintenance Agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, that addresses maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with the storm water quality protection/BMPs described in the final drainage/stormwater quality protection plan. **Plan Requirements:** At a minimum, the Maintenance Agreement must include requirements that all inline storm drain filters must be inspected, repaired, and cleaned per manufacturer specification and at a minimum before September 30th of each year. Additional inspections, repairs, and maintenance must be performed after storm events as needed throughout the rainy season (November 1st to April 15th) and/or per manufacturer specifications. Any necessary minor repairs	

Surface and Stormwater Quality **Operations** **Impact WQ 2:** Would the Project introduce urban pollutants into stormwater runoff from the site during the post-construction phase or Results in a discharge of pollutants into an "impaired" water body that has been designated as such by the SWRCB or the CCRWQCB under Section 303(d) of the CWA? Post-development impacts to water quality may include introduction of urban pollutants into storm water runoff. The primary sources of such pollutants would be driveways and parking areas that may be coated with oil, grease, and other materials on the pavement surfaces and the discharge of liquid contaminants accumulating in uncovered or corroded trash enclosures. In addition, runoff from landscaped areas may contain pesticides, herbicides, and other chemical compounds. Urban runoff may also contain pollutants that can escape primary treatment and enter Tecolotito Creek and flow into the Goleta Slough. Each of the Project's Plans must be reviewed and approved by the City to ensure full compliance with the MEP standard for water quality and the City's SWMP. Such compliance would reduce impacts to a less than significant level (**Class II**)	Potentially Significant	**WQ 2-1:** The Permittee must prepare an Operations and Maintenance Plan (Plan) that addresses maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with the stormwater quality protection/BMPs described in the final drainage/storm water quality protection plan. **Plan Requirements:** At a minimum, the Operations and Maintenance Plan must include requirements that all inline storm drain filters must be inspected, repaired, and cleaned per manufacturer specifications and these requirements must, at a minimum, occur before September 30th of each year. Additional inspections, repairs, and maintenance must be performed after storm events as needed throughout the rainy season (November 1st to April 15th) and/or per manufacturer specifications. Any necessary minor repairs must be completed before the next rainy season. Before September 30th of each year, the Permittee must have a report summarizing all inspections, repairs, and maintenance work done during the prior year available to submit to the City for its review and approval. **Timing**: The Permittee must submit the required Operations and Maintenance Plan to the Public Works Director, or designee, before the City issues building permits ~~before the City issues a LUP or final map recordation~~. **Monitoring:** The Public Works Director, or designee, must annually verify compliance with the provisions of the Operations and Maintenance Plan and must respond to instances of non-compliance with the agreement. **WQ 2-2:** The Permittee must prepare a Maintenance Agreement, in a form approved by the City	Less Than Significant (Class II)

Consistency with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan **Impact LU 2:** Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? A General Plan Amendment would be required to re-designate a small area of the residential site and a small area of the commercial site to allow for lot line adjustment and zone change needed to accommodate access and the proposed bicycle plan but neither revision will impact the size or type of proposed or existing development. The repeal of the Raytheon Specific Plan would eliminate the need for further amendment of a Planning document that is no longer needed to complete a cohesive development of the site consistent with the intent of the City's General Plan. The proposed uses are entirely consistent with the Land Use Element of the City Plan as amended as demonstrated in the analysis provided in Table 4.9-2 (General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Consistency Analysis). (**Class II**)	Potentially Significant	**LU 2**: Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the following EIR Sections would address potential consistency issues associated with the Project and General Plan policies: Section 4.1 Aesthetic Section 4.2 Air Quality Section 4.3 Biological Resources Section 4.4 Cultural Resources Section 4.5 Geology and Soils Section 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Section 4-7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials Section 4-8 Hydrology and Water Quality Section 4-9 Land Use and Planning Section 4.10 Noise Section 4.11 Public Facilities Section 4.13 Transportation and Traffic Section 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems	Less Than Significant (Class II)
Consistency with Zoning Ordinance – PRD **Impact LU 3:** Would the Project conform to the applicable provisions of the City's Inland Zoning Ordinance (IZO)? The Project requests a series of zone changes: 1. Residential component from combined DR-20 and PRD-275 to PRD-465 2. In the Residential component, a change of zone from DR and PRD-275 to M-RP (1.89 gross acres) 3. In the Business Park component, a change of zone from M-RP to PRD-465 (0.78 gross acre) Requested Zone Change No. 1 is consistent with the underlying Medium Density Residential General Plan Designation. The net residential density is 15 dwelling units per acre which, with the provision of affordable housing and the addition of appropriate concession for the housing is consistent with the Zoning Code and General Plan. Zone Changes Nos. 2 and 3 will be consistent with the Land Use designations on the affected parcels assuming approval of a pending General Plan Amendment being processed concurrent with the Project's entitlements. Therefore the	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)

Consistency with Zoning Ordinance – PRD **Impact LU 3:** Would the Project conform to the applicable provisions of the City's Inland Zoning Ordinance (IZO)? The Project requests a series of zone changes: 1. Residential component from combined DR-20 and PRD-275 to PRD-465 2. In the Residential component, a change of zone from DR and PRD-275 to M-RP (1.89 gross acres) 3. In the Business Park component, a change of zone from M-RP to PRD-465 (0.78 gross acre) Requested Zone Change No. 1 is consistent with the underlying Medium Density Residential General Plan Designation. The net residential density is 15 dwelling units per acre which, with the provision of affordable housing and the addition of appropriate concession for the housing is consistent with the Zoning Code and General Plan. Zone Changes Nos. 2 and 3 will be consistent with the Land Use designations on the affected parcels assuming approval of a pending General Plan Amendment being processed concurrent with the Project's entitlements. Therefore the changes of zone would have a less than significant impact as shown in Table 4.9-3 (Consistency with PRD Zone) (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Consistency with IZO Development Standards **Impact LU 4:** A parking analysis was performed for the Project that demonstrated that the Project's parking spaces exceed the number of parking spaces required by the IZO as shown in Table 4.9-4 (IZO Parking Requirements and Project Parking ~~even when discounting all on street parking~~. The impact is less than significant (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Consistency with Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Land Use Plan **Impact LU 5:** Given the location of the Project within the Santa Barbara County Airport's Airport Influence area the potential hazards from low-altitude aircraft over-flights is considered potentially significant unless an avigation easement is provided (Class II). Noise impacts due to airport operations would be less than significant as demonstrated in Section 4.10 Noise (Class II)	Potentially Significant	**LU 5-1:** The Permittee must execute and record a deed restriction, in a form approved by the City Attorney, that acknowledges and assumes responsibility for airport safety risks; waives any future claims of damage or liability against the City; and agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City against any and all liability, claims, damages, and/or expenses arising from	Less Than Significant (Class II)

Noise			
Project Generated Noise **Impact N-1**: Would the Project generate noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL that could affect sensitive receptors? <u>Construction Period Noise</u> Noise levels from heavy equipment used for earth moving during construction typically range from 80-90 dBA at distances of 50 feet. An assumption of 95 dBA at 50 feet is used in the Goleta Guidelines to define areas of potential impact. Based on this assumption, any sensitive receptor, such as residences within 1,600 feet of a construction site, may be subject to significant noise impacts. The nearest sensitive receptor site would be the Willow Springs apartments, located southeast of the Project site, north of Hollister Avenue, and east of Los Carneros Road. The distance between the southeastern corner of the Project site and the nearest existing residences would be approximately 550 feet. The peak construction equipment noise, based on the Goleta Guidelines, could reach 95 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. This noise level would decay to 74 dBA over a direct path of 550 feet, which is the shortest distance measured to the nearest existing apartment. This noise level would be further reduced by the presence of an existing earthen stockpile located between the Project site and the nearest residences, which would attenuate the noise levels by redirecting and partially absorbing the sound waves. The barrier attenuation provided by the intervening stockpile was calculated in terms of the path length difference for a direct sound wave versus a sound wave refracted over the top of the earthen mound. Including 3 dB enhanced reduction due to absorption by the earthen berm (compared to a less effective solid wall construction) the presence of the intervening stockpile would sufficiently reduce construction equipment noise levels at the closest residence to below the significance threshold, even during maximum activity along the Project site's eastern perimeter so that impacts would be less than significant (**Class III**). <u>Operational Noise – Project Traffic Noise Generation</u>	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)

The Project would generate a total of 2,902 daily vehicle trips that would be added to the existing traffic volumes on the local roadway system. At each turning opportunity, the Project contribution to the total traffic volume would be progressively diluted, along with the potential to contribute to noise levels. The maximum Project-related noise contribution to any roadway is 0.2 dB CNEL at 50 feet from the roadway centerline, well below the 65 dBA-evaluated threshold for this impact. As such Project-related traffic noise impacts are diluted and are not expected to be detectable (**Class III**).			
Residential Units Noise Exposure **Impact N-2:** Would outdoor living areas be subject to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL, or indoor areas be subject to noise levels of 45 dBA CNEL or greater? <u>Outdoor Noise Exposure</u> The General Plan provides noise contours associated with the UPRR/US Highway 101 corridor that incorporates the levels of freight train operations reported in the GP/CLUP. Project site structures located along the perimeter would perform as a de facto sound wall that will reduce the noise penetration into the site. However, proposed residential units along the perimeter of the site could be exposed to noise levels greater than 65 dB, particularly for upper story residential units <u>located in proximity to the corridor even with buildings absorbing or deflecting sound</u>. Noise generated from the UPRR/U.S. Highway 101 corridor along the northern boundary, could expose the upper floors of most of the two-story alley-loaded homes, and many of the two-story triplex, fourplex and townhome buildings to 70 dB, while portions of the two-story two-pac homes and two-story fourplex buildings along the northern perimeter could be exposed to 75 dB. The three-story apartments could be exposed to UPRR/U.S. Highway 101 corridor noise levels above 65 dB. Accordingly, additional noise reduction measures may be required for all residential units that are not shielded from U.S. 101/UPRR noise by the elevation differential, noise wall, or other buildings or due to their interior location within a building. Noise generated from Los Carneros Road could expose proposed residential units to noise levels between 65 and 70 dB. Specifically, the 65 dB contour could extend into the	Potentially Significant	**N 2-1:** Residential outdoor living space (e.g., patios and balconies) associated with residential units located within the 65 dBA CNEL and with a line of sight to the US 101/UPRR ROW, must be protected from sound intrusion so that they meet the City's standard of 65 dBA CNEL for outdoor living spaces. Protective measures may consist of, without limitation, installation of glass, Plexiglas, wood, or metal sound attenuation barriers along the perimeter of outdoor living spaces for those residential units. The sound attenuation barriers must be of a size and material to adequately mitigate this impact as determined by an acoustical study to be performed to determine Project specific requirements for each proposed residential building. Failure to conclusively demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed noise attenuation measures shall result in the denial of a permit to build the affected unit **Plan Requirements and Timing:** These requirements must be incorporated into all construction documents submitted for approval before the City <u>issues a building permit</u> ~~a Land Use Permit~~ for the residential units located within the 75 <u>to</u> 65 dBA CNEL and with a line of sight to the ~~U.S. 101~~/ UPRR<u>/</u>U.S. Highway 101 corridor. **<u>Monitoring</u>:** The Planning and Environmental ~~Services~~ <u>Review</u> Director, or designee, must verify compliance before ~~the issuance of a Land~~	Less Than Significant (Class II)

southernmost units of the Podium Flat building near the southern boundary of the Project site. Similarly, the 65 dB contour could extend into portions of the apartments along the site's eastern boundary. Mitigation would be required to reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level (**Class II**). Indoor Noise Exposure State standards require an acoustical analysis for all multi-family units located in areas where the Ldn exceeds 60 dBA, in order to demonstrate that the interior standard of 45 dBA Ldn will be met. Therefore, a detailed acoustical analysis will be required to determine precise noise exposures levels for each of the residential units constructed pursuant to Project mitigation measures. It can reasonably be predicted that an exterior Ldn of 65 dBA will be reduced to an interior Ldn of 45 dBA using basic construction techniques and materials, with closed windows. Use of dual-paned windows, which is now required for residential construction by the California Building Code for energy conservation, would also provide additional noise attenuation to reduce interior noise. However, an acoustical study must be prepared that demonstrates the effectiveness of these noise attenuation measures before a definitive finding of less than significant with mitigation finding can be made (**Class II**).		~~Use Permit~~ the City issues a building permit for the residential units located within the 65 dBA CNEL and with a line of sight to the UPRR/U.S. Highway 101 corridor. The City building inspectors must verify compliance in the field before ~~issuance of~~ the City issues a certificate of occupancy for an affected unit. No certificate of occupancy shall be issued unless compliance is achieved.	
Impact N-3: Would the Project substantially increase the ambient noise levels for sensitive receptors in adjoining areas? A threshold of 3 dB is commonly used to define "substantial increase." Increases of +3.0 dB require a doubling of traffic volumes on already noise-impacted roadways. The Project would add a maximum of 0.6 dB of noise at 50 feet from the nearest intersection with adjacent sensitive receptors. Peak hour Project traffic would not create a zone of noise incompatibility, or create any clearly perceptible noise increase, a less than significant impact (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Impact N-4: Would the Project result in grading or construction activity within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors, including schools, residential development, commercial lodging facilities, hospitals or care facilities outside of the hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. or on weekends? The City GP/CLUP includes a Policy NE 6.4, Restrictions on construction hours, which is required as a condition of	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)

approval for any land use permit or other planning permit and compliance would result in a less than significant impact (**Class III**)			
Vibration **Impact V-1**: Would the Project expose residential units to vibration generated along the UPPR? Vibration levels would be below the structural damage threshold of 100 VdB. Passenger trains would not result in vibration impacts that would exceed significance for infrequent events. However, ground floor residences nearest the UPRR would experience freight train vibration levels above the threshold of annoyance due to infrequent events of 80 VdB, based on the default vibration estimations. However, a vibration assessment analyzing the effectiveness of design features would be required to demonstrate a less than significant impact (**Class II**)	~~Significant and Unavoidable~~ Potentially Significant	**V 1-1:** Residences with foundations within 70 feet of the UPRR track centerline must be designed with vibration mitigating features incorporated into the construction documents. The Permittee must provide a vibration assessment, prepared by a qualified consultant. The vibration assessment must include a survey of existing vibration to characterize the rms vertical velocity level as a function of distance from the tracks and evaluate the effectiveness of the final design to mitigate vibration to below 80-VdB. Possible design features to reduce vibration impacts to below 80-VdB could include supporting the building foundation on elastomer pads or installing trenches between the rail line and the foundation of the new residences. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The vibration mitigating features must be incorporated into all construction documents submitted for approval before the City issues building permits ~~the issuance of Land Use Permits~~ for the residential units located within 70 feet of the UPRR track centerline. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must verify compliance with this requirement before the City issues ~~issuance of Land Use Permits of~~ building permits for the residential units located within 70 feet of the UPRR track centerline. **V 1-2:** The Permittee must provide a rail line real-estate disclosure to potential buyers and occupants within the Project site informing of site proximity to the Union Pacific Railroad and that associated noise and vibration may be perceptible.	~~Significant and Unavoidable (Class I)~~ Less Than Significant (Class II)

		Plan Requirements and Timing: The Permittee must provide a draft copy of the real-estate disclosure including information of the rail line and associated noise and vibration to the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, and the City Attorney for review and approval. This disclosure must be accompanied by a plan for keeping the notification documents updated and distributed by facility property management to tenants upon signing of lease agreements and to future owners upon sale of the units. The disclosure must be included in the Project CC&Rs, which must be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney before recordation of the final map. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director must verify compliance with this requirement before final map recordation.	
Public Services – Fire Protection			
Fire Protection Service Population Ratio **Impact PS 1:** Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable levels of service or performance objectives? The Project's residential population would add to the population already served by Fire Station 14. The 5-minute response guideline would continue to be met. In the event that Fire Station 14 requires backup, other available engine companies would respond via static and/or dynamic deployment. Fire protection would also require the provision of adequate onsite fire protection facilities. The Fire Protection District ~~Department~~ would require defensible space, serviceable access, adequate fire hydrants, adequate building addressing, adequate interior fire sprinkler system, adequate fire or emergency alarm system, and approved locking systems for any gated access ways, among other standard conditions, resulting in a less than significant impact (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Wildland Fire Protection	Potentially Significant	**PS 1-1:**	Less Than Significant

Impact PS-2: Would the Project 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? The Fire Protection District ~~Department~~ has completed a preliminary review of the Project site plans for adequate fire protection design in 2011 and determined at that time that the emergency vehicle access improvements shown on the plans meet Departmental access standards. A "defensible space" of 100 feet around proposed structures or to the property line is required. However, the District will not require fuel modification that will have adverse effects on sensitive natural communities identified by the ESHA, Creeks, and Riparian policies of the City's General Plan, which includes the entirety of the Tecolotito Creek ESHA and upland SPA buffers and the upland buffer associated with the unnamed tributary in Lot 7. Further, mitigation measures designed to protect habitat values in the SPA upland buffers discourage dead wooding in the upland buffers because of the value of these elements to wildlife. Because the District ~~Department~~ does not require fuel modification for areas within ESHA or Streamside Protection Areas (SPA), this is a potentially significant impact. However, with appropriate mitigation as determined by the Fire Protection District's review of current plans, potentially significant wildland/urban interface fire hazard can be reduced to a less than significant level (**Class II**)		Compliance with Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District (SBCFD) Conditions Letter dated April 16, 2012. The Permittee must ensure that all work must stop immediately and must contact the SBCFD, Hazardous Materials Unit if visual contamination or chemical odors are detected during any grading and/or construction activities. Grading and/or construction activities must not resume ~~until~~ without approval from the SBCFD, Hazardous Materials Unit. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues any building permit: a. A Fire Protection Certificate will be required for each phase of the Project. Before the Permittee constructs any structure: b. All access ways (public and private, road and driveways) must be installed and made serviceable and maintained for the life of the Project. • Access must be as shown on plans dated April 2, 2012, received April 9, 2012. • Access to this Project must conform to Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District ~~Department~~ Development Standard #1. • Access ways must be unobstructed and extended to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of any building. c. Signs indicating "Fire Lane – No Parking" must be placed every 150 feet or as required by the Fire Protection District ~~fire department~~. d. Fire hydrants must be installed pursuant to the SBCFD's requirements. Fire hydrants must be located per District ~~Department~~ specifications and must flow 1250/750 gallons per minute at a 20 psi residual pressure. Plans	(Class II)

		must be approved by the ~~fire department~~ Fire Protection District before installation. e. Road names are required for this Project. f. The Fire Protection District ~~Department shall~~ must review the SPA upland buffer plans for the Tecolotitio and unnamed tributary ESHAs and make recommendations as to plant materials that will meet non-invasive requirements but will also be fire retardant or resistant. District ~~Department~~ will also review all architectural, landscape and fencing plans for all residential units to be constructed adjacent to the SPA upland buffer and may require changes to those plans that will better address the wildland/urban interface issues. These changes may include, but are not limited to, the use of solid block walls between the single family homes and the upland buffer, forbidding construction of patio covers in the back yards of single family homes constructed of flammable materials such as cloth awnings or wood, such other measures and the ~~Department~~ District deems necessary to reduce fire danger in the absence of fuel modification activity in the upland buffers adjacent to these structures. Before the City issues a certificate of occupancy: g. Interior automatic fire sprinkler system requirements must be met. h. Automatic fire or emergency alarm system requirements must be met. i. Recorded addresses must be issued as required by Fire Protection District ~~department.~~ The District ~~fire department~~ must determine and assign all address numbers and must issue such numbers to property owners and occupants. j. Building address numbers must be posted as required by Fire Protection District ~~Department~~. k. Access way entrance gates must conform to Fire Protection District ~~department~~ standards. l. Payment of development impact fees to the City is required. The fees must be computed on	

Wildland Fire Protection **Impact PS-2:** Would the Project 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? The Fire Protection District ~~Department~~ has completed a preliminary review of the Project site plans for adequate fire protection design in 2011 and determined at that time that the emergency vehicle access improvements shown on the plans meet Departmental access standards. A "defensible space" of 100 feet around proposed structures or to the property line is required. However, the District will not require fuel modification that will have adverse effects on sensitive natural communities identified by the ESHA, Creeks, and Riparian policies of the City's General Plan, which includes the entirety of the Tecolotito Creek ESHA and upland SPA buffers and the upland buffer associated with the unnamed tributary in Lot 7. Further, mitigation measures designed to protect habitat values in the SPA upland buffers discourage dead wooding in the upland buffers because of the value of these elements to wildlife. Because the District ~~Department~~ does not require fuel modification for areas within ESHA or Streamside Protection Areas (SPA), this is a potentially significant impact. However, with appropriate mitigation as determined by the Fire Protection District's review of current plans, potentially significant wildland/urban interface fire hazard can be reduced to a less than significant level (**Class II**)	Potentially Significant	**PS 1-1:** Compliance with Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District (SBCFD) Conditions Letter dated April 16, 2012. The Permittee must ensure that all work must stop immediately and must contact the SBCFD, Hazardous Materials Unit if visual contamination or chemical odors are detected during any grading and/or construction activities. Grading and/or construction activities must not resume ~~until~~ without approval from the SBCFD, Hazardous Materials Unit. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues any building permit: a. A Fire Protection Certificate will be required for each phase of the Project. Before the Permittee constructs any structure: b. All access ways (public and private, road and driveways) must be installed and made serviceable and maintained for the life of the Project. • Access must be as shown on plans dated April 2, 2012, received April 9, 2012. • Access to this Project must conform to Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District ~~Department~~ Development Standard #1. • Access ways must be unobstructed and extended to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of any building. c. Signs indicating "Fire Lane – No Parking" must be placed every 150 feet or as required by the Fire Protection District ~~fire department~~.	Less Than Significant (Class II)

Public Services - Libraries **Impact PS-4a**: Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable levels of service or performance objectives? The number of volumes of material available to the Goleta branch library would be adequate to serve the needs of Project residents without the need to provide new facilities.	Less Than Significant	**No mitigation required.**	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Public Services - Public Schools **Impact PS 4b**: Would the Project generate enough students to result in the need for an additional classroom using current State standards (Grade K-2, 20 students per classroom; Grades 3 -8, 29 students per classroom; Grades 9 – 12, 28 students per classroom)? The number of students generated by the proposed Project in all grade levels would not exceed the existing capacity or generate the need for additional classrooms at schools within the school districts that would serve the Project. Further, the Project would be required to pay school facilities impact fees imposed by the affected districts. Payment of these fees fully mitigates any potential impacts of the Project on school facilities under State law (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	**No mitigation required.**	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Recreation			
Impact REC 1: Would the Project's residential population increase the use of existing facilities and create additional demand for recreational facilities in the City of Goleta such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? The Project would meet most of its resident's recreational demand on-site through the provision of private facilities. The Project would increase use of existing public recreation facilities for active and passive recreation. The City currently has a sufficient supply of public passive open space within the City to meet existing demand as well as the demand generated by the Project. However, the current supply of public active recreational land in the City is considered insufficient.	Potentially Significant	**Rec 1-1:** The Permittee ~~applicant~~ must provide the following improvements to the 1.75 acres of active Neighborhood Park area within the Village at Los Carneros Park site: a. paved pathways; and b. benches. • No pets will be permitted in the Neighborhood Park. • The perimeter of the active Neighborhood Park area must be fenced with five-foot high fencing consisting of a 2-foot high block wall	Less Than Significant (Class II)

The Project would provide a total of approximately 4.6 acres of combined private and public active recreational area, which would result in a ratio of 3.83 acres of active recreation area provided per thousand Project residents, which is less than the City's adopted goal of providing 4.7 acres of parkland per thousand residents. Therefore, the Project's population of 1,209 residents would add to the deficiency, even though the Project would increase the active recreational facilities by 4.6 acres, available to the public by with 2.56 acres available to the public. By providing on-site active recreational facilities in combination with the required payment of development impact fees, which would be used to fund additional public park facilities, the Project would meet legal requirements for public recreational facilities. Accordingly, the Project would not result in a substantial demand for active park facilities that would cause physical deterioration of existing public facilities and impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level (Class II).		with a 3-foot high post and rail fence or powder coated wrought iron on top. If post and rail fence is selected, it must be constructed of concrete with factory-applied powder color that does not require repainting. All fencing must be set outside of the ~~riparian corridor and~~ upland setback areas (SPA) of the ~~riparian corridors of~~ Tecolotito Creek and its unnamed tributary. • No lighting will be permitted. • Maintenance personnel must ~~police~~ monitor the active park area once a week to remove any trash and debris from the park site. • Use of the ~~Los Carneros Park~~ Neighborhood Park will be prohibited after 6 p.m. or sundown, whichever occurs first. • All grasses and plant materials installed in the Los Carneros Park neighborhood park must be drought tolerant, non-invasive native species compatible with the adjacent SPA riparian corridors. The ~~Irrigation for~~ Neighborhood Park landscape irrigation system must include a controller that is ~~be~~ a high water efficient system and must be controlled by a controller accessible to maintenance personnel from within the Project area. Sprinkler heads must be directed away from the ~~riparian corridors~~ SPA open space adjacent to the Neighborhood Park site. The active portion of the Neighborhood Park must be maintained by the HOA. **Project Requirements and Timing:** Plans for the proposed improvement of the 1.75-acre	

		active Neighborhood Park area, inclusive of the improvements outlined above, must be incorporated into the Project's landscape plans and must include cut sheets and specifications for all irrigation system components. The Project's landscape plans, cut sheets, and specifications must be submitted to the City's Planning and Environmental Review Director for review and approval before the ~~issuance of any LUP~~ City issues any permits. A maintenance agreement and performance security in form and amount acceptable to the City Attorney must be filed with the City before the City issues any grading permits. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, will inspect the site upon notification of completion of the park improvements and periodically thereafter to ensure that all improvements are installed pursuant to this condition and maintained in good condition over the course of the maintenance period.	
Impact REC 2: Would the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? The proposed Project includes the provision of approximately 1.75 acres of active Neighborhood Park facilities located between two ESHA/SPA areas. Access to the Neighborhood Park site can only be gained through a bicycle/pedestrian path that must be constructed through the Tecolotito Creek SPA ~~riparian corridor~~ from the Tecolotito Creek maintenance road. There is no direct access to the Neighborhood Park through the Project itself. The construction of the access pathway through the ~~riparian corridor~~ SPA would result in adverse physical effects on the ~~riparian corridor~~, SPA, which would ~~need to be fully mitigated~~ require mitigation. ~~It would also increase potential for human access to the protected corridor, which would require mitigation.~~ Unless the active uses of the Neighborhood Park were limited to those types of active uses that would avoid the SPAs and the unnamed tributary, use of	Potentially Significant	**Rec 2-1:** A pathway accessible to pedestrians and bicycles must be constructed between the Tecolotito Creek Maintenance Road and the active Neighborhood Park area to provide access. • All impacts associated with the provision of this pathway, whether direct or indirect, temporary or permanent, must be mitigated for pursuant to the requirements of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife as a condition of its 1602 Agreement. • All mitigations must be installed within one year of the date of the execution of the 1602 Agreement. • The access path must be fenced on both sides by 4-foot tall post and beam	Less Than Significant (Class II)

the proposed site for active recreation could have an adverse physical effect on the environment. With mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level (**Class II**).		fencing or as required by the CDFW to prevent unauthorized access to the balance of the SPA ~~riparian corridor~~. • ~~Lighting must not be installed.~~ No lights may be installed. • The HOA is responsible for the cost of maintaining the pathway including weekly policing of the pathway for the removal of trash and debris. **Project Requirements and Timing**: Plans for the proposed improvement of the pathway access through the ~~riparian corridor~~ SPAs to the active Neighborhood Park, inclusive of the improvements outlined above, must be included as part of the Project's landscape plans, including design of the perimeter fencing. The Project's landscape plans must be submitted to the City's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval ~~prior to the issuance of any LUP~~ before the City issues any permits. A maintenance agreement and performance security in form and amount acceptable to the City Attorney must be filed with the City ~~prior to~~ before the City issues ~~issuance of~~ any grading permits. **Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must should inspect the pathway upon notification of completion of the park improvements and periodically thereafter to ensure that all improvements are installed pursuant to this condition and maintained in good condition.	
Recreation Cumulative Impacts **Impact REC 3**: Would the Project's residential population contribute to cumulative population growth and an associated cumulative increase the demand for recreational facilities in the City of Goleta? Upon build-out of the General Plan, the available active recreation ratio would be reduced from 3 acres per thousand residents to approximately 2.85 acres per thousand residents. The Project's population would result in a contribution to this	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 1-1 and 2-1 listed above, in addition to payment of development fees to the City as required by Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 16.14 for the purpose of acquiring and developing active recreation facilities, would reduce the significance of these impacts.	Less Than Significant (Class II)

cumulative impact. However, in addition to developing onsite public and private active recreational facilities, the Project would also be required to pay its prorated share of the cost of acquiring and developing sufficient active park area to satisfy the cumulative demand pursuant to the requirements of the Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 16.14 with the required payment of park and recreation fees as per Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 16.4 would be used to fund public park facilities.			
Traffic and Parking			
Line of Sight Safety Impact **TR 1:** Would the Project's access to a major road or arterial require a driveway that would create an unsafe situation? <u>Village Way / Los Carneros Road Line-of-Sight</u>: A sight distance analysis was conducted to determine the adequacy of the lines of sight associated with the subject driveway, focusing on both westbound approach on Los Carneros Road (stopping sight distance) and on vehicles exiting the site turning right onto Los Carneros Road (intersection sight distance). The study found that a minimum line-of-sight distance of 480 feet is required for a motorist attempting to make a right turn onto Los Carneros Road when stopped at 18 feet behind the curb-line. The Project does not include any permanent structures on this corner that could block the line-of-sight. However, the right-of-way on the east corner of this intersection would contain landscaping that could reach a height sufficient to interfere with visibility unless mitigated by limiting landscape at this location to vegetation that would not top 36 inches in height at maturity. With this mitigation, the Project impact would be reduced to a less than significant level (**Class II**). <u>Internal Circulation</u>: Village Way is a private drive that would serve as the backbone of the Project's internal circulation system, providing one lane in each direction, with on street parking allowed at various locations. Internally, full vehicular access (i.e., both left and right-turn ingress and egress) will be accommodated at the Project's driveways intersecting with Village Way. The recommended speed limit on Village Way would be 15 miles per hour for pedestrian safety. With other mitigation measures including striping, speed bumps at key locations if needed, and	Potentially Significant	**TR 1-1:** For all Project driveways along Village Way internal to the Project site, and the Village Way/Los Carneros intersection, adequate corner sight distance and stopping sight distance must be provided as specified in the City Engineering Design Standards adopted by the City Council in 2002. To achieve adequate corner sight distances for in-Project driveways and the Los Carneros Road/Village Way intersection the Project will be required to: a. Landscaping design must ensure that plant materials specified and installed at the Los Carneros Road/Village Way intersection do not exceed a height a 36 inches when mature for the distance shown in the in TIA Figure A-1. This will be achieved by restricting plant materials in this location to ground cover and dwarf shrubs such that a clear line-of-sight for a minimum intersection sight distance of 480 feet is maintained. There must be no monument signage, trees, utility infrastructure or other feature in excess of 36 inches in height must be placed within the line of sight restricted area. b. Unless otherwise approved and posted, the speed limit of 15 miles per hour must be enforced on Village Way. The <u>Permittee</u> ~~developer~~ must post signage, paint the speed limit on the paved street at intervals and, if needed as determined by the City's Traffic Engineer, install speed bumps to help maintain this speed limit to ensure pedestrian safety. Stop signs facing driveways entering into	Less Than Significant (Class II)

adequate sight distance at T intersections, the potential impacts associated with internal circulation and pedestrian safety could be reduced to a less than significant level (**Class II**).		Village Way must be installed where more than one dwelling unit is served by a driveway. Where necessary due to road curvature or other condition such as building placement, landscape is limited to a height of 36 inches and convex mirrors must be installed at the driveway intersection as an aid to drivers turning onto Village Way. Village Way must be stripped for crosswalks were needed to for pedestrian access. Handicapped crossings must be striped where needed if handicapped accessible parking spaces are not located adjacent to a curb. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the final map may be recorded, the detailed design plans for all internal roadways together with detailed landscape and utility plans must be submitted to the City's Director of Planning and Environmental Services, the City Engineer, and City Traffic Engineer for review and approval. The plans must be prepared in accordance with City standards and include compliance with these mitigation measures. The City Traffic Engineer or Public Works Director or designee may require additional mitigations if needed to ensure that adequate site distance is provided both internal to the Project and at the Village Way/Los Carneros Road intersection and that all reasonable measures needed to ensure pedestrian safety, including the maintenance of a 15 MPH speed limit, are undertaken. **Monitoring:** The Public Works Director, or designee, must approve the ~~applicant's~~ Permittee's roadway design and the Public Works Director together with the Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, must approve the detailed landscape plan before the final map may be recorded for the Project and must ensure adequate performance of these improvements before the City issues any certificate of occupancy.	

Roadway Segment Impacts **Impact TR 2**: Would the Project increase traffic volumes on local roadway segments by more than 1.0 percent in either the Project or cumulative condition on roadways where plus Project traffic would exceed the Acceptable Capacity or are forecast to exceed the Acceptable Capacity under cumulative conditions? The two-lane segment of Los Carneros Road south of Hollister Avenue currently carries 15,193 vehicles per day (vpd), which exceeds the City's Acceptable Capacity standard (i.e., LOS C) under existing conditions. Los Carneros Road, south of Hollister Avenue, was widened to four lanes subsequent to the preparation of the Project's TIA. This widening has addressed the previously existing exceedance of the capacity standards. Incremental but less than significant impacts are noted at the remaining ten study roadway segments as a result of the Project. However, the Project will be required to contribute its fair share of the cost of street widening from which it will benefit and which is responsible for reducing the Project's impact to a less than significant level (**Class II**).	Potentially Significant	**TR 2-1:** The Permittee must ~~construct or~~ monetarily contribute ~~to~~ the Project's pro rata share of the cost of the road widening improvements from 2-lanes to 4-lanes of the roadway segment of Los Carneros Road south of Hollister Avenue. The road widening has already been completed. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The Permittee must pay a traffic impact fee before the final map may be recorded. **Monitoring:** The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify that payment of this fee has been made before recordation of the Final Map.	Less Than Significant (Class II)
Intersection Operations Impacts **Impact TR 3:** Would the Project utilize a substantial portion of a study area intersection's capacity where the intersection is currently operating at an acceptable LOS but with cumulative traffic would degrade to or approach LOS D based on the City's definition of "substantial" as stated in its Threshold #4? Growth in overall traffic volumes due to the Project is anticipated to incrementally increase the v/c ratios and delay values at the study intersections. However, all 20 intersections in the study area are expected to continue operating at LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak hours with the addition of the Project-generated traffic. Incremental but less than significant impacts are noted at the study intersections (**Class III**). Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis The Project's incremental increase in traffic at Study Intersections impacts does create a signal warrant condition for any intersection where such conditions do not already exist; a less than significant impact (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)

Castilian Drive/Cortona Drive Intersection The TIA includes an evaluation of the Castilian Drive/Cortona Drive intersection to determine if traffic control devices may be needed at this location. The minimum thresholds for Warrant No. 3 (peak hour) are not satisfied and this intersection is forecast to continue to operate at LOS C or better; a less than significant impact (**Class III**). Vehicle Queuing at the Los Carneros Road/Calle Koral Intersection A vehicle queuing analysis was prepared as part of the TIA for the Los Carneros Road/Calle Koral intersection to evaluate the Project's potential impacts to vehicle queues and storage requirements. The Project's contribution to existing traffic will not result in an exceedance of the holding capacity of left-turn storage area, a less than significant impact (**Class III**).			
Congestion Management Program (CMP) Impacts **Impact TR 4**: Would the Project add to traffic volumes along US Highway 101 in excess of CMP threshold criteria? A CMP impact assessment was prepared to identify potential project impacts on the designated CMP roadway system. The analysis indicates that the Project will not create any significant impacts at any of the freeway segment locations or CMP intersections. Only incremental but less than significant impacts are noted (**Class III**)	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Intersection Impacts **Impact TR 5:** Would the Project add to traffic volumes at CMP intersections in excess of CMP significance thresholds? The Project would create incremental but less than significant impacts at the CMP study intersections (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Cumulative Impacts on Roadway Segments **Impact TR 6:** Would Project-generated traffic volumes result in significant cumulative impacts on any study area roadway segments based on the City's significance criteria? The two-lane segment of Los Carneros road south of Hollister Avenue is forecast to exceed the Acceptable Capacity standard under both the Cumulative Without Project and Cumulative With Project conditions. Project-related traffic would increase volume on this segment by 1.9 percent, which exceeds the City's 1.0 percent impact	Potentially Significant	**TR 6-1:** Mitigation Measure TR 2-1 would also mitigate the Project's cumulative contribution impact on the Los Carneros Road south of Hollister Avenue segment.	Less Than Significant (Class II)

threshold. However, with the widening of Los Carneros Road south of Hollister Avenue, completed in 2013, the Project's impact has been reduced to a less than significant level (**Class II**).			
Cumulative Impacts on Intersection Operations **Impact TR 7:** Would Project-generated traffic volumes result in significant cumulative traffic impacts at study area intersections based on the City's significance threshold criteria? Project-generated traffic volumes would result in significant cumulative traffic impacts at the following intersections: • Cortona Drive/Hollister Avenue • Los Carneros Road/U.S. 101 Southbound Ramps • Los Carneros Road/Calle Koral Incremental, but less than significant project contribution to cumulative traffic impacts are noted at the remaining 16 study intersections. Coromar Drive/Hollister Avenue Intersection Subsequent to the completion of the Project's TIA a signal was installed at the Coromar Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection as a project-specific mitigation measure associated with the approved Cabrillo Business Park. However, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts at this location would be considerable and potentially significant. Mitigation measures consisting of specific improvements at each of the three intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse with Cumulative Plus Project conditions, and a requirement that the Project contribute its fair share of the cost of the recently installed traffic signal at Coromar Drive/Hollister Avenue would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative effects to less than cumulatively considerable (**Class II**). Cortona Drive/Hollister Avenue Based on the Supplemental Traffic Analysis prepared for the Project on March 31, 2014, the recent installation of the Coromar/Hollister intersection has produced an increase in gaps in traffic flow on Hollister Avenue approaching Cortona Drive. The Supplemental Analysis concluded that the relatively low forecast southbound cumulative left turn volume	Potentially Significant	**TR 7-1:** The southbound approach to Hollister Avenue on Cortona Drive shall be restriped to provide one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane. This improvement can be accommodated within the existing Cortona Drive roadway width. In addition, an existing two-way left-turn painted median on Hollister Avenue that begins at the Cortona Drive intersection and extends easterly, shall be restriped to provide a formal refuge area for southbound left-turn movement onto Hollister Avenue where a motorist may wait for an appropriate gap in eastbound traffic before entering the travel lanes. This minor painted median restriping can be accommodated within the existing Hollister Avenue roadway width. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The design of the restriping ~~traffic signal~~ improvements must be reviewed and approved by the Director of Public Works, or designee, before the final map may be recorded. Before the City issues the first certificate of occupancy, the Permittee ~~Project developer must post a performance security, in a form approved by the City Attorney, and~~ must implement ~~construct~~ said improvements in accordance with approved plans. **Monitoring:** The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify implementation of the restriping improvements consistent with the approved plans. ~~Agreement and/or applicable fees.~~ **TR 7-2:** The Permittee must monetarily contribute the Project's pro rata share of the cost of the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection	Less Than Significant (Class II)

at this intersection as well as the additional gaps in Hollister Avenue traffic flow due to the new Hollister/Coromar signal, an additional traffic signal at the Cortona Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection is no longer recommended. Implementation of intersection improvements would reduce cumulative impacts at Cortona Drive/Hollister Avenue that would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impact at this intersection to less than cumulatively considerable (**Class II).** **Castilian Drive/Cortona Drive Intersection** The TIA concluded that the existing two way stop sign would remain adequate to control traffic at the Castilian Drive/Cortona Drive intersection in the cumulative plus Project condition (**Class III**) Cumulative Vehicle Queuing Los Carneros Road/Calle Koral Intersection The available left-turn storage provided at the Los Carneros Road/Calle Koral intersection approaches are anticipated to accommodate the respective forecast 95th percentile vehicle queues in the cumulative plus Project condition and the contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable (**Class III**). Roundabout Review for Los Carneros Road/Calle Real Intersection This intersection is expected to operate at better overall delays and corresponding LOS under the roundabout configuration than with the all-way stop controlled operation. Therefore, use of the more conservative all-way stop control methodology in evaluation of potential Existing Plus Project and Cumulative Plus Project impacts for this intersection, as analyzed in the TIA would be appropriate. The Project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts at this intersection would be reduced under the roundabout traffic control condition and the Project's contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable (**Class III**).		of Coromar Drive/Hollister Avenue, which has already been installed. Project-specific mitigation measures are conditioned for the approved Cabrillo Business Park project, consisting of the addition of a traffic signal at the Coromar Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection as identified in Development Plan conditions of approval for that project. Because these traffic improvements have been implemented before this Project has obtained a certificate of occupancy, the Permittee will be required to pay its fair-share contribution of the cost incurred before recording ~~recordation of~~ the final map. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Before the City permits recordation of the Project's final map ~~a final map for the Project~~, the Permittee ~~project developer~~ must pay the Project's pro rata share of the cost of these improvements pursuant to any applicable Reimbursement Agreement **Monitoring:** When the Permittee ~~Project developer~~ pays its monetary contribution for the Coromar Drive/Hollister Avenue intersection signal improvements the Public Works Director, or designee, must verify that the ~~such~~ payment was consistent with the Agreement ~~or applicable GTIP fees.~~ **TR 7-3:** The City's Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) includes an improvement project to add a separate northbound right-turn on Los Carneros Road at the intersection of Los Carneros Road / US Highway 101 Southbound On-Ramp. This improvement is currently being designed under the direction of the City Public Works Department. Based on the Los Carneros Overhead Bridge Replacement Project Traffic Study, this improvement would create an operational LOS C for operations at this intersection, including Cumulative Plus Project volumes.	

		The Project would be subject by ordinance to pay~~ment of~~ pay Development Impact Fees (DIFs) adopted for the purpose ensuring that development pays its fair share of the cost of transportation improvements associated with cumulative development from which it would benefit. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** Fees must be paid before the final map ~~may be~~ is recorded or the City issues any permit ~~a LUP~~ for the Project, whichever comes first. **Monitoring:** The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify payment of the Project's DIF fees before the final map is recorded. **TR 7-4:** The Permittee must ~~construct or~~ monetarily contribute to the construction of provide for an the additional northbound through lane along Los Carneros Road. The northbound through lane must be constructed from approximately 350 feet south of the Los Carneros/Calle Koral intersection to align with the existing right turn lane north of the intersection. Full improvements for a northbound through lane are required as a mitigation measure for traffic impacts associated with the Cabrillo Business Park project (at the project level) and with the Village at Los Carneros Project (at the cumulative level) and identified as Development Plan conditions of approval in the EIRs for each respective project. The Village at Los Carneros Permittee ~~applicant~~ must pay the Project's fair-share contribution to the developer of the Los Carneros northbound through lane improvements in accordance with any City reimbursement agreement for these improvements in effect at that time. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Permittee must pay a monetary contribution for	

		the additional northbound through lane improvements. ~~such~~ The contribution must be paid pursuant to any applicable reimbursement agreement and before the final map is recorded. ~~recordation of the final map~~ **Monitoring:** The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify that the ~~such~~ contribution was consistent with the agreement or applicable fees before the final map is recorded ~~recordation of the final map~~.	
Cumulative Congestion Management ~~Plan~~ Program Impacts **Impact TR 8:** Would Project-generated traffic volumes result in significant cumulative traffic impacts at CMP intersections? The Project would contribute trips that would exceed the CMP impact thresholds under cumulative conditions at the following CMP study intersections forecast to operate at LOS D or worse (**Class II**): • Storke Road/Hollister Avenue • Los Carneros Road/US Highway 101 SB Ramps • Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue The CMP requires member agencies to prepare a deficiency plan for CMP system facilities located within their jurisdictions that exceed the CMP LOS standard. The City of Goleta has adopted a standard of LOS C with the exception of the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection, where LOS D is an acceptable operating standard. The three intersections listed above are forecast to operate at an acceptable standard under the General Plan build-out with recommended transportation improvements (**Class II**). The Goleta Transportation Improvement Program (GTIP) allows the City to collect funds required to implement the identified transportation improvements from new benefiting development and includes the programmed improvements at these intersections that would improve LOS operations to LOS C or better. The payment of the GTIP fees would reduce the Project's contribution to a less than cumulatively considerable level (**Class II**).	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure TR 7-3 for improvements to the Los Carneros Road/US Highway 101 southbound ramps intersection for cumulative impacts would also mitigate for impacts under the CMP criteria (**Class II**). **TR 8-1:** The CIP includes an improvement project with options to add a free westbound right-turn lane on Hollister Avenue at the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue Intersection**.** This improvement, along with restriping the intersection to accommodate an additional northbound through lane would mitigate the Cumulative Plus Project impacts. The Project would be subject by ordinance to payment of Development Impact Fees (DIFs) adopted for the purpose of ensuring that new development pays its fair share of transportation improvements associated with cumulative development. Fees must be paid before recordation of the final map. The GTIP was established to collect funds to implement future identified improvements within the City. The Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection is included in the GTIP, although a specific method for improving this intersection has not been identified. The improvements are to be designed to achieve an LOS D operating condition during the PM peak hour. The Permittee ~~is required to~~ must contribute fees to the GTIP fund.	Less Than Significant (Class II)

		Plan Requirements and Timing: The payment of the City's traffic impact fee must occur before the final map may be recorded. **Monitoring:** The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify that payment of this fee has been made before recordation of the final map. **TR 8-2:** The CIP includes an improvement project to install dual northbound and westbound left-turn lanes at the Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue intersection. This improvement would provide for LOS B (V/C 0.69) operations at the intersection with Cumulative Plus Project volumes. The Project would be subject by ordinance to payment of Development Impact Fees (DIFs) adopted for the purpose of requiring projects to pay a fair share of transportation improvements associated with cumulative development. Fees would be paid before recordation of the map or issuance of the first Land Use Permit for the Project; whichever occurs first. As a result of payment of these fees, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts at the Hollister Avenue/Los Carneros Road intersection would be less than cumulatively considerable and is considered less than significant. The GTIP was established to ensure that new development contributes its fair share of the funds required to implement identified transportation improvements within the City. The Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue intersection is included in the GTIP although a specific method for improving this intersection has not been identified. The improvements are to be designed to achieve a LOS D operating condition during the PM peak hour. The Permittee must ~~will be required to~~ contribute its fees to the GTIP fund.	

		Plan Requirements and Timing: The payment of the City's traffic impact fee must occur before the final map may be recorded. **Monitoring:** The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify that payment of this fee was made before the final map may be recorded.	
Utilities and Service Systems			
Water Demand **Impact WS 1:** Would the Project require new or expanded water supply facilities or entitlements to serve it? The Project's total estimated water demand would be approximately 79.2 AFY, which would be approximately 24.0 24.9 AFY more than the projected water supplies currently allocated to the site for the previously approved 2007 Village at Los Carneros Residential Project (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
SAFE Water Supplies Ordinance of 1991 Analysis SAFE limits the GWD to an annual allocation release of no more than one percent of its total potable water supply to new or additional service connections. The total annual new water demand would be approximately 20 AFY or approximately 13 percent of the available annual allocation to new services. Therefore, the Project's water demand would fall within the limits of the GWD's annual new service allocation, the Project could be supplied with water without violating the SAFE Ordinance (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Wastewater Treatment **Impact WW-1:** Would the Project require new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities? GWSD currently maintains a surplus treatment capacity within the GSD treatment plant. The Project would generate wastewater flows of approximately 85,560 gallons per day, which would be approximately 6.1 percent of the available treatment capacity. Therefore, no additional treatment facilities would be needed (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Impact WW-2: Would the Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves the Project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the its projected demand in addition to the provider's existing service commitments?	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)

The surplus treatment capacity of 1.41 million gallons per day would accommodate the Project's estimated wastewater flows, which would require an estimated 6.1 percent of the available treatment capacity (**Class III**).			
Solid Waste **Impact SW-1:** Would the Project generate more than 196 tons of solid waste per year, after a 50 percent credit is given for source reduction and recycling? <u>Construction Waste – Short Term Impact</u> The Goleta Municipal Code requires that at least 65% by weight of all construction waste generated by the Project be diverted for recycling. The Project's total construction wastes would be 673 tons after recycling 65 percent. Due to the temporary nature of construction waste generation, and by complying with the Goleta Municipal Code diversion requirement, disposal of solid waste from construction activities would be less than significant (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Operations – Long Term Impact The total annual solid waste disposal from operational activities is estimated to be 574 tons per year after applying a 50 percent reduction credit for recycling, which would exceed the City's significance threshold of 196 tons per year by an additional 378 tons per year, a significant and unavoidable impact (**Class I).**	Significant And Unavoidable	**SW 2-1:** The Permittee must develop and implement an operational Solid Waste Management Program (SWMP) and identify the projected amount of waste generated onsite during the operational phase of the Project. **Plan Requirements**: The program must include, but not be limited to, the following measures: a. Providing at least 50 percent of the total area reserved for solid waste storage space and/or bins to be designated for storage of recyclables within the Project site. b. Implementing a green waste source reduction program focusing on recycling of all green waste generated on-site. c. Developing a Source Reduction Plan (SRP), describing the recommended program(s) and the estimated reduction of the solid waste disposed by the Project. d. Implementing a program to purchase materials that have recycled content for Project construction and/or operation (e.g., plastic, lumber, office supplies). The program could	Significant And Unavoidable (Class I)

		include requesting suppliers to show recycled materials content. To verify compliance, the Permittee must develop an integrated solid waste management program, including recommended source reduction, recycling, composting programs, and/or a combination of such programs, subject to the Public Works Director, or designee's, review and approval before ~~issuance of~~ the City issues any certificate of occupancy. e. The Permittee is responsible for funding the cost of post construction inspections to verify compliance with the SRP in a method approved by the Planning and Environmental Review ~~Services~~ Director, or designee, and/or the Public Works Director, or designee **Timing:** The Permittee must submit a Solid Waste Management Program to the City Public Works Director, or designee, for review and approval before the City issues any permit. All program components must be implemented before the City issues any certificate of occupancy and must be maintained for the lifetime of the Project. The required deposit to the permit compliance account must be made before the City issues the first certificate of occupancy for any use on the site. **Monitoring:** Before occupancy clearance, the Planning and Environmental ~~Services~~ Review Director, or designee, and/or Public Works Director, or designee, must verify compliance with the Solid Waste Management Plan. Once the Project is occupied, the owner and property management company are responsible for continued implementation of the Solid Waste Management Plan. The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, and/or Public Works Director, or designee, must inspect the Project site periodically for the first five (5) years after completion of Project occupancy to verify compliance with the Solid Waste Management Plan.	

Impact SW-2: Would the Project be served by a landfill with inadequate capacity to meet the Project's solid waste disposal needs? The Tajiguas Landfill is permitted to receive 1,500 tons per day. The Project's disposal rate following a 50 % reduction for recycling materials, would dispose of approximately 1.9 tons per day, or 0.1 percent of the landfill's permitted daily disposal, a less than significant impact (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Impact SW-3: Would the Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? The Project would be required to comply with all applicable regulatory statutes regarding solid waste disposal and would result in a less than significant impact (**Class III**).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant (Class III)
Cumulative Impact SW-4: Would the Project have a cumulatively significant contribution to solid waste impacts? The Project would generate solid waste in excess of the City's single project threshold and therefore, would also make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts associated with solid waste that cannot be successfully mitigated (**Class I**).	Significant and Unavoidable	See Mitigation Measure Required for SW 1	Significant and Unavoidable

1.5 ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives were selected for analysis in this EIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint/Density Alternative
- Alternative 3: Reduced Density/Scale Alternative

The selection of these alternatives was based on CEQA Guidelines and the Project's significant impacts. A summary of the alternatives analysis including identification of the environmentally superior alternative is provided below.

1.5.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative is defined in Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines as "the existing conditions at the time of the notice of preparation is published …as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." In this case, an appropriate assumption for this Alternative is that it would result in development of the site consistent with the site's existing entitlements (Village at Los Carneros Phase I approved by the City in February of 2008). This Alternative will provide a comparison of the potential impacts of the current Project to the already entitled Village at Los Carneros Phase I project that included 275 Multi-family Dwelling units on 16.11 acres comprised of Lots 2 and 5 of TM 14,500. The project entitlements also received approval for the rezoning of the Lots 2 and 5 residentially developed from DR-20 (Design Residential, 20 units/acre) to Planned Residential Development – 275 (PRD-275). Among the entitlements also requested was a Specific Plan Amendment to the Raytheon Specific Plan to allow for the proposed residential development. For the remaining area of 27.02 acres, an appropriate set of development assumptions is used in this analysis based on the existing General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) land use designation of R-MD (Residential Medium Density), which allows between 15 and 20 units per acre. It is also assumed that, in accordance with the GP/CLUP, 4.82 acres would continue to be provided to account for the public park dedication and 2.47 acres would be preserved as part of the Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) for the Tecolotito Creek, resulting in a net developable area of 35.84 acres. It is assumed the bicycle path, and a private recreation center, pool areas, open space, ball courts, and pocket parks would be provided. Under this alternative, the total number of residences that would be developed is calculated to be 599 multi-family units based on land coverage limitations.

1.5.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint/Density Alternative

Alternative 2 would develop a reduced number of residential units, which would reduce the related impacts for air quality emissions, water quality, water, traffic generation, biological resources and solid waste disposal. This Alternative would occupy a reduced development footprint to allow for a 100-foot ESHA/SPA buffer along Tecolotito Creek pursuant to GP/CLUP Conservation Element Policy CE 2.2. To develop the site with these reductions in the number of residences, and the increase in the ESHA/SPA buffer area, Alternative 2 would eliminate 14 of the Project's single-unit 2-pac buildings, two single-unit alley-loaded buildings, and at least the western halves of the two 44-unit podium flats proposed for Lot 6. The area of Lot 6 that is beyond the 100-foot SPA would be developed with either 2 podium flats (22 units each)

designed as half of the proposed buildings; 4 townhomes of 6 units each; or 7 single-unit 2-Pac buildings, depending on feasibility of design and space accommodations for such units. These options under Alternative 2 would reduce the total number of units from 465 to either 405, 385, or 368 respectively. By increasing the development buffer from Tecolotito Creek to 100 feet for the SPA, the Project would also establish a Fire Lane to provide easier access for emergency vehicles to the Project's westernmost residences. The lot coverage of development and open space areas would be changed.

1.5.3 Alternative 3: Reduced Density/Scale Alternative

Alternative 3 would retain the same development footprint as the proposed Project, but would reduce the total number of units by replacing the two 3-story, 44-unit podium buildings (88 units total) on Lot 6 with 39 multi-family townhome dwellings, reducing the total unit count to 416 units instead of the current 465-unit project. This design would decrease the overall density of development and the scale and massing of structures on the property, and the intensity of operational and resource consumption aspects. However, the overall development footprint would remain the same. This would provide an opportunity to preserve some views of the Santa Ynez Mountains by reducing the heights of buildings along Los Carneros Road.

1.5.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Based on this alternatives analysis, an environmentally superior alternative must be designated among the alternatives described above. The environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives discussed in this EIR is the Alternative 2. This alternative would result in incremental reductions in the level of severity of impacts associated with Aesthetics due to a reduction in buildings, Air Quality, Biological Resources due to preservation of sensitive resources, Cultural Resources due to the preservation of a sensitive historical resource, Greenhouse Gas, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, and Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities. However, the Alternative would not be consistent with the City's General Plan Land Use Element (Central Hollister Residential Development Plan Area) or its Housing Element.